The Theoretical Aspects of Translation Teaching Methods

Ahmed ABACHI PH.D

Translation teaching, Like translation itself, has yet to develop a full and coherent account of its practice. In the former instance whether to teach theory or not is still being debated among pedagogists. As regards translation, arguments whether it is an art or a science have been going on for many years. Furthermore what makes matters even worse are the many complexities involved in the translation process. The complexities are not only linguistic, grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, but also extralinguistic, sociological, etc. Faced with all these parameters, it would be easy to get the impression that Translation is impossible.

Nevertheless, various formulations of principles and practices have been proposed. The context in which these principles and procedures have been formulated is "translation theory". According to Newmark translation theory is concerned with determining appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts or text-categories. Furthermore it provides a framework of principles and a background of problem solving (1982: 19).

The programme of translation theory is conducted with the aim of formulating methodological translation principles which according to Wilss (1982) can be classified in the following areas of research:

1 - The systematic description, classification and explanation of language pair specific translation procedures. Within this

context the language pair oriented science of translation is concerned primarily with those syntactic, lexical and socio-cultural phenomena in a given language witch do not have one-to-one correspondences in the system of another language and must therefore be translated by means of compensatory non-literal transfer procedures.

2 - The development of a text-typology relevant to the science of translation. The two principal research areas here are, first the defining of textual segments and structures on the microcontextual level (within the clause/sentence) and by macro-contextual level (going beyond the clause/sentence rank) and second, the testing of textually adequate transfer strategies, while giving consideration to text-syntactic text-semantic and text- pragmatic factors.

3- The development of objective or at least intersubjective yardsticks for the assessment of the degree of translation equivalence with the specific goal of replacing the predominantly intuitive-judgement of translation quality by explicit textually based evaluations of translation equivalence (1982: 85).

The aim in the formulation of these principles is to investigate translation difficulties and to bring about translation strategies, procedures and techniques, in other words to investigate what translation is about and how to translate. The formulation of various principles of translation procedures depends on one's view of what language is about. After all, when one is translating, one is dealing with language. Translators work with languages. Language is the medium the translator works on. Consequently any translation theory is a direct outcome of a language theory as Nida explains:

Anyone involved in translation must inevitably be

concerned with theories about language, since these

influence so greatly people's view about the legitimacy

of certain translation principles (1972: 301).

Catford is also of this opinion:

Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a

text in another. Clearly then any theory of

translation must draw upon a theory of language (1965:1).

Among those, to name but a few, who drew upon language theory to formulate translation principles and procedures are Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Mounin (1973), Nida (1964), catford (1965), Nida and Taber (1969), De Beaugrande (1978), Wilss (1982). Although the concept of translation equivalence has been an essential issue in translation theory over the last two hundred years (Wilss, 1982: 134), it was not until the fifties that translation research devoted considerable energy to the analysis of the transition from a source language text to a target language text. The studies were set up to investigate problems of translation and formulate translation principles and procedures. As a result, they came up with a number of different classification systems which more or less exhaustively reflect the diversity of modes of behaviour in translating. The means of analysis were the application of different language theories such as the structuralist/grammatical, the socio-linguistic and the text-linguistic.

As regards translation teaching, attempts have been made to implement these principles in the training of translators. On the other hand, some pedagogists are sceptical of theory. They insist more on practice. However, even if teaching methods are practical, they would still contain a shade of theory. The preparation of any material to be translated would have as its background at least some theoretical basis. Further in a piece of translation it is always possible to detect how the translation process has operated. Therefore in a sense all translation teaching methods are implicitly based on translation theory, even when the latter is not explicitly taught. At least translation theory should, if anything, help one to understand better houw to translate. From this point of view, translation theories are by nature didactic. It is therefore not surprising that the theory and practice of translation

teaching usually reflect the current view on what translation is about. In order to illustrate the existing link between language theory and translation theory in general and translation teaching in particular, four theoretical teaching models of translation are suggested as follows:

A. The philological model

B. The structuralist/grammatical model

C. The socio-linguistic model

D. The text-linguistic model

The models are presented on an evolutionary basis in the sense that they represent an attempt to show the different stages through which translation theory has gone. Furthermore they represent an examination of the application of elements of language theory to translation theory to formulate translation principles which in turn were applied in translation teaching.

