

CHAPTER 2

CURRENT TRENDS IN TRANSLATION TEACHING

2.1 Introduction

Translator training has undergone considerable changes since the beginning of the nineties, attempting to bridge the gap between the academic and professional worlds of translating. Translation trainers, often professional translators themselves, have started to look at real translation situations, investigating what makes certain translations (and translators for that matter) more successful than others and incorporating their findings into their approach and methodology of translation teaching.

It is the objective of this chapter to view the current ALTFC against the wider context of translator training, thus addressing the first secondary aim of this study. However, before discussing the various approaches to teaching translation, it will be examined what translation trainers seem to have in common. The consensus will then serve as a presupposition for dealing with the various approaches.

2.2 The consensus among translation trainers

Scholars on translation teaching seem to agree on two things: firstly that there is a difference between translation in foreign-language teaching and translation teaching for professional purposes and secondly that a functional approach to translation should be adopted. The difference between translation in foreign-language teaching and translation teaching for professional purposes will be discussed first.

2.2.1 Translation in foreign-language teaching versus translation for professional purposes

According to Menck (1991: 108), translation became a feature in language teaching when Latin ceased to be the *lingua franca* in Europe and the national languages were introduced into the classroom. The classics from Greek and Latin literature were translated into the respective national languages, with the Greek and Latin texts as the ideal on which the national languages and literatures were to be modelled. When in the late 18th century modern languages were added to the school curriculum Latin was still one of the most important subjects and teaching Latin “a formalised and rigid ritual” (Menck 1991: 108; my translation). However, this formalised ritual was directly transferred to teaching modern languages, with the main emphasis being on reading and writing. Speaking and hearing were largely neglected because a language was learned to read its literature and not to communicate with speakers of that language (Colina 2002: 3).

At the centre of this type of teaching was the so-called grammar-translation method (Menck 1991: 109-112). According to this method, translation out of and especially into the foreign language was the main means to apply, consolidate and test the lexis and grammar of the foreign language. Translation mainly

consisted in matching vocabulary and grammatical rules on a one-to-one equivalence basis between the mother tongue and the foreign language. As a result, artificial sentences and texts were constructed for students to translate.

Although the grammar translation method is now almost universally rejected in foreign-language teaching its influence can still be felt to this day (Menck 1991: 112; Jakobsen 1994: 144) and has markedly influenced many people in their perception of what translation is and what it entails. This is particularly important in view of potential initiators of translation (see par. 2.2.2.1), as well as laypersons dabbling at translation.

What is then the main difference between translation in foreign-language teaching and translation for professional purposes? According to Menck (1991: 147-148), translation in foreign-language teaching is a means to an end (*Übersetzung als Übungsform*), e.g. to facilitate the understanding of a text or test certain capabilities (i.e. grammar, vocabulary) in the foreign language. In foreign-language teaching, translation is therefore used to achieve purely L2-relevant, and thus completely different, training objectives (see Krings as quoted in Menck 1991: 148).

In contrast, translation for professional purposes (*Übersetzung als Fähigkeit* according to Menck 1991: 147-148) is an end in itself. It is a skill acquired on the basis of L1 and L2 proficiency (Nord 1991a: 140). Nord considers a certain level of L1/L2 proficiency a prerequisite for the acquisition of transfer (translation) competence, although several authors report a fair amount of language study in their translation classes (e.g. Weatherby (1998: 25) with regard to the L2; Conacher (1996: 166) and Lang (1994: 397) with regard to the L1.) In translator training, the objective of translation is to acquire translation skills, i.e. translation as training aid and training objective in one.

Since the above translation methods (i.e. *Übersetzung als Übungsform* and *Übersetzung als Fähigkeit*) are used in training to achieve radically different objectives, translation in foreign-language teaching can never be considered as a preparation for translation for professional purposes as is shown by Krings (as quoted in Menck 1991: 151). He found that learners were not sufficiently aware of translational problems. They did not reflect on the function of the translation (see par. 2.2.2), showed a readiness to translate without properly understanding the ST, tended to translate word for word and thus produced hybrid language variations in the TT, i.e. SL words and structures appeared in the TL. This so-called *translationese* does not only occur in translations of foreign-language learners but is also typical in the work of inexperienced translators¹.

Krings (as quoted in Menck 1991: 151) blames the above shortcomings on the uncommunicative nature of translation in foreign-language teaching. This means that the texts to be translated are not authentic and translation takes place in a vacuum, with the translation having no real communicative function (see

par. 2.2.2.1). Hönig and Kussmaul (as quoted in Menck 1991: 142; my translation) put the problem in a nutshell when they wrote the following:

Students translate a text they do not understand for an addressee they do not know. And the product of their efforts is often marked by a teacher who does not have any practical experience as a translator nor any theoretical knowledge in the field of translation studies.

Even though current trends both in language and translator training favour a communicative approach by concentrating on language in communication rather than language as a formal construct (Colina 2003: 5-6; Menck 1991: 132), there is a marked difference between the two. In language training the language is the object of study (Mackenzie 1998: 15) and learners try to get as close as possible to native competence, a competence which is then accessed for production (Colina 2002: 6). In the case of translation, language is used as a tool and the emphasis is no longer on competence but performance since the translator has to focus on “particular instantiations of language use, in specific texts and contexts” (Colina 2002: 6). Unlike in language teaching where the language system in the brain is accessed for production, in translation the language system is accessed via the ST, which is by definition an intrinsic part of translation irrespective of the stance taken as to its importance (see par. 2.2.2.3).

Stressing the communicative aspect of language training, Menck (1991: 474-483) states that for translation exercises to be useful in language training they must cease to be mere testing devices for certain competencies and approximate translation for professional purposes. This means that authentic texts must be chosen and the communicative situation taken into consideration by giving clear translation briefs (see par. 2.2.2.3). As such, translation should become a fifth training objective in foreign-language training, apart from comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, to contribute to competence and intercultural understanding. The communicative aspect of language and intercultural understanding with regard to translation will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs on the functional approach to translation, which seems to be the second consensus among translation teachers.

2.2.2 The functional approach to translation

For the purposes of this study, the functional approach is mainly seen in contrast to the linguistic/equivalence-based approach to translation. The linguistic-oriented translation theorists often used the linguistic trends of the time for their approach towards a translation theory. Nida and Taber (1982), for example, relied heavily on Chomsky’s transformational grammar, while House (1977) drew on text linguistics. Central to most of their efforts was the desire to establish criteria for the production and evaluation of translations as well as lay down guidelines for the training of prospective translators. This linguistic approach to translation is therefore also known as the *normative* or *prescriptive* approach.

One of the features dominating linguistic-based translation theories and models is the concept of *translation equivalence*. The discussion on equivalence first centred on words and word phrases and gradually included longer units, resulting in the concept of *translation unit*, which is a cohesive element somewhere between the word and the sentence or at the level of the entire text, depending on the translation theorist (Snell-Hornby 1988: 16).

Whereas under the influence of structuralist and transformational-generative linguistics the notion of *equivalence* was first adopted in its mathematical sense, this approach was soon considered to be too limiting. Nida and Taber (1982) therefore added the cultural element to their concept of *dynamic equivalence*, which measures equivalence by the equivalent response of the receptors (see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.1.2). Newmark's (1995: 47- 52) *communicative* translation is rather similar to Nida and Taber's *dynamic equivalence*, with the ST translated in such a way that the content and language are easily accessible and comprehensible to the reader. Newmark (1995:51) goes on to say that even though not all the words in the ST will be translated, the translator must still be able to account for every single one. House (1977; see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.1.2) with her pragmatic-semantic approach starts out with the larger unit, i.e. the text and works down to the smaller units, which is in contrast with Catford (1965), who tried to achieve equivalence at the smallest level and if this was not possible, worked his way up to larger units.

