

TOPIC 4

Eugene A. Nida: he emphasized the need to provide translators with better models, resources, and training, building a translation network and organizational structure that became *the global United Bible Societies Translations Program (UBS)*.

Theory of dynamic (functional) equivalence:

- An approach designed to enable the translator to capture the meaning and spirit of the original language text without being bound to its linguistic structure.

Toward a Science of Translation (moving to translation):

“Since no two languages are identical... there can be no fully exact translation”

- One must in translation seek to find the closest possible equivalent.

The basic factors that can account for differences in translations:

1. The nature of the message.
 2. The purpose of the author and, by proxy, of the translator.
 3. The type of audience.
-
- Some translations aim at very close formal and semantic correspondence but are generously supplied with notes and commentary.
 - Many are not much concerned with giving information as with creating in the reader something of the same mood was conveyed by the original.

Two types of equivalence:

- Formal & dynamic.
- **The present direction is toward increasing emphasis on dynamic equivalences.**

	Formal	Dynamic
Focus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focuses attention on the message itself. (form & content) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based upon ‘the principle of equivalent effect’.
Concerns:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The message in the TL should match as closely as possible the different element in the SL. (poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not concerned with matching the TL message with the SL.
Determine success:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measured by its <u>accuracy and proximity</u> to the original text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measured by a complete <u>naturalness of expression</u> (idiomatic), and the effect on the target reader. tries to relate the TR to modes and behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture. → it doesn’t insist that he understand the cultural pattern of the SL context in order to comprehend the message.
Relationship of the Source & Receptor:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the SL context, and to understand customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. ‘gloss translation’, the translator attempts to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship between the TR & TM_{message} the same as the message between SR & SM.

	<p>reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some Medieval French</i> text into English → not requiring a knowledge of the original language of the text. • Require numerous footnote in order to make the text fully comprehensible. 	
Orientation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source-oriented translation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target-oriented translation.

Case Study:

What are the main problems/difficulties/constraints (linguistic and cultural) of the source text?

- In chapter two in Alice in The Wonder Land, I have noticed many translating difficulties including linguistic and culture differences of the ST. For example, the phrase “*Criouser and curiouiser!*”, this phrase demonstrates the main character feelings by changing the word “curious”, which means feeling nosy or unusual about something. And the author in the source text used a lullaby which is similar to a small poem with rhyming endings like music.
- Another problem barrier was the culture of the ST. One of these barriers in the text was “she quite forgot how to speak good English”. To the SR, the English language is what is usual to them. However, when translating it, some translators may change the “English” to their Target Language. Moreover, if the TR were not Christians and not familiar with Christmas, the translator may also change “Christmas” to something else which will send the same message in the ST. Also, in the ST the character speaks the French language in one of the scenes, which may also be changed to other language to match the TR’s culture.

What is the function of each translated text?

- Both translated texts were functioned to send their TR the same original message that was send to the SR.

What translation strategy did both translators utilize? *Give Examples.*

- The first text that was translated by Amira Kiwan, was translated using the Word-by-word strategy. She tried to bring the TR close to the author’s culture. For example,

she did not change the “Christmas” word that was in the ST. Also, she didn’t change “... speak good English” instead she kept it the same. And the lullaby that was in the ST, she only translated each word which lost the goal of it.

- In the second text that was translated by Siham Bint Saniyya, she used the Sense-by-sense strategy, where she focused more on the message itself rather than the words in the text. She wrote a different lullaby which aims to keep the music to the readers while keeping the same message. She also changed the language to Egyptian language to make it more informal and easier to the TR.

If you were the translator, which strategy would you prefer and why?

- If I was a translator, I would choose the sense-by-sense strategy. Because the TT would be easier to read, and it would make the TR feel comfortable while maintain the message of the ST.