It is beyond the scope of this article to reviw every single theory or propose delineation of the stages of development of language theory, translation theory and translation teaching.

This is simply an overview of the different theories brought about and a comparison of their applicability in terms of translating and teaching translation. There are bound to be important theories and schools of thought not properly covered.

This should not seriously affect the comparison made below.

The purpose of this review of the theoretical teaching models of translation si as follows:

- to provide some understanding of the link between translation theory and translation teaching in terms of application with the learners in mind.

- to provide a framework for the assessement of the advantages and shortcomings of each method. This could serve as a basis for other teachers to re-assess their own teaching methods.

- to provide background information for understanding the mechanism of translation and translation teaching.

I - the philological model

Philological studies of language concentrated mainly on the written form rather than on the spoken, with heavy emphasis particularly on grammar. Scholars were primarily interested in establishing philosophical explanations for the rules of grammar.

For example, the rule which tells us the regular plural of an English noun is formed by adding an "S". However, there was no attempt to analyse the pronunciation of the plural cas ending in speech. This is because the attitude was prescriptive and the aim was to teach people how to write well. There was no attempt to cover certain areas of syntax such as elliptical sentence-types or flexibility of word-order in language (Crystal 1971: 36-76; Lyons 1968: 21-37).

Given the fact that the written form of language was the primary source of examination, it can be assumed that the philological theory of translation dealt mainly with corresponding grammatical forms of the source and target languages and attempted to evaluate their equivalences.

Furthermore, given that at that stage almost all translators were men of letter (Newmark 1982: 3), the philological theory of translation concentrated mainly on literature and poetry. There was relatively low interest in other aspects such as scientific technological or commercial translation. The philological theory of translation was primarily concerned with literary texts.

Furthermore, because of its relationship with literary analysis, problems of equivalence of literary genres between source and target languages became so important (Nida 1976: 67). The main characteristics of this theory can be summarised as follows:

1. translation was considered an art

2. there was a heavy emphasis on aesthetic creativity such as rhythm, rhyme, assonnance etc..

3. Little attention was paid to the linguistic operation involved

4. there were controversial arguments on how to translate.

These included whether translation should be free or

literal; whether poetry should be translated be poetry or prose.

5. there was relatively low interest in scientific and technical translation.

2:1 Translation Teaching in the Philological Model

Translation teaching methods in European universities during

the early years of their foundation were mainly based on the

practices of classical philology (Citroen 1966: 141). Because of the philological approach to language studies with emphasis on grammar and morphology it can be assumed that translation was taught how to transfer a text from one code to another. Further, because of the concentration of translation on literature, teaching examples would be drawn from this area of study.

The application of the philological approach to translation teaching is illustrated by Tolstoi (1954) who claims that trainees can be faced with two main difficulties:

a. text-comprehension

b. text-rendering

The difficulties are of the order of vocabulary and grammar.

Vocabulary can be cleared if dictionaries, bilingual or

encyclopaedic, are used properly. Hence he suggests that

trainees should be taught how to use dictionaries properly:

quand on enseigne la traduction on doit donner a l'élève une liste succinte mais complète d'ouvrages de référence et de livres ou il puisse trouver non seulement le mot ou le terme qu'il lui

faut, mais même la phrase voulue (il convient de joindre à la liste en question les dictionnaires idiomatiques etc...) (1954: 11).

However, if the dictionary proved inefficient such as when the word is a neologism, then it should be decomposed into ist root, prefix and suffix in order to obtain its meaning.

The grammatical difficulties can be divided into two categories:

a. simple grammatical constructions

b. complex grammatical constructions

The first category poses no problems for simple grammatical constructions can be translated literally. Complex grammatical constructions can be broken down into their lower units, ie subject, verb, object. Thus as he explains:

pour trouver dans une phrase l'idée directrice, il faut commencer par déterminer tout d'abord les mots,les plus importants, le sujet, l'attribut, et les éléments les plus indispensables de la proposition en question...

en effet si le sens est compris correctement et si le squelette est ébauche juste du point de vue de la structure il est assez facile d'ajouter les mots qui manquent aux endroits voulus (1954: 12).