One of the problems with the concept of translation equivalence is that it is based on the assumption that there is a certain degree of symmetry between languages to make equivalence possible (Snell-Hornby 1988: 16). While such a symmetry may exist between some languages (e.g. among the Romance or Nguni languages), it may not exist at all in other language combinations (e.g. between the European and African languages). Furthermore, most definitions of *equivalence* tend to put the ST on a pedestal against which the TT is supposed to be measured and assessed. Inevitably, the TT will fail to reach the ideal because of linguistic and cultural constraints between languages. By denying that the TT is a text in its own right, the translation process is relegated to a secondary activity (see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.1.2). Since the TT cannot, and is often not supposed to, fulfil the same function as the ST, the equivalence-based approach would prevent translators in many instances from producing accessible translations for their target readers since, for example, adaptations and reformulations are not considered to be translations².

A wider view of translation is presented by the functional approach to translation, which says that the translator should not be guided by the function of the ST, as functional equivalence would have it, but by the function the TT is to achieve in the TC, with the function of TT being mainly determined by its receiver (Nord 1992: 40). Although not based on entirely new ideas, the functional approach was first consolidated by Hans Vermeer (Reiß & Vermeer 1984) in the first part of *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (Foundation of a General Translation Theory), which he co-authored

with Katharina Reiss, and further developed by Nord in her many publications (see list of sources). Based on action theory, stating that human action is “intentional, purposeful behaviour that takes place in a given situation” (Nord 1997: 11), the functional translation theory comprises translation as intercultural communication, translation as cultural transfer and skopos theory (*skopos* being Greek for *purpose* or *aim*). These three aspects are interlinked and often overlap and will be discussed below.

2.2.2.1 Translation as intercultural and interpersonal communication

The point of departure for the model of translation as intercultural communication is the insight that language and culture are interdependent (Stolze 1994: 156-157). Action becomes communicative “when it is carried out through signs produced intentionally by one agent, usually referred to as the ‘sender’, and directed toward another agent referred to as the ‘addressee’ or the ‘receiver’” (Nord 1997: 16). The sender and receiver thus form part of a communicative situation at a certain time and place, which adds a historical and cultural dimension to the communication process. The historical and cultural dimension influence the senders’ and receivers’ knowledge and expectations, their linguistic and paralinguistic behaviour, the way they assess a certain situation and “the standpoint from which they look at each other and the world” (Nord 1997: 16).

While in an intralingual communication situation the sender and receiver are expected to have enough common ground for communication to be successful, the same may not be assumed in interlingual communication. Apart from the linguistic barrier, the cultural background, expectations and world view of the sender may differ to such an extent that meaningful communication cannot take place. In such a case, the translator is not only a linguistic mediator but also a cultural one. He mediates between the non-converging world views of the participants in the intercultural communicative act, thus “allowing the participants to cooperate to the degree they wish” (Katan 1999: 11). This means that a translator not only needs a thorough knowledge of the SL and TL but also of the SC and TC. The role of the translator thus goes beyond the actual translation. Nord (1997: 17) therefore distinguishes between translation and translational action. Translation forms part of translational action and refers to the actual rendering of a text. Translational action, in turn, includes the whole range of actions performed by translators, e.g. dealing with clients, giving advice, doing research, etc.

However, translation is not only intercultural but also interpersonal and comprises a number of roleplayers. According to Nord (1991a: 5-11), these roleplayers are the ST producer, ST sender, ST, ST recipient, initiator, translator, TT and TT recipient. In this list, Nord makes a distinction between the ST text producer and ST sender. The former actually produces the ST but may do so on the latter’s behalf (e.g. ghost writer). This may result in a discrepancy between the sender’s intention and the text written by the producer. The ST produced is generally intended for a ST readership. Although the ST recipient does not play an active role in the intercultural communication, he still influences the ST with

regard to linguistic and stylistic characteristics. The TT, in turn, differs from the ST in that the situation in which it is produced is different from that of the ST, with the ST sender and TT recipient being separated in time and space. All these factors have to be taken into consideration by the translator.

The translator's role is unique in that he only has a translational interest in the ST. He will critically read the text as an ST recipient. Based on the translator's competencies in the SL and SC as well as the TL, the translator must be able to "reconstruct the possible reactions of an ST recipient" and "anticipate the possible reactions of a TT recipient and thereby verify the functional adequacy of the translation he produces" (Nord 1991a: 11). Although the translator is not the sender of the ST he produces a communicative text in the TC that contains the intentions of the ST. Any deviations from the sender's intentions will have to be communicated to the initiator, who can be any of the individuals involved in the intercultural communication process, e.g. the ST producer, ST sender or TT recipient (see par. 2.2.2.3 on the role of loyalty in the translation process). The role of the initiator is crucial in the intercultural communication process because he is the one who actually wants the text translated for a specific purpose and issues the translator with a translation brief or negotiates with the translator such a brief (see par. 2.2.2.3).

It is interesting to note that in her description of the roleplayers in the intercultural communication process, Nord (1997: 19-22) shows a clear shift in emphasis from the ST participants to the TT participants. Nord (1997: 20) defines the main roles in the translation process (in its narrower sense) as those of the initiator and the translator. Following Holz-Mänttari, Nord (1997:20) makes a distinction between initiator, who needs the target text, and the commissioner, who approaches the translator and *commissions* a target text for a particular purpose and TT recipient. Moreover, a distinction is made between the TT receiver and the TT user. While the former is the addressee of the TT (e.g. a student) and thus an important factor in the TT production, the latter will put the TT to use (e.g. a teacher). The text producer is only relevant in the translation process if the text was produced for translation, otherwise his role is relegated to producing the ST features. The ST and TT are no longer mentioned as roleplayers in the translation process. This could be due to the influence of Holz-Mänttari (Nord 1997: 12-13), who considers any type of intercultural transfer as *translational action*, irrespective of whether it involves any source or target texts. The importance of viewing translation as intercultural and interpersonal transfer lies in the fact that the translator is for the first time considered to be an actor in the translation process (see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.1.2). He is no longer restricted to applying transfer procedures to turn an ST into a TT according to equivalence principles (Stolze 1994: 158). The role of the translator is also highlighted in the following section on translation as cultural transfer.

2.2.2.2 Translation as cultural transfer

According to Reiss and Vermeer (1984: 70), a sender of a text can never demand that a text is received in a certain way. He can only suggest a certain understanding of the text. The way the text is understood will depend on the situation and the respective recipients. Various people will understand the same text differently, even when they are from the same culture.

A text can therefore only be an offer of information, from which the receiver will choose the pieces that are relevant to his situation and purpose. In the same vein, every translation, independent of its function and text type (genre), is an offer of information in the TL and its TC based on information offered in the form of a source text in a source language and its source culture. Translation is thus no longer simply a transfer of communication but an offer of information on a communicative act that has already taken place (Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 76-77). (This is also how Nord defines the target text, i.e. the translated text, in her book (1997: 141).)

Based on the information in the ST, the translator will choose the information in accordance with his (or the initiator's/commissioner's) expectations of the target receivers and their situation(s) (see also par. 2.2.2.3 on Nord and loyalty). It is obvious that these expectations and thus the information offer with regard to the TT will differ from the information offer in the ST because the source and target text receivers belong to different cultural and linguistic communities (Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 123).

This leads to the question of what translators have to know if they want to take cultural aspects into consideration. According to Gail Robinson (Katan 1999: 17), the various definitions of *culture* can be grouped into external behaviours (e.g. language, gestures, customs/habits) or products (literature, folklore, art, music, artefacts) and internal ideas, beliefs and values. The traditional teaching of culture has concentrated on history, literature and political institutions. However, in order to be useful to translators and interpreters it has to shift its focus to "culture as a shared system for interpreting reality and organising experience" (Katan 1999:17). Katan (1999:17) goes on to define culture as

a shared mental model or map of the world, which includes Culture, though it is not the main focus. The model is a system of congruent and interrelated beliefs, values, strategies and cognitive environments which guide the shared basis of behaviour.

Any type of shared behaviour is normally governed by rules, norms and conventions (Nord 1991b: 95-97). While rules are backed by legislation and breaking them will result in punishment, norms are based on the general agreement of certain groups to act in a certain way. According to Toury (1980:51), norms are

the translation of general values and ideas shared by a certain community - as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate - into specific performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations ... These instructions, the norms, are acquired - even internalized - by individual members of the community during the socialization process, and may be said to serve as criteria, in comparison with which actual instances of behavior are evaluated or judged by a group as a whole and by its members individually.