Tolstoï's method of teaching translation is certainly one of the most singnificant contributions to the discipline. The work is probably the first to give an account of translation exercises with feed-back from trainees. However, a method which relies on filling in gaps where necessary is certainly very rudimentary.

The method reflects the philologists' empirical principles of translation which among others are

- a translator must never add or leave out anything

- a translator may if need be add or leave out something

II- The structuralist/grammatical model

The linguistic theory of translation was based on comparison of the linguistic structures of source and receptor languages.

The comparison of literary genres and stylistic features was gradually abondoned. The empasis laid on comparing and contrasting the structures of the languages involved is a direct

influence of the structuralist approach to language study.

Language was studied as a set of sturctures with levels and interrelated parts. The meaning of individual units is ascertained in their paradigmatic and syntagmatic relation to the whole system (see Lyons 1968: 70-80).

Translation became a process of interlingual code transfer ie a lingustic operation (Mounin 1963). The basis of this theory is contrastive linguistics and it involves the use of more-or-less elaborate sets of rules for matching roughly corresponding structures, for example the manner in which actives in language A correspond to passives in language B, the relations between nominal constructions in language A and parallel verbal constructions in language B.

The work of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) is a detailed comparison of French and English where various rules for a set of equivalences are formulated. Vinay and Derbelnet identified seven procedures for translating:

- borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition,

modulation, equivalence, adaptation

- borrowing occure at the lexical level. If for instance a lexicla item in the source language has no equivalent in the traget language the translator must resort to brrowing. A sentence such as "the coroner spoke" is better translated into French by "the coroner prit la parole". With frequent uses this type of word will become part of the core language.

- claque or also known as through translation occurs when all the elements which compose the syntagm of the source

Language are literally translated in the target language, eg science fiction is translated by:

cilmu lkhaya: li

- Literal translation or word for word translation occurs when the syntactic structures of the clause or sentence of the source language text is replaced by syntactic structures of the target language, eg

English: this train arrives at Union station at ten French: Ce train arrive à la gare centrale à 10 heures

- Transposition is the rendering of the source language element by syntactico-synatagmatic structures which have the same meaning but do not correspond formally because of changes in the class of words used. eg: "dès son lever" is translated by "as soon as he gets up". The substantive "lever" is replaced by the verb to get up, because English does not have a substantive to express this action.

There are two types of transpositions:

- compulsory transpositions;

- optional transposition

Compulsory transposition occurs when-the translators has no alternative but to translate a substantive, for example in the source language, by a verb in the target language; as in the case in the example above. However, in the event of a reverse situation the translator has the choice between calque or optional transposition, for example the phrase "after he comes back" can be rendered either by "après son retour" or "après qu'il sera revenu". This translation procedure is also applicable when translating into Arabic. The English phrase above can either be translated by "inda ruju: c ihi" or "c indama:

---

yarja^cu": . The option for the first alternative is generally that of a literary style.

Equivalence: is the replacement of a source language situation by a communicatively comparable target language situation. The purpose is to create as similar effect in the target language as in the source language.

eg. French: oeil pour oeil

English: eye for eye

Arabic: al^cynu bil^c ayni

Adaptation: amounts to textual compensation for sociocultural differences between the source language and target language communities. For example, the English phrase "He kissed his daughter on the mouth" is better translated simply by "qabbala ibnatahu bihana: n. Thus communicating the message while maintaining the sociocultural behaviour of the target language community.

Modulation indicates a change in the angle from which something is seen (changement de point de vue), change in the point of view.

eg. English: teperature

Arabic: daragat lhara:ra

Adaptation, in this context, illustrates the differences in the ecological conditions in which the two communities live. A similar event is described in two different linguistic means.

While an English person would describe the weather in terms of temperature expecting it either to rise or fall, an Arab would describe it in terms of literally "degree of heat".

The seven standards of translation procedures as formulated by Vinay and Darbelnet can be represented as follows.

As shown in Fig 1 there are two main categories of translation procedures: literal translation and non literal translation. Literal

translation includes calque, borrowing and word for word. Non literal translation includes trasposition, adaptation and modulation. Equivalence can be included in either the category literal translation or non literal translation.

Equivalence can be achieved by a literal translation as in the case of "oeil pour oeil" for "al^{c}aynu bil^{c}ayni. It can also be a non literal translation in case a phrase in the source language does not have a direct equivalent in the target language. For example, the phrase "his wife wears the trousers" is better translated by "tussaytiru lmar-atu ^{c} ala: zawjiha:", because "tartadi: lmar-atu assirwa: la" is unidiomatic and does not carry the connotative meaning of the source language into the target language.

These translation procedures offer a technique to the translator to tackle various translation problems. Their effectiveness was described by Malblanc in his foreword to Vinay and Darblnet as follows:

La stylistique comparée offre une technique nouvelle pour aborder les problèmes de traduction quelles que soient les langues considérées: Il ne s'agit pas en effet d'une collection de recettes a appliquer automatiquement, mais bien de principes fondamentaux grâce auquels peut-être dressée la carte de cheminements qui permettent de faire passer tous les éléments d'un texte dans une autre langue (1958: 1).

Oter examples contrasting other languages followed later (Malblanc: 1961; French and German, Friederich: 1969; English and German).

Catford's Linguistic theory of translation (1965) is also based on structural linguistics. He examines the process of translation on four planes of language as distinguished by Firth and Halliday. The phonological, graphonological, grammaticl and lexical. He then develops a scal and category model as a basis for a structural approach to translating. In his model, Catford categorized translation shifts between levels, structures, word-class units and systems.

In addition to the structuralist principles, insights of generative and transformation grammar also made their way into translation. Nida (1952) advocated the back transformation of complex surface structures onto an underlying level in which the fundamental elements are objects, events, abstracts and relations. Such an approach was developed essentially for two purposes:

1. to provide a means of adequate analysis of complicated grammatical structures in Greek and Hebrew.

2. to determine the least ambiguous structure that might then serve as a basis for transfer into other languages

Later Nida (1964) further elaborated the use of transformational and generative grammar to investigate the linguistic meaning in translation. Nida's use of generative grammar to investigate the linguistic meaning stems from the view of traditional grammar which claims that structures made up of similar classes of words have similar meanings. For example, the phrases "his car", "his failure", "his arrest" and "his arrest" and "his goodness", in accordance with traditional phrase-structure grammar, are treated as essentially the same, since they consist of a possessive pronoun, followed by a noun as the head word of the phrase.

However, according to Nida, the relationship between his and the following nouns is in each instance quite different (Nida 1964:59).

In "his car", the expression is more or less equivalent to "he has a car", but in "his failure" the corresponding expression would be "he failed". For "his arrest" the corresponding form would be "he was arrested" and "his goodness" is roughly equivalent to "he is good". Consequently in terms of meaning, "his car" can be described as meaning "A posesses B"; "his failure" is equivalent to "a performs B", while "his arrest" is equivalent to "a is the goal of the action B", and "his goodness" may be describes as "B is the quality of A".

Similarly the use of transformational grammar can greatly facilitate the anlysis and description of ambiguous expressions.

For example, the expression "The fat major's wife" may mean that either the "major is fat" or "the wife is fat". If the expression comes from "the major has a wife" the former meaning is intended, but if the expression is derived from "the major has a fat wife" then it is the second meaning (ibid: 61).

The diversity of transformational structures within a similarity of so-called formal structures may be very great. For example, "his fine car" and "their beloved ruler" may appear formally similar, but the meaningful differences are abviously very extensive. While "his fine car" may be derived from the kernels "he has a car" and "the car is fine", the phrase "their beloved ruler" comes from "they love him and he rules over them".

Nida also states that the most obvious transformations in English are passives from actives (1964 - 60). This technique is very useful when translating from English into Arabic where passive forms have to be transformed into active as in the following example:

"the thief was killed by the policeman"

Given the rules of the use of the passive form in Arabic, it is necessary here to transform the passive into active. Arabic uses passive only when the agent in unknown. Therefore this sentence will have to be translated as follows:

"qatala ash-shurtiyyu allissa"

Thus the application of generative and transformational grammar can provide useful techniques to derive goal language sentances.