Norms need not be unitary within a certain culture but can also undergo change in the course of time. Although the violation of norms is not legally penalised it may result in social criticism or even loss in social standing.

Conventions, in turn, are not always clearly formulated and are often based on “common knowledge and on the expectation of what others expect you to expect them (etc.) to do in a certain situation” (Nord 1991b: 96). Conventions are not binding, easily replaceable and internalised either by trial and error or by imitation. Conventions here are meant to refer to the synchronisation of social behaviour in general. Translation-specific conventions, as part of cultural conventions, will be discussed in the following section (par. 2.2.2.3).

The fact that different cultures have different rules, norms and conventions means with regard to translation that the TT will never offer the same or a similar amount of information as the ST. In the words of Reiss and Vermeer (1984: 123; my translation), “a translator does not offer more or less information than the source text producer; a translator offers different information in a different way”. As a result the translation process is irreversible. The extent to which the offer of information differs in the TT will depend on the TT receiver and the translation skopos, which will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.2.3 Skopos theory

Skopos theory sees translation as a special and complex type of communicative action. In translation, the given situation, which is evaluated by a person and forms the basis for further action, is the ST (primary action). The question is therefore no longer just whether and how further action (i.e. translating/interpreting) should take place but also what this further action should include. All translational decisions as to *whether*, *what* and *how* will be guided by one dominant factor, namely the skopos or purpose (Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 96 use the terms *skopos*, *purpose*, *function* or *aim* synonymously). This means that the *what for* determines whether, what and how action is to take place. It is more important that a certain translation purpose is achieved than that the translation is carried out in a certain way. The end (purpose) therefore justifies the means (Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 95-101).

Since the translator cannot always derive the purpose the translation is to fulfil in the TL and TC from

the ST or his own experience, he needs a translation brief. It is either given to the translator by the initiator/commissioner or established in a discussion between the translator and initiator/commissioner. The translation brief will guide translators with regard to the information they choose from the initial offer of information (ST) and the way they package this information in the TT. According to Nord (1997: 60), the translation brief should contain the following:

- the intended text function(s) (i.e. informative, appellative, etc.),
- the target-text addressee(s),
- the (prospective) time and place of text reception,
- the medium over which the text will be transmitted, and
- the motive (reason) for the production or the reception of the text.

If the translation brief states that the function or purpose must be changed or maintained in the translation, the translator will have to do so since the purpose overrides all other translational considerations. A translation will therefore no longer be judged in terms of equivalence principles (see par. 2.2.2), but in terms of its adequacy with regard to the translation brief (Nord 1997: 35). However, a translation must still be coherent.

A translation is coherent if it is meaningful to the target-culture receiver, i.e. “it should make sense in the communicative situation and culture in which it is received” (Nord 1997: 32). This is called *intratextual coherence* and is thus in contrast with *intertextual coherence*, which refers to the relationship between the ST and TT. The type of ST and TT relationship will depend on the translator’s interpretation of the ST and the function the TT is to fulfil in the TC. However, intratextual coherence takes precedence over intertextual coherence and, as has been shown above, both are subordinate to the *skopos*.

On the basis of the above principles and theories, Reiss and Vermeer (1984: 119) formulated the general theory of translation, which consists of five basic rules, with a sixth rule stating how the first five rules are interlinked. The six rules read as follows:

- (1) A translation depends on its *skopos*, i.e. its intended purpose.
- (2) A translation is an offer of information in the TC and TL based on an offer of information in the SC and SL.
- (3) A translation presents an offer of information and is as such not reversible (i.e. the ST cannot be reproduced from the TT).
- (4) A translation must be coherent in itself (intratextual coherence).
- (5) A translation must be coherent with regard to its ST (intertextual coherence).
- (6) The above rules are hierarchically interlinked in the stipulated order.

Reiss and Vermeer's general theory of translation thus combines the principles of translation as intercultural communication and cultural transfer as well as skopos theory into five rules and orders these rules hierarchically according to importance. The numerical order of the rules clearly shows that in the functional approach to translation the skopos or purpose reigns supreme, with the information offered and intra- and intertextual coherence in subordinate positions.

As has been shown above, the ST may be sacrificed if so required by the skopos. Nord (1991a: 28-30 and 1997: 124-128), however, believes that a translator must also take the expectations of the ST author, initiator and TT readers into consideration. This means that a translator may not produce a TT that is contrary to or incompatible with the ST author's intentions or the TT receivers' ideas of what a translation should be in terms of the prevalent conventions of the TC. Thus, the decision of what may be a legitimate skopos for the ST is "based on the conventional concept of translation regarded as valid in the cultures involved" (Nord 1991b: 94).

Nord (1991: 28) calls this responsibility of the translator with regard to certain participants in the translation process *loyalty* (Chesterman 2000: 86 speaks of the accountability norm). While *function* refers "to the factors that make a target text work in the intended way in the target situation", *loyalty* refers to the interpersonal relationship between the participants in the translational communication process and restricts "the range of justifiable target text functions for one particular source text" (Nord 1997: 126). Functionality plus loyalty means that the translator will attempt to produce a functional TT that is in line with the translation brief issued by the initiator and will be accepted by the TT recipients because it takes culture-specific conventions into consideration (Nord: 1991b: 92).

Translational conventions can be divided into *regulative* and *constitutive* ones, with regulative conventions being subordinate to constitutive conventions (Nord 1991b: 100). Regulative conventions will guide the translator in solving translation problems below text level, such as whether imperial or metric measures are used and whether names of people are translated or the SL names maintained. Constitutive conventions determine as to what will be considered a translation in a certain culture (e.g. just faithful translations or any type of intercultural transfer).

Translational norms are less common than conventions and may, for example, apply to the translation of legal texts, where the translator has to stay as close to the ST as possible. Moreover, there may be communities where there are official stipulations of what a translation entails if it is to be officially accepted. In such cases, the translator does not have a choice but must uphold the norm (Nord 1991b: 100).

As a result of *loyalty*, the translator has to carry out a compatibility test before starting with the actual translation task to establish whether, based on the translation skopos, a functional and loyal translation

can be produced. If the translator believes that such a TT cannot be produced in terms of the translation brief he must enter into discussions about the translation task with the respective participants in the translational communication process. If no satisfactory compromise can be found the translator will have to decline the translation task. Furthermore, the principle of loyalty also implies that although translators may still focus on certain aspects of the ST and neglect others they must keep the ST sender informed of those changes. Unlike many other supporters of the functional approach to translation, including Vermeer and Holz-Mänttari, Nord is not willing to completely dethrone the ST. It will be shown throughout the remainder of this chapter that the role of the ST in translation is still a controversial issue.

2.2.2.4 Implications of the functional approach to translation teaching

One of the reasons why the functional approach is useful in translation teaching is that it encourages translation teachers to move away from equivalence-based principles (see par. 2.2.2) and take a wider view of what translation entails. This has facilitated a more profession- and practice-oriented translator training and permitted the inclusion of a wide variety of activities professional translators are asked to perform (Nord 1997: 117). Such realistic assignments are also beneficial from a motivational point of view and prepare learners for real-life translation situations (Nord 1994a: 66).

In making translator training more profession-oriented, only authentic texts from recent publications and on topical issues, which Nord (1991a: 147) calls real *texts-in-situation*, should be used in the classroom. Jakobsen (1994: 147-148) takes this approach one step further by suggesting *warm* texts to guarantee students' continued interest in a task. *Warm* texts are texts needed for a genuine communicative purpose and still in the process of being made (i.e. in the translation class), with a text remaining *warm* for as long as students are responsible for it.

By using authentic texts that have to be translated for different purposes, students are forced to transcend purely linguistic structures and work actively as well as creatively with different text types within a communicative and cultural framework. In addition to improving their linguistic awareness on an intercultural basis, it helps students to acquire translation skills. By being able to determine various skopi for the translation of an ST, translation trainers can adjust the translation task to the level of the respective students (e.g. a summary in the TL of a rather complex ST; see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.5).