Further, principles of generative and transformational grammar were also tried to develop computer translating programmes.

However, the texts produced by these programmes were syntactically correct, but lacked cohesion. Therefore pre-editing and post-editing by human translators wers always necessary (De Beaugrande 1978: 12).

3.1 Translation Teaching in the structuralist/grammatical model

Vinay and Darbelnet "stylistique comparée" is claimed to be highly pedagogical. Various translation pedagogists recommend its use in translation teaching (Horleguin 1966; Gravier 1976; Coveney 1982). Its application in the form of contrastive analysis is illustrated by Perkins (1978) who claims that learning becomes easier when similarities occur, while learning is interfered when contrasts occur. He also claims that the main difficulties faced by student which usually lead them to errors are bilingual interferences. He therefore suggests a systematic examination of the typical functional differences between the two languages concerned. This according to Perkins "will enable the students to grasp and master the equivalents of the most common structural patterns" (1978: 236).

Contrastive linguistics is still widely applied in translation teaching despite the strong criticism it has received. Lederer pointed out that translation is an essentially different activity from contrastive linguistics:

Le traducteur ne traduit pas une langue mais toujours un message (1964: 16)

The difference, therefore, results from the difference between langue and parole. The text containing a message to be translated is an instance of parole. Consequently theoretical equivalence of translating at the level of langue is not necessarily relevant to the process of translation. Furthermore, it has also been claimed that although the "stylistique comparée" method has been found to be genuinely useful by generation of students, it however lies mainly in its ability to improve their language performance rather than their translational competence (Mason, 1982: 20). Similarly Wilss (1977) states that contrary to contrastive linguistics, translation teaching is parole rather than langue oriented. It is theoretically both language two/language one, and language one/language two oriented. The domain of translation teaching is therefore more diversified than contrasive analysis with its

exclusive language one/ language two approach. Moreover, contrastive linguistics is focused on the investigation of systemic, context independent language one/language two structural divergencies up to clause/sentence leval without taking into account the gragmatic dimension of a text (1982: 177). Similarly generative and transformational grammar has also attracted a number of linguists who advocated its application as a translation teaching technique (Walmsley 1970; Callens 1972). However, on assessment it has been revealed that its limitations are represented mainly in the selection of the sentence as the maximum unit for syntactic analysis. This proved to be a serious block to the investigation of intersentence structures. Linguistic competence clearly involves paragraph and discourse competence, for both speakers and hearers are able to react consistently to the satisfactory or unsatisfactory character of larger discourse units, as Nida pointed out:

No theory of translation can restrict itself to the treatment of sentence (1976: 73).

Another liability in the standard of generative and transformational grammar is its failure to deal with certain lexical structures. The meaning of some lexical elements is handled in terms of their deep structure outside their context, as De Beaugrande explains:

Clomsky's model was designed upon the assumption of autonomous syntax, and is not amenable to any larger scale inclusion fo concepts related to meaning (semantics) and to actual language to meaning world (pragmatics) (1978: 12)

Clearly then, the structuralist-grammatical approach in a sense supposes that translation problems can be solved when the structures of the source language and target language are maintained in contact. Therefore it can be suggested that the aim of this method in translation teaching is to prepare good bilinguals. However, the method leaves other aspects of translation, such as the use of a particular level of language in a given situation or the handling of a particular communicative act

in a complex socio-cultural contex, unaccounted for. These are claimed to be the domain of socio-linguistics.

III- The soci-linguistic model

The socio-linguistic approach stemmed from a dissatisfaction with thke purely linguistic attempt to analyse language. The structuralist-grammatical failed because of its inability to deal effectively with meaning. Unlike Chomsky who explained meaning in formaly terms, deep structure and transformations, the sociolinguistic school view meaning in its social and cultural context. Levi-strauss and Malinowski's studies in anthropology reminded linguisticians of the cultural dimension of meaning in language. The idea of investigating meaning from its cultural context. Levi-Strauss and Malinowski's studies in anthropology reminded linguisticians of the cultural dimension of meaning in language. The idea of investigating meaning from its cultural level stems rom Von Humbolt's though that "the differences between languages is not... one of sounds and signs but rather in the view of the world itself" (quoted in Wilss 1982: 34). The sociolinguistic theory of translation was also influenced by Casagrande's claim "that one does not translate languages but cultures" (1954: 338). Following this view a new concept of translating has been initiated. This new concept is evidenced in Nida (1964) and Nida and Taber (1969) who relate translation to communication theory rather than to a purely specific linguistic theory. Drawing upon this theory they devised various

Translation techniques such as chain analysis, hierarchical analysis and compential analysis to deal with various levels of meaning such as the linguistic meaning, the referential meaning, the emotive meaning and the connotative meaning. The aim is to bridge the gap between individuals of different cultural

backgrounds. The focus is on the reader's response, or in Nida's term: the dynamic equivalence. The dynamic equivalence defies the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of language relativity. The view behind this hypothesis is that language influences and determines

the human conception of the world; influences and determines the human conception of the world; consequently the cultural gap is inevitable and not always bridgeable. However, the

dynamic-equivalence method has a universalist assumption:

"anything that can be said in one language can be said in another" (1969: 4). Nida's example of how to translate the idiomatic expression "as white as snow" to people who do not know snow confirms the possibility of universal communication. He suggests that the idiomatic expression can either be translated by its equivalent in the target language for instance " as white as fungus" or simply expand it to a non metaphorical expression such as "very, very white". The dynamic-equivalence also reminds the translator of the connotative spheres whic may vary from language to language. It has been claimed for example that "dog" in English and "kalb" in Arabic differ in their collective connotative ranking. An English person associates the word "dog" with companionship, whereas an Arab is perhaps more likely to associate it with a dirty, despicable animal. When translated, these culture bound intrinsic lexical elements are to be handled within their situational-contextual occurence, rather than their cultural interpretation.

Similarl, Catford's theor of translation (1965), although primarily linguistic and related to surface structure

equivalence, nevertheless moves in the direction of communication within context and situation. This is illustrated in its emphasis on differences of dialects, registers, style and their implication in translation. Catford defines dialect as "a language variety related to the performer's provenance or affiliations in a geographical temporal or social dimension.

Register and style are language varieties related to the immediate situation of utterance. For example, in translating Cockne dialogue into French, Parigot would be the target language equivalent dialect. If it is an informal conversation, it should be translated by the same level of style. However, in many

cases a change of style or registers involves a corresponding change of dialect or even language. In Arabic for style (Catford 1965: 83-91).

1 Translation Teaching in the socio-linguistic Model

The teaching of the source language culture and the target language culture is becoming a standard ingredient in many translation teaching programmes (Horn 1966, Reiss 1976). The purpose is to train students to be sensitive to how people conceptualise the world differently. In terms of practical exercises to train students how to relay the two cultures, teachers may consider the application of the dynamic-equivalence expressions such as idioms, metaphors, cliches etc. In this respect Rokkan (1980) suggests the introduction of prose passages in the classroom. Her idea stems from the extensive use of contrastive linguistics which according to her neglects other aspects of language such as register, tone and implications.

Further, Rokkan also claims that the introduction of prose passages Will enble the students to gain contextual Knowledge from relevant areas such as literature and social studies. the prose exercise can also offer excuse for the exploration of near-synonyms, allied and phrases (1980: 226).

Although the "prose" theory, register and the culture based throry have played a considerable role towards a comprehensive mode! of Language analysis and consequently in translation, they neverthless have their limitations in terms of teaching- In Nida's theory there is a heavy emphasis on the trenslation of Language form its cultural level. this is justifiable as far as Nida's wort is concerned. However, if one can add a futher argument about translation, it can be claimed that one dones not translate cultures, but one translates texts.