An important factor in translator training is therefore the translation brief (see par. 2.2.2.3), which has to be supplied to translation students with every translation task. The translation brief prevents students from translating in a vacuum, with their only frame of reference being an educated guess at what might please their teacher (see par. 2.2.1). Nord (1994a: 65) has found that as a result of specifying the situation in which the text is used by means of the translation brief, trainee translators tend to make fewer linguistic errors or faults in their translations.

Furthermore, the functional approach is consistent in that it can be applied to literary as well as non-literary translation (unlike the equivalence-based model) and used for any type of text and language and cultural combination. It thus makes translator training more rational, *economical* and independent of linguistic and cultural peculiarities (Nord 1994a: 66).

Another advantage is that by comparing the target situation outlined in the translation brief with the ST situation and function, translation problems can often be anticipated. This will help students to develop translation strategies that will apply to the translation of the whole text and not just smaller units, e.g. words and phrases (Nord 1994a: 65).

While the translation brief, and functional translation theory for that matter, does not tell the translator what to do in detail, it supplies global guidelines on how to approach the TT. According to Nord (1997: 118), it is not the purpose of a theory to instruct translators on how to go about their work but to “help practitioners observe and reflect on what they are doing, on the consequences that one or another decision may have for the communicative effect of the target text they are producing”. Despite the fact that many trainee translators will still take translational decisions intuitively (see par. 2.3.2), functional translation theories supply them with a theoretical framework to rationally justify certain choices over others. By being more aware of who or what is guiding their choices, (trainee) translators will become more self-confident and, as a result, more professional. The rest of this chapter will focus on the various tendencies in translator training based on the functional approach.

2.3 Tendencies in translator training

With the above consensus in mind, there seem to emerge three main tendencies in translation teaching from the literature examined. The first seems to favour guiding students step-by-step through the translation process until an adequate TT has been produced in terms of the translation brief. The second approach focuses on the translation process rather than the finished product and tries to point out and remedy methodological weaknesses. In the third approach, authors tend to concentrate on competencies and skills and borrow from the first two approaches whenever deemed useful. These three approaches will be described in more detail below.

2.3.1 Nord and her model of translation-oriented text analysis

The main representative of the first approach is Christiane Nord, who in 1991 presented one of the more exhaustive attempts to deal with the methodology and didactic application of text analysis in translation. Nord puts her model of translation-oriented text analysis at the centre of training translators. Her model is based on the so-called New Rhetoric formula and expressed in a series of *wh-questions* which are used to analyse the ST as well as the translation brief to point out where the ST and TT differ

and which ST elements can be maintained and which must be changed to produce a functional TT in the TC (Nord 1991a: 35-140 and Nord 1992: 40-43). The questions are as follows:

Who transmits

To whom

what for

by which medium

where

when

why

a text

with what function?

On what subject-matter

does he say

what

(what not)

in what order

using which non-verbal elements

in which words

in what kind of sentences

in which tone

to what effect?

The first set of questions enquires about the *extratextual* features, which refer to the communicative situations in which the ST and the prospective TT function (Nord 1991a: 35-36). By answering these questions the translator gets information on the author or sender of the text (who?), the intended recipient of the text (to whom?), the sender's intention (what for?), the medium or channel by which the text is communicated, e.g. in written or spoken form or as a flier or brochure (by which medium?), as well as the place (where?) and time (when?) of communication (text production and text reception) and the motive of communication (why?). The answers to the above questions will indicate the function the text is to achieve (with what function?).

Since the roles of the sender and the receiver were discussed at some length under *Translation as intercultural and interpersonal communication* (see par. 2.2.2.1) the discussion will start with the *sender's intention*. The sender's intention is best explained by contrasting it with *function* and *effect*, which according to Nord (1991a: 47) are "three different viewpoints of one and the same aspect of communication". The intention (what for?) takes the sender's perspective and the purpose he wants to achieve with the text. However, even the best intentions may not result in the intended purpose, with the recipient not assigning the function to the text that the sender intended. The text function results from the combination of all extratextual factors and is defined externally before the text is read by the receiver. Nord (1997: 40-45) divides the communicative functions of texts into *referential* (content-oriented), *expressive* (sender-oriented), *appellative* (receiver-oriented to elicit a reaction) and *phatic* functions,

with the latter establishing, maintaining and concluding contact between the sender and the receiver (see also Newmark's classification of functions in Chapter 3, par. 3.2.1.3). In contrast, the effect of a text can only be evaluated once the text has been read, thus including the extratextual as well as intratextual factors. Ideally, intention, function and effect should be congruent, which means that "the function intended by the sender (intention) is also assigned to the text by the recipient, who experiences exactly the same effect conventionally associated with this function" (Nord 1991a: 48).

Motive (why?), in turn, does not only refer to the reason but also the occasion why a certain text has been produced. It refers to an event prior to the communicative situation, e.g. the death of a public personality resulting in an obituary, or also a wedding in wedding invitations (Nord 1991a: 67-69). The motive often pre-signals conventional features, such as formulas or non-verbal elements (a black rim in a death announcement), and predetermines intratextual features, such as content, vocabulary and sentence structure. While the motive for the ST production can normally be gathered from the text environment, the motive for the TT production should be in the translation brief. The motive can give an indication as to the sender, receiver or time and place of text production, i.e. communication.

The place of communication is important from a linguistic point of view, especially when various varieties of a language exist (e.g. English spoken in Great Britain, America, Australia, South Africa, etc.). Knowing where the text was produced will supply information as to what variety to expect in the ST as well as to what variety to use in the TT. A feature that is closely interlinked with the place of communication is the time of communication. The time of communication has serious linguistic implications not just with regard to language use but also comprehension in the case of the translator and recipient. Certain text types and text-type conventions are linked to certain periods and change in the course of time (also see par. 2.2.2.1 on the importance of *place* and *time* in the translation process).

Regarding the *medium*, first a distinction will have to be made between texts that are transmitted in speech and in writing since this will affect text production with regard to explicitness, sentence types, features of cohesion, the use of non-verbal elements (gestures, photos), etc. Sometimes the spoken and written medium are mixed, as in the case of speeches that are written to be spoken. In written communication, however, the medium normally refers to the type of publication, such as newspapers, fliers, journals, brochures, etc. The translator will have to bear in mind that the same media may have different functions in different cultures and that the medium will raise the expectations of the recipient as to the text function (Nord 1991a: 56-60).

The questions enquiring about the extratextual features can be answered before actually reading the text since it should be possible to gather most of the clues from the text environment. If the text environment does not supply any information as to the situation in which the text is or is to be used the analysis of the intratextual features will often also supply reliable information on the communicative situation. Since the

situation normally precedes the act of communication the extratextual features tend to be established first although this is not compulsory. Moreover, the above questions build an expectation as to what will be found in the text, which will be confirmed or disproved when enquiring about the intratextual factors.

The intratextual factors, enquired about with the questions in the second column of the above list, refer to the text itself and include non-verbal elements. Intratextual factors can only be identified after the text has been read. They are analysed by asking about the subject matter of the text (on what subject matter?), the content or information (what?), the knowledge assumptions made by the author (what not?), how the text is constructed (in what order?), the non-verbal elements in and around the text (with which non-verbal elements?), the lexical and syntactic characteristics (in which words and type of sentences?) and suprasegmental features (in which tone?), which serve to stress some parts of the text and push others to the background (Nord: 1991a: 37).

While the first three questions regarding the subject matter, content and knowledge assumptions or presuppositions supply semantic information, the five questions regarding the text composition, non-verbal elements, the type of words and sentences used, as well as the suprasegmental features belong to the concept of style. The questions regarding the semantic aspects of the text will be dealt with first.

Once the *subject matter* has been identified (e.g. sports, financial), the items of information that the sender chooses to include in the text, i.e. the *content*, will have to be investigated (Nord 1991a: 89-95). The translator will have to analyse how these information units are linked together, whether there are any gaps regarding cohesion and coherence in the text and whether these gaps can be overcome without adding information. This leads to the dimension of *presuppositions* (Nord 1991a: 95-100), which includes all the knowledge the sender expects the receiver to have in order to receive the message in its intended function. Presuppositional information is very important since communication can only be successful if the sender and the receiver “implicitly assume the same presuppositions in sufficient quantity” (Nord 1991a: 96).

Having dealt with the semantic information supplied by the questions enquiring about intratextual factors, the remaining questions will deal with the stylistic aspects of text. The first of the stylistic aspects is text composition (Nord 1991a: 100-107). Every text has macrostructural and microstructural elements. *Macrostructure* refers to the composition and ordering of units. First one will have to establish whether the text forms part of a larger hierarchy of texts (e.g. anthology), which will influence its interpretation, or whether there are sub-texts, having different situational conditions, and thus functions, embedded in the text. Such sub-texts also include quotations and footnotes.

Other aspects of macrostructure are the beginning and the end of a text, which are important regarding the comprehension and interpretation of the text. These are conventional in certain text types (fairy tales,

letters) and therefore culture-specific. Metatextual items, such as titles or inclusions (e.g. *so to speak*, *as pointed out earlier*), also form part of the macrostructure because they supply information about the text. Finally, macrostructure also refers to the ordering of textual units into chapters, expressed, for example, by chapter headings or numerals, and paragraphs, indicated either by non-verbal markers (e.g. indentation, space) or lexical markers (*firstly*, *finally*, *on the one hand*, *on the other hand*).

The *microstructure*, in contrast, distinguishes between formal structures (simple versus complex) and functional or semantic structures in the form of information units, utterances, logical relations, etc. The microstructural analysis is normally effected at sentence level and also deals with the thematic organisation of sentences and clauses (see Chapter 4, par. 4.4.3), lexical devices as well as suprasegmental features (see below).

Regarding non-verbal elements, Nord (1991a: 108-109) makes a distinction between non-verbal elements, such as gestures, facial expressions, photos, illustrations, types of print, and suprasegmental features, which function as “features of verbal text organisation” (Nord 1991a: 121). Depending on the medium, suprasegmental features are either realised acoustically (e.g. intonation, variation in pitch and loudness) or optically (e.g. capitalisation, italics, punctuation, spaced or bold type).

The choice of words used in a text is determined by intratextual as well as extratextual factors. The intratextual features mainly include the subject matter and content, indicated by the lexical chains running through the text. In legal texts, for example, archaic words and very formal structures are often expected. From an extratextual point of view, factors such as the time, place, sender, medium and motive can influence the selection of words. For example, the stylistic level of words is likely to differ between e-mails (colloquial) or formal letters. Moreover, the motive of communication may pre-empt a certain style or formula (funeral speeches, wedding invitations). The sender’s intention and status will also have stylistic implications regarding the lexis (colloquial versus formal, form of address) and in texts written in America, Australia or Great Britain one would expect markers of the respective variety. The translator will have to analyse why the author chose certain words and expressions over others. This is particularly important if the function of the ST is or cannot be maintained in the TT.

From an intratextual point of view, the analysis of the sentence structure (Nord 1991a: 118-120) leads to information on the characteristics of the subject matter (simple versus complex), structure of the text, suprasegmental features and syntactic figures. However, the sentence structure is not only influenced by intratextual features but also extratextual ones, such as the sender’s intention, receiver, medium (spoken versus written) and the text function (conventional features). The translator again has to bear in mind that different languages use different means to stress certain sentence parts, prefer certain structures over others (e.g. verbal versus nominal constructions, gerunds, connectives) and that depending on the text type the average length and type of sentences will vary.

As has been shown above, the extratextual and intratextual features cannot be seen in isolation since they mutually influence and condition each other. Either in certain combinations or in their entirety, both sets of factors will produce a certain *effect* regarding the receiver (Nord 1991a: 130-140). *Effect* is thus receiver-oriented since it establishes the relationship between a text and its receiver. It is the result of the communicative purpose and can influence the receiver's social relationship towards the sender, level of knowledge, emotional state and future actions (see Chapter 3, par.3.2.1.4 for a practical application of Nord's model).

Once the ST and the translation brief have been analysed in terms of Nord's model, the translator establishes which parameters can be maintained and which will have to be changed in order to produce a functional and loyal TT in terms of the translation brief. Furthermore, the comparison will alert the translator to certain problems that may be encountered when translating the text. Such problems can be of a pragmatic (situational), cultural, linguistic and text-specific nature (Nord 1991a: 158-160). Although not dealt with separately most of these problem categories have been indirectly addressed under the *Functional approach to translation* (see par. 2.2.2.1-3) and the above analysis of intratextual and extratextual features.

Apart from supplying guidelines regarding the translation process and translation strategies at macro- and microtextual level (see text composition above), the comparison of the ST and the translation brief points to the competencies a translator should have to carry out translation tasks successfully. These competencies include text reception and analysis, research, transfer, text production, translation quality assessment, as well as the SL/TL and SC/TC (see par. 2.3.3). Incidentally, Nord (1991a: 146-147) would like to see translation classes concentrating on transfer skills only, with all the other competencies having been acquired prior to attending translation classes in, for example language, cultural study or introductory courses.

One of the advantages of Nord's model of translation-oriented text analysis in translator training is that the *wh*-questions are easily remembered and can be applied to any type of ST in any SL and SC, as well as to translations from and into any type of TL and TC (unlike the equivalence-based approach which makes a clear distinction between literary and non-literary translations). Nord's model guides students step by step through the translation process and encourages them to reflect on the respective decisions and strategies taken.

Moreover, Nord's model facilitates the simulation of realistic translation situations in the classroom by taking a wider view on what translation entails. This is of particular importance in the South African context where translators frequently have to digress from translation *proper* and adapt or reformulate texts to make them accessible to often semi-literate target receivers (Walker et al. 1995: 112-113). This model can also be used for a variety of pre-translation exercises to create an awareness of the various

text-types in the mother-tongue as well as to improve the students' monolingual writing, adaptation and reformulation skills (see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.5). The same text can be used for several translation exercises with the difficulty of the task specified in the respective translation briefs.

While Nord's model guides student translators step by step to a functional and loyal translation, other translation trainers concentrate on what is going on in the minds of professional translators or translation students when they translate rather than their final product. This leads to the second approach to translator training, which is process-oriented.

2.3.2 The process-oriented approach

The process-oriented approach is based on think-aloud protocols (TAPs), which are research tools used to find out what is going on in the minds of translation students or professional translators. In think-aloud protocols, translators utter everything that goes on in their minds while translating and thus give an insight as to which translation strategies they use, why they use them, at which level of training certain strategies become automatic and where and why certain mental processes result in successful or unsuccessful translations. As a result of TAPs, translation strategies can be classified with the pedagogical aim of alerting students to potential translation problems (Kussmaul 1995: 7-9). In contrast to the process-oriented approach, product-oriented error analysis and translation quality assessment look at the finished translation to describe errors, find reasons for errors and develop pedagogical help (Kussmaul 1995: 5).

Fraser (1996: 121-134) used TAPs to study community translators and professional commercial translators to find out where professional translators differ from students with regard to at least some of their mental processes and translation strategies. Applying her findings to teaching undergraduate students, Fraser believes that process awareness and the benefit of assigning a translation brief can be linked together to encourage students to identify decision-making parameters and develop an awareness of the translation process as a specific form of communication.

Gile (1995: 125-124; 1994) substitutes TAPs with the written problem reports that students have to submit together with their translation assignments (also see Fraser 1996: 128). Apart from being a powerful tool in error diagnosis, problem-reporting forces students to reflect on their methods and thus makes them more receptive to instruction, especially with regard to macrostructural (*global strategy*) issues. In order to help translation trainers to pinpoint in which phase of the translation process an error occurred, Gile (1995: 101-127) developed the *sequential model of translation*.