Similarlarly, register theory falls short in itd sectionalising of Langiage into level such as register, mode and style and analyses its context from its statistical constituents. for example, a particular register is a function of a statistically determined

predominance of certain lexical and grammatical features as Catford states:

Register marers are chiefly lexical and grammatical- statistical features such as the high frequency (30% to 50%) of passive verb forms and the low frequency of the pronouns I, you, she in English scientific register (1965: 90).

The application of this method in translation teaching Will drive The lerners to concentrate on the statistical orientation, leaving other discourse dimensions such as text-structure and text-pragmatics unaccounted for. Tese are claimed to be the domain of text-linguistics which is dealt with in the next section.

IV-. The text-linguistics model

One of the fundamental changes in modern linguistics is the gradual shift from 'linguistique de la langue' to linguistique de la parole'. The shift was initiated by the advent of the text-linguistics theory.   Text-linguistics stemmed from dissatisfaction with the traductional approach to language study from a micro-level (word, phrase, sentence) to widen its intersts in the study of the text. The difference between the two is that conventional linguistics to answer the question 'what structures can linguistic analysis uncover in a language?'. On the other hand, text-linguistics attempts to answer the following question, 'how are discoverable structures built through operations of decision and selection, and what are the implication for communicative interaction?' (De Baugrande and Dressler 1981: 15).

Clearly then, traditional linguistics attempts to analyse language, whereas text-linguistics attempts to investigate communication. Text-based studies can be traced back to Harris (1952) who proposed a method of discourse analysis according to equivalences. Later, various attempts were made to analyse communication in terms of text and context; text-theory (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981), text-grammar (Werlich 1976), text-processing (de Beaugrande 1980), text and context (Van Dijk

1977). The common feature of these studies is the recognition of the text as thke proper unit of examination.

Similarly the unit of translation in the text-linguistic approach is the text. Translation is regarded as a text-oriented even; and this has led to the redefinition of its principles:

a. The relevant language unit for translating is not the individual word or the single sentence.

b. Translating should not be regarded as an exercise in comparing and contrasting two texts, but as a process of interaction between the author, translator and reader of the translation.

c. The interesting factors are not text features themselves, but underlying strategies of language use as manifested in texte features.

d. The strategies must be seen in relation to the context of communicating.

e. The act of translating is guided by several sets of strategies which respond to the directives within the text.

One set acounts for the systematic differences between the two languages. A second set depends on the type of language use found in an individual text. A third set applies to systematic instructions of selecting equivalent items within their relevant context (De beaugrande 1978:13).

Furthermore, one of the most significant contributions of text-linguistics to translation is the classification of texts into types which has the implication that the way a text is translated will depend on its type. Further, given that a text type is identified by its communicative function, the translation co-textual refers to the processing of text-structure and texture. The contexual refers to the negotiation of a text on the level of intertextuality. subsumes the examination of text-roduction and reception which depend on the translator's prior knowledge of other texts.

The classification of text-types and their relevance to translation has been discussed by various translation theorists. Among those, Newmark (1981) classifies texts according to their function; expressive, informative, vocative and discusses which category is to be translated semantically and which communicatively. Hatim (1984) classifies texts into three categories: expository, argumentative and instructive, and illustrates their application to set up translation teaching methods.

1. Translation teaching in the text-linguistic model

The advent of text-theory cannot but draw the attention of the translation teacher on the limitations of contrastive linguistics and sentence based techniques. Neubert reminds translation teachers by claiming that "it has become one of the most common places of translation as well as translation teaching that we translate texts and not words and structures (1983: 61).

Recent works on text-linguistics are gradually making their way to translation teaching. This is largely significant in Reiss' (1982) describes teaching methods which are text-linguistic based.

Neubert (1984) is also convinced that translation is text-bound.

He consequently examines a number of questions related to text-linguistics, including textual constraints means of expression and the semantic and the pragmatic equivalence in relation to text-types and describes their implementation in a translation training course (1984: 61-9).

Similarly, the examination of the text-typological approach and its implementation in teaching is illustrated in Hatim's work (1984). Drawing upon text-theory, text-grammar and text-processing he identifies three categories of text types:

1. Exposition: this can be descriptive, focusing on objects and relations in space. Narrative, focusing on events and relations in time. Conceptual, focusing on concepts and relations in terms of either analysis or synthesis.