The sequential model of translation is divided into the *comprehension* and the *reformulation phase*. During the comprehension phase, student translators read a text segment of the ST and mentally

formulate a *meaning hypothesis*, based on their knowledge of the SL as well as the world. This background knowledge may sometimes not be enough to make sense of the ST and the translator may have to acquire additional knowledge by means of research. Once he has arrived at a meaning hypothesis, it must be tested for *plausibility*. This means that the translator “looks at the idea or information he or she believes that the translation unit expresses, and examines it critically with respect to other information possessed so as to detect any contradictions” (Gile 1995: 103). If the meaning hypothesis is found to be faulty, new meaning hypotheses must be generated and checked for plausibility till a satisfactory one is found. This process completes the *comprehension loop*.

When a meaning hypothesis passes the plausibility test it moves on to the reformulation phase. In this phase, the meaning hypothesis is verbalised in the TT by using knowledge of the TL as well as extralinguistic knowledge. A *fidelity* check will ensure that the TT version complies with the ST unit, that “none of the information has been omitted in the translation, and that no *unwarranted* information not contained in the source-language translation unit has been added” (Gile 1995: 104; his italics). In addition, the translator must make sure that the translation unit is acceptable from an editorial point of view, i.e. correct language usage, stylistic appropriateness, etc. Both processes must be repeated until the results conform with the fidelity and editorial principles, and thus the *reformulation loop* is completed. Once a translation unit has passed the comprehension and reformulation phase the whole process will start afresh for a new translation unit. Every now and again, several translation units (aggregates, which can be sentences, paragraphs, pages, etc.) must be checked for fidelity and acceptability. This will ensure that nothing has been omitted in the TT, as well as prevent inconsistencies with regard to style, terminology and meaning.

Once the model has been introduced, it can be used as a reference whenever translated texts are of a poor editorial quality or translation errors occur. Gile (1995: 119-123) states that most of the translation errors found are due either to an inadequate knowledge base or faulty procedures. The former are mainly of a linguistic nature and include an insufficient command of the SL and TL. The latter can be ascribed to insufficient analysis in the comprehension phase (statements are contrary to common sense, etc.), insufficient efforts in knowledge acquisition (e.g. terminological errors, deviations from appropriate editorial style) and insufficient efforts in the reformulation loop (e.g. a student is unable to break out of a particular sentence structure or lacks confidence).

Gile (1995: 11) finds his sequential model of translation and the process-oriented approach to translation particularly useful at the beginning of translator training because teachers need not comment on the selection of certain TT words or linguistic structures but on the processes concerned (see Chapter 3, par. 3.2.5). As a result, the teacher has to be less critical of the product (motivational advantages) but can still reduce product deficiencies due to incorrect translation methodology. However, process-orientation is not sufficient to ensure that students reach a high level of expertise. For the fine-tuning of

results, product-orientation will be needed.

An extension of the above ideas seems the radical change of the translation classroom suggested by Jakobsen (1994). Instead of translation teachers lecturing and correcting translation mistakes and students performing translation tasks at home, Jakobsen (1994: 147; see also par. 2.3.3) wants to see the translation class as a place in which “students and teachers are active at the same time” and “the target text is in the process of being created”. Teachers are therefore no longer just instructors and assessors but collaborators in a relevant writing task, suggesting strategies or relevant tools while the text is being produced. Written problem reports are thus no longer needed since translation problems are addressed immediately while they are still fresh in the students’ minds. The collaboration between trainers and students emphasises the team-work aspect of translation³.

The two concepts of spontaneity and hypothesis testing (Gile’s sequential model of translation) have been also picked up in Chesterman’s (1994: 89) adaption of Karl Popper’s idea that “knowledge advances by means of problem-solving”, with an initial problem (P1; see Gile’s translation unit above) and an attempt to solve it in a tentative theory (which could stand for tentative target text but can in fact be anything from an individual unit to a complete text). While it is immaterial how this tentative theory is arrived at (guesswork, rational deduction, etc.), the crux lies in the rigorous testing of this tentative theory for errors (error elimination). The more theoretical knowledge the translator has, the more demanding the hypothesis testing will be and the more relevant the questions that will be asked of the tentative theory, thus separating professional translators from amateurs or student translators (Chesterman 1994: 91)⁴. Once the tentative theory has passed the error elimination phase, the result is not a perfect theory (translation) but a new problem (P2), indicating that a translation is never perfect nor finished.

At this point, it is interesting to note that Chesterman (1994: 91) rejects the importance of the translation process since it is of little interest how the translator arrives at a tentative theory (translation). The important factor is what happens when one has got one, i.e. error elimination. Despite rejecting the process-oriented approach, Chesterman (1994: 91) quotes Gile’s sequential model of translation as being along similar lines as his error elimination, i.e. tentative theory testing. However, Chesterman’s model was included in this section because tentative theory generation will work well in groups and because from a didactic and methodological point of view, students may have to go back to the processes and how they arrived at certain solutions in order to be able to eliminate errors.

The approaches discussed so far encourage the use of models or theories to guide students through the translation process and help them assess their translations. However, some translation teachers found on the basis of their practical experience that students failed to apply their theoretical and linguistic knowledge to solve translation problems. In attempting to prepare students for professional translation

careers, they decided to concentrate on skills and competencies rather than theoretical knowledge.

2.3.3 The competence and skills-led approach to translator training

The third approach to teaching translation deals with the competencies and skills a translator should have to be able to produce a functional translation in terms of the translation brief. According to Wilss (1996: 192), the range of translation activities together “contribute in a more or less integrated way to the build-up of translation competence, translation competence understood as a generic term for translation knowledge and skills”.

Although many authors are inconsistent and indiscriminate in their use of *competence*, *skill* or even *strategies* (Chesterman 2000:82-83), all authors agree for obvious reasons that linguistic competence in the SL and TL is absolutely essential and when not included in the list, it is stated elsewhere in the text that said competence is taken for granted. However, bilingual competence is the ideal and most authors concede that language training is also taking place in their translation classes. Nord (1992: 47) adds cultural competence to the linguistic competence since language cannot be seen in isolation but must be considered against the environment in which it functions. Moreover, the necessity of a research competence is stressed by most authors, which Critchley et al. (1996: 111-112) call the skills of subject expertise and technical terminology and which is termed knowledge acquisition by Gile (1995: 141-155).

Vienne (1998: 112) and Nord (1992: 47) agree that the competence of text reception and analysis is important but while this competence is listed separately in Nord, Vienne lists it under translation competence. In Critchley et al. (1996: 105), text reception and analysis would, taken in its widest sense, probably fall under the skill of *targeting* a document. A document is targeted firstly, by means of knowledge engineering, i.e. deciding on what type of information is needed to perform the translation task (subject expertise) and specifying who the end user will be (user model), and secondly, by setting the linguistic parameters for writing an effective target document.

Nord (1992: 44) uses translation competence in its narrower sense of transfer competence, i.e. what translation strategies to choose for producing an adequate TT in terms of the communicative and target-cultural situation. Transfer competence also includes the capability to compensate for TL deficiencies by using, for example, parallel texts or close cooperation with a TL mother-tongue speaker. Interestingly, Nord (1994b: 373) considers it more advantageous to have a good transfer competence with a limited linguistic competence than good linguistic competence without any transfer competence since transfer competence is a skill apart and cannot be automatically linked to linguistic competence.

Vienne (1998: 112-115), in turn, divides translational competence into two basic elements. The first

element consists of the “ability to analyse a variety of translational situations” by defining “the appropriate translation product” (Vienne 1998: 112) and establishing a broad translation strategy, i.e. how and by whom the translation will be used. The second element of translational competence is “the ability to decide on a strategy for resource research adapted to the translational situation, as well as the ability to evaluate and exploit the resources necessary to carry out the assignment received” (Vienne 1998: 113). Vienne’s translational competence thus includes the research component, which is considered separately by other authors. The main focus of Vienne’s research is text-type-specific, eventually resulting in the compilation of a *textary*. A textary contains original (not translated) TL texts and other information sources (e.g. articles on particular topics) collected by the translator for future reference.