2. Argumentative: this can be overt (eg the counter argument 'letter to the editor')or covert (eg the case-making propaganda trait).

3. Instruction: this aims at the formation of future behaviour either with option as in advertising or with no option as in treaties, contracts and other binding legal documents (1984: 147).

Drawing upon this classification, Hatim builds up teaching strategies. The learners are taught how to identify text-types, and isolate their communicative function and context. The key to identifying the text-types and its context is to sectionalise it into supra-sentencial entities which follows the negotiation of texture, structures and text-samples.

These few examples demonstrate the spreading influence of text-linguistics in translation teaching. With the popularising works by contemporary theorists, therefore it is only reasonable to predict that text-linguistics will establish itself in the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, S. 1980. Translation Studies. Methuen, London

BEAUGRANDE, R. de and DRESSLER, W. 1981. Introduction to Text-Linguistics. Longman, London

CASAGRANDE, J.B. 1954. 'The Ends of TRanslation'. Oxford University Press, London

CITROEN, N. 1955. Training Technical Translators. Babel, vol. 1 part 2, pp. 61-65

CITROEN, I.J 1966. 'Targets in Translator Training'. Meta, 11, 4: 139-44

CRYSTAL, D. 1971. Linguistics. Harmondsworth

HATIM, B. 1984. 'Discourse/Text-Linguistics in the Training of Interpreters'. In Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting. Edited by wills, W. and thorne, G. Tubingen Narr. pp. 298-307

HATIM, B. 1984. 'A Text-Typological Approach to Syllabus Design in Translator Training'. The Incorporated Linguist, 23, 3,146-9

HORN, S.F. 1966. 'A College Curriculum for the Training of Translators and Interpreters in the USA'. Meta, 11, 4: 147-54

LYONS, J.1970. New Horizons in linguistics. Harmondsworth

MASON, i. 1982' The Role of Translation Theory in the Translation Class'. Quinquereme, 5, 1: 18-33

MOUNIN, G. 1963. Les problèmes théoriques de la Traduction, Gallimard, Paris

NEUBERT, A. 1984. 'Text-bound Translation Teaching' in Translating and Interpreting. edited by wills, W. and thome, G. Tubingen.

NEUWMARK, P. 1982. Approaches to Translation. Pergamon Press oxford

NIDA, E.A. 1964. Towards a science of Translation. Brill, Leiden

NIDA, E.A. 1975. Componential Analysis of Meaning. Mouton The Hague

NIDA, E. A. 1976. 'A Framework for the Analysis and Evaluation of Theories of Translation'. In Translation - Application and Research. Edited by Brislin, R.W. New York, pp. 47-91

NIDA, E. A. 1979. 'Translations and Translators'. Babel, 15,4: 214-15

NIDA, E.A. and TABE, c. 1969. Theory and Practice of Translating Brill, Leiden

PERKINS, C.R.B. 1978. 'Toward a More Systematic Teaching of Translation' English Teaching Language Journal, 32, 3: 236-41

REISS, K.1976. 'How to Teach Translation'. The Bible Translator 27, 3: 69102

ROKKAN, E. 1980 'Advanced Translation Teaching' English Language Teaching Journal. 224-6

TOLSTOI, S.S 1954. Quelques Problèmes Fondamentaux de l'Enseignement de la Traduction. L'Interprète 3, pp. 10-14; 4, pp. 10-13

VINAY, J.P. 1957. 'Peut on Enseigner la Traduction'. Le Journal des Traducteurs, 11, 4: 141-148

VINAY J.P. and DARBELNET, J. 1958. Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais: Methode de Traduction. Didier, Paris.

WALMSLEY, J.B. 1970. 'Transformation theory and Translation' International Review of Applied Linguistic in Language Teaching, 8, 3: 185-99

WILSS, W. 1976. 'Perspectives and Limitation of a Didactic Framework for kthe Teasching of Translation'. In Translation:

Application and Research, edited by British, R. W. pp. 117 - 73

WILSS, W 1982. The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods. Gunter Narr, Tubingen.