In contrast, Critchley et al. (1996: 105) do not even list translating as a separate skill. They feel that once the five skills, i.e. targeting a document (see above), specifying the text type, subject expertise, managing technical terminology and designing effective documents, are mastered, translating will automatically fall into place. The ability to specify text types is practised by means of a contrastive text approach. Distinctive characteristics of certain text types are established in the SL and TL, based on situational resemblances (text function, addressee, etc.) and linguistic contrasts (e.g. syntax, style) (Critchley et al. 1996: 107-108). The skills of subject expertise and managing technical terminology are closely interlinked. While the former deals with acquiring enough knowledge and retrieving sufficient information to write a convincing TL document on a certain subject, the latter is about establishing bilingual glossaries. These glossaries should not only match up terms but also classify the terminology according to entities (objects, people, abstract entities), activities, qualities and relations (e.g. definitions, hierarchies, etc.) (Critchley et al. 1996: 111-113).

Finally, the ability to design effective documents is based on the belief that technical writing and translation skills significantly overlap and that translators will increasingly be involved in collaborative efforts to write up and package information effectively. This may not only include writing a text to required specifications in the TL but also avoiding cultural ambiguities (e.g. meaning of colours and signs across cultures), designing the format and aligning translations with graphics, etc. (Critchley et al. 1996: 114-116).

One ability omitted by the authors quoted on competence is speed, which, incidentally, is the second of only two competencies that Chesterman (1994) deems necessary in translators (the first being the ability to generate a series of possible target texts for a certain source text). According to Chesterman (1994: 92), speed is “the ability to select from this series [of possible target texts], ‘quickly and with justified (ethical confidence)’, the particular version most suited to a given readership”.

Robinson’s (1997: 34-39) understanding of speed is wider. According to him, the factors controlling speed are the typing speed, the level of text difficulty (research required), personal preferences or style,

as well as job stress and the general mental state of the translator. Speed generally picks up with increasing experience and automation of the translation process. However, it is very difficult to change one's own working pace and not everybody can work fast enough to comply with market demands. Moreover, working under pressure can erode a translator's motivation and slow her down.

While Chesterman (1994: 92) identifies two competencies a translator should have, Chesterman (2000: 82) reports three categories of translation strategies, with strategies referring to "potentially conscious, goal-oriented procedures for solving problems". His *search* and *textual* strategies largely overlap with the research and transfer competencies discussed above. However, it is interesting that Chesterman (2000: 82) particularly mentions *creativity* strategies which a translator uses to get the creative juices flowing once the translation flow gets stuck. These strategies include coffee breaks, going for a walk, sleeping over a problem, trying to verbalise it, etc.

Another important skill that is often taken for granted in translation teaching is reading comprehension. Mitchell's (1996) paper is based on the fact that a reader does not derive meaning from the surface structure but the deep structure of a text. Translators should therefore not be bogged down by words and syntax but create a mental picture of the substance of a text and "look at this created image from all angles, thus getting the effect of spaces, the connotations and implications contained in the text, the unexpressed, the *non-dit*" (Mitchell 1996: 94; her italics). This mental image will then serve as the template for the TT. It will help translators to immerse themselves completely in a text without using any words and give them the confidence to produce a first draft translation which is logic and coherent. Seleskovitch and Lederer (1995: 3, 24-25) call this process of mental imaging *deverbalisation* and consider it an important process in the training of interpreters.

Colina (2002: 10-13) also reports that reading should no longer be considered a linguistic decoding operation since in order to comprehend readers do not only interpret the meaning of words and phrases but also use their existing knowledge on the subject matter. This means that translators do not have to know every word to understand a text and resort to a dictionary as soon as they encounter an unknown word. Colina (2002:12) suggests that new language teaching reading material should be used in translation classes since they are designed to facilitate comprehension processes and will thus change student behaviour and comprehension far beyond the mere linguistic.

Although there seems some disagreement as to the competencies required by a translator and deviations as to the classification of skills and competencies, there is general agreement on the importance of text production competence and the ability to specify text types, two skills that seem interrelated. Critchley et al. (1996: 106-107) treat specifying text types as a separated skill since a lack of textual ability will lead to covert (non-binary) mistakes. Since translators are text producers in the TL they should be familiar with TL text-type conventions. By teaching different text-types either intralingually and/or

interlingually, the translation is organised around “the analysis and experience of text-types” (Critchley et al. 1996: 108), resulting in *interdependent* documents. Interdependent documents, i.e. the ST and TT have the same status, are either *parallel*, e.g. multilingual versions of the same text, or *fully equal*, where culture-specific adjustments have been effected.

While Critchley et al. (1996) use the term *parallel* to describe one of the relationships between an ST and a TT, Schäffner (1998: 84) uses the term *parallel* differently when she suggests the systematic analysis of parallel texts which are, and she quotes Neubert, “L₂ and L₁ texts of equal informitivity which have been produced in more or less identical communicative situations”. Schäffner (1998: 87) believes that text-typological conventions are a criterion for the quality of the TT since a “TT that conforms to the target culture expectations will in all probability fulfil its intended function in an appropriate way”. Comparing texts allows translators to adopt structures and lexical items from actual usage in parallel texts in the TT. Since the main emphasis is on TT production the translation process becomes *prospective*, i.e. the TT is at the centre of the translational action, with the ST being only one of several factors influencing the TT.

By using a slightly different angle, Jakobsen (1994: 145) advocates text production in L1. Her point of departure is the fact that translation always begins with the need for such a text, and the same questions are asked when an L1 text is to be created. In Jakobsen’s classes, students are therefore first trained in L1 writing skills (bearing in mind that her students translate into L1), with some of the parallel texts supplied to the students using the L2. Then the amount of parallel texts in the L2 is gradually increased until it is no longer clear whether students hone their writing skills in the L1 or actually translate. Translating as such is introduced only at a late stage in her translation class because Jakobsen (1994: 146) is convinced that “placing translation within the whole spectrum of text production, and consistently exposing students to authentic parallel texts, will help them develop greater critical awareness of acceptability norms and textual models in the target language”. At the same time, this will prevent them from producing pseudo-texts, e.g. TTs with SL interference or TTs that violate text-type conventions (see par. 2.2.1).

Fraser (1996) also comments on the usefulness of analysing L1 text-types for boosting student translators’ confidence, which prevents them from clinging to words and bilingual dictionaries. A new and easily applicable idea introduced to her translation class is “contextualised brainstorming of English vocabulary in a relevant subject area prior to starting the translation exercise” (Fraser 1996: 131). This helps with the recognition of L2 terms and results in fewer vocabulary errors.

While the above authors promote translation into the L1 or the mother tongue, Weatherby (1998: 21) uses the text-type-specific approach in her class for translation into the L2. This procedure consists of studying original L2 texts, producing original L2 texts, studying L1 texts, error analysis (i.e. studying

poorly translated texts; in contrast to Vienne 1998 above) and lastly, translating carefully selected texts. She believes that the best and most useful results are achieved when students immerse themselves completely into the respective text types before they start translating⁵. It is worth noting that apart from studying poor translations, Weatherby's students must also practice their text-production skills in the respective L2 text-type.

At this point, it should be mentioned that translation into the L2 is rather controversial and frowned upon by many translation scholars and teachers. This is based on the assumption that most translators learned their mother tongue first and one or more foreign languages at a later stage. As a result, they are more confident and comfortable, and thus more efficient, in their mother tongue. They are what Wilss (1999: 10) calls *compound bilinguals*. In contrast, *coordinate bilinguals* have grown up or spent the better part of their childhood in a bilingual environment and are thus equally competent in both languages. It is therefore a widely held belief that only coordinate bilinguals should translate into a foreign language.

However, Weatherby (1998: 21) maintains that the above attitude is contrary to professional translation practice since more than half of the work produced by professional translators is into the L2. This is corroborated by Mackenzie (1998: 17-18). According to her, there are only a few countries in the world where major (commercial) languages are spoken and which have a sufficient supply of native speakers of other languages who are capable and willing to translate into their L1. This is a particular problem for languages of limited diffusion (LLDs), such as the Scandinavian and African languages. Although many speakers of languages of limited diffusion will, out of necessity, learn one or several of the major commercial languages, there are far fewer native speakers of the major languages who have a sufficient command of an LLD to translate effortlessly and successfully into their L1. For example, many African language translators also have to translate into English because there are not enough native English speakers who are capable of translating from the African languages.

Moreover, mother-tongue knowledge of the SL may be necessary for a proper understanding of STs that are of a technical nature. In such a case, it may be preferable to have a translator convey the content accurately at the cost of grammatical and stylistic errors. Especially when it comes to specialised texts, it seems that even translators translating into the L1 first have to familiarise themselves with the specific text-type and the respective terminology (see Jakobsen 1994 and Fraser 1996 above). It should therefore be possible for a translator to produce a useful TT in the L2 after proper research and preparation. As a last point, it seems that especially with regard to student translators, interference seems to work both ways, i.e. when translating into the L1 as well as into the L2.

Based on the literature examined in this study, it seems that the debate will still continue for some time with regard to the competencies and skills translators should have, the legitimacy of translating into the L2, the role of the ST or translating being a separate competence or not. Perhaps the competencies and

skills could be summarised in Mackenzie's (1998: 16) words which say that professional translators as experts must be able "to ask the right questions and (...) know how and where to look for the answers".

2.3.4 Conclusion

The main emphasis of this chapter was on the three approaches to translation teaching that emerged from the literature examined and included Nord's model of translation-oriented text analysis, as well as the process-oriented and skills-led approaches. In conclusion, it seems safe to say that far from being mutually exclusive, the three approaches actually complement each other. Although Nord's approach to translation teaching seems the most comprehensive, she takes most of the translation-relevant competencies for granted and seems to concentrate on transfer competence only in her translation classes. This is rather unrealistic, as has been seen in the discussion above, since only very few students really have all the skills to actually apply her model in its entirety. However, even those authors who are not convinced of the importance of the ST and who stress the contrastive analysis of text types, do require a means to analyse the ST. Here Nord's model of translation-oriented text analysis is very valuable since her *wh*-questions can be asked by and guide students at all levels of training, even though the complexity of the answers may differ. On the other hand, the findings of contrastive textology may help those following Nord's approach to overcome some of the culture-specific and pragmatic translation problems.

In the same vein, text-typological findings are also needed in Gile's process-oriented approach during hypothesis testing, whereas several of the above authors use the process-oriented approach in their translation classes (e.g. Fraser 1996, Jakobsen 1994). Moreover, Weatherby (1998: 24) modified Gile's sequential model of translation by studying original L2 texts before trying to make sense of the different individual translation units. Although the difficulty of the various stages vary, with the comprehension phase being easier for Weatherby's students and the reformulation phase more difficult, she found the model rather useful. Perhaps here Nord's transfer competence could benefit from studies into students' methodological strengths and weaknesses (e.g. TAPs and problem reports).

While researching the field of translation pedagogy, which according to Wilss (1996: 192), is "the theoretical pillar of empirical translation teaching", one thing became rather obvious, namely that most of the literature deals with translation teaching at university and technician level, i.e. at tertiary level (see Chapter 1, par. 1.1.1.2). Hardly anything has been written about translation training for students with very little, or even without any, formal educational qualifications, which is the main problem that is being addressed in this study, i.e. whether the current ALTFC is relevant within the DOD environment, especially in view of the fact that the candidates attending the course lack a uniform linguistic background and the course duration is only four weeks.

One of the authors who has dealt with non-formal training in South Africa is Robin Trew (1994). In his paper on *The development of training models for African language translators and interpreters*, delivered at an international conference hosted by the Linguistics Department of the University of South Africa (Unisa), Trew (1994) discussed the very difficult circumstances (linguistic, political, professional and lack of training) under which African language translators and interpreters often work. His pilot training programmes (1 one-month course for interpreters and 1 one-month course for translators) showed that the skills required by African language translators and interpreters in South Africa are different from those required of practitioners working in English and Afrikaans or in foreign languages (Trew 1994: 85). Moreover, for training programmes to be successful they will have to be based on the concrete experience of translators and interpreters already providing services in the African languages. It must be mentioned that Trew mainly worked with practising translators and interpreters in his pilot training programmes and not novices to translation and interpreting.

Another author who has given the South African situation some thought with regard to African language translation and interpreting is Daniel Gile (1998), who acted as keynote speaker at the international conference *Language facilitation and development in Southern Africa*, held in Pretoria on 6-7 June 1997. His keynote address was entitled *Flexibility and modularity in translator and interpreter training*. Gile realises that certain aspects of European translator and interpreter training may not suit relative newcomers to translator training, such as South Africa, especially in view of the fact that European training programmes aim at producing top quality professionals. In contrast, African language translators and interpreters in South Africa often cater to a target population that is not highly literate. Even though the training of top quality professionals should also be the ultimate goal of translator and interpreter training in South Africa in order to upgrade the profession as a whole and to improve the career opportunities for translators and interpreters, Western approaches to translator and interpreter training will take too long to address the South African translation and interpreting needs in terms of quality and quantity. Moreover, many of the practising translators and interpreters in South Africa may not even qualify to attend training courses at tertiary institutions, despite the fact that they have produced useful work.

In order to address training situations such as in South Africa, Gile (1998: 84-85) explores the possibilities of modularity, i.e. presenting translator and interpreter training in autonomous learning units, and the resulting flexibility in adjusting parts of the training programme to specific student needs. Modules can concentrate on encyclopaedic knowledge building, which may include anything that is deemed useful from a translation and interpreting point of view, and skills building. Skills-building modules could, for example, include transfer, research and linguistic skills. However, Gile (1998: 82) admits that not enough research has been done to show whether, from a methodological point of view, *useful* translator and interpreter training can be provided to students with a limited knowledge of the *world* and the languages involved.

The literature survey conducted in this chapter thus mainly produced current trends in translator training at tertiary institutions and partially addressed the first secondary aim of this study, i.e. to establish current trends in translator training and the extent to which they can help to improve a translation facilitation course at the level of the ALTFC (see Chapter 4, par. 4.3 and 4.4 for possible answers to the second part of the first secondary aim). However, African language translation facilitation in the DOD must be seen against the background sketched above. It is therefore the purpose of this study to shed some light on whether translator training in the form of the ALTFC is relevant within the DOD environment and to students with an alleged limited encyclopaedic and linguistic knowledge (first main aim). This includes the establishment of whether the students' needs are addressed (second secondary aim).

The focus of Chapter 3 falls on how the first main aim and the second secondary aim of this study will be accomplished. Chapter 3 will first deal with the realities in the DOD by looking at the current ALTFC. Moreover, it will investigate the methodological aspects of good questionnaire design and then examine the *Survey for the revision of the African language translation facilitation course at D Lang* as the research instrument for the empirical part of this study.

Endnotes

1. *Translationese* is in contrast to what Baker (1998: 481), following Frawley's terminology, calls the *third code*. The *third code* does not refer to faulty or substandard language found in translations but to the language typically produced by professional translators due to the pressures and nature of translation as a communicative event. The type of language patterning common to translations is currently at the centre of corpus-based translation studies and includes phenomena such as explicitation, simplification, normalisation/conservatism and levelling out (opting for a middle course where two extremes are concerned; Baker 1996: 180-184).
1. Walker et al. (1995: 102-106) point out that such a rigid approach to translation would pose a serious problem regarding the training of African language translators since translators frequently have to adjust texts to make them accessible to an often semi-literate target readership.
2. Conacher (1996: 164-178) also reports her success with bilingual workshops. She divides the translation class into smaller groups, with the majority of the group being L1 speakers and one or two L2 speakers. Students bring their individual translations to the translation class, which the group then merges into a group translation that is to be handed in to the translation trainers. The translation trainer then chooses the most successful translation or provides a composite translation for discussion during the following class.

Mackenzie (1998: 18) has translation students work in groups only during the first half of their translation course since teamwork seems to be the norm in a translation company environment. She reports very useful results, especially when translating into the L2.
3. Viaggio (1994) provides an interesting discussion on the relevance of translation theory to translation practice by showing chronologically (starting with Vinay and Dalbarnet) and by using concrete examples how certain insights and theories will inevitably influence the decisions a translator takes when performing a translation task.
4. See also Lang (1994: 397), who points out that student translators do not seem to struggle with foreign language competence as much as with mother tongue competence.