

translation transfer, influenced by Chomsky's generative grammar, and his concepts of formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Newmark's similarly influential categories of semantic translation and communicative translation are also discussed, as is Koller's analysis of equivalence.

Chapter 4 overviews attempts that have been made to describe the product and process of translation. These include classifications of the linguistic changes or 'shifts' which occur in translation. The main model described here is Vinay and Darbelnet's classic taxonomy, but reference is also made to Catford's linguistic model. A new section introduces some of the work that has been conducted from a cognitive perspective, which seeks to explain message processing and how translation as communication is achieved. This section covers the interpretive model of the Paris School, Bell's psycholinguistic model and Gutt's work on relevance theory.

Chapter 5 covers Reiss and Vermeer's text-type and skopos theory of the 1970s and 1980s and Nord's text-linguistic approach. In this chapter, translation is analysed according to text type and function in the TL culture, and prevailing concepts of text analysis – such as word order, information structure and thematic progression – are employed.

Linked closely to the previous chapter, Chapter 6 moves on to consider House's Register analysis model and the development of discourse-oriented approaches in the 1990s by Baker, and Hatim and Mason, who make use of Hallidayan linguistics to examine translation as communication within a socio-cultural context.

Chapter 7 investigates systems theories and the field of target-oriented 'descriptive' translation studies, following Even-Zohar, Toury and the work of the Manipulation School.

Chapter 8 examines the cultural and ideological approaches in translation studies. These start with Lefevere's work of the 1980s and early 1990s – which itself arose out of a comparative literature and Manipulation School background – and move on to more recent developments in gender studies and translation (in Canada), to postcolonial translation theories (in India) and other ideological implications of translation. The chapter then focuses on a case study of translation from Asia.

Chapter 9 looks at the role of the translator and translation practice. It begins by following Berman and Venuti in examining the foreign element in translation and the 'invisibility' of the translator. The idea explored is that the practice of translation, especially in the English-speaking world, is considered to be a derivative and second-rate activity, and that the prevailing method of translation is

1970s and the 1980s also saw the rise of a **descriptive approach** that had its origins in comparative literature and Russian Formalism (see Chapter 7). A pioneering centre was Tel Aviv, where Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury pursued the idea of the literary **polysystem** in which, among other things, different literatures and genres, including translated and non-translated works, compete for dominance. The polysystemists worked with a Belgium-based group including José Lambert and the late André Lefevere (who subsequently moved to the University of Austin, Texas), and with the UK-based scholars Susan Bassnett and Theo Hermans. A key volume was the collection of essays edited by Hermans, *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (Hermans 1985a), which gave rise to the name of the **'Manipulation School'**. Bassnett and Lefevere's volume *Translation, History and Culture* (1990) then introduced the term **'cultural turn'**. This dynamic, culturally oriented approach held sway for much of the following decade (Chapter 8).

The 1990s saw the incorporation of new approaches and concepts: Canadian-based translation and **gender** research led by Sherry Simon, the Brazilian **Cannibalist** School promoted by Else Vieira, and **postcolonial** translation theory with the prominent figures of the Bengali scholars Tejaswini Niranjana and Gayatri Spivak (Chapter 8). In the USA, the cultural studies-oriented analysis of Lawrence Venuti called for greater visibility and recognition of the translator (Chapter 9). Developments continued at a fast pace in the new millennium, with special interest devoted to translation, globalization and resistance (Cronin 2003, Baker 2006), the sociology and historiography of translation (e.g. Inghilleri 2005a, Wolf and Fukari 2007), translator training (e.g. Kearns 2008) and process-oriented research (e.g. O'Brien 2011; see this volume, Chapter 4). Research activity, as well as the practice of translation, has also been revolutionized by new technologies. These new areas include audiovisual translation, localization and corpus-based translation studies (see Chapter 11). Furthermore, the international reach of the discipline has expanded with research in or on China (e.g. Chan 2004, Cheung 2006, 2009) and the Arab world (Selim 2009) in particular.

1.6 The van Doorslaer 'map'

In order to deal with such a breadth of work, a new conceptual tool was developed for the Benjamins *Translation Studies Bibliography*, as explained by van Doorslaer (2007). In the new maps, a distinction is drawn between 'translation'

unity of form and sense and where 'phonemic similarity is sensed as semantic relationship', is considered 'untranslatable' and requires 'creative transposition' (ibid.: 143).

The questions of meaning, equivalence and translatability became a constant theme of translation studies in the 1960s and were tackled by a new 'scientific' approach followed by one of the most important figures in translation studies, the American Eugene Nida (1914–2011).

3.2 Nida and 'the science of translating'

Eugene Nida's theory of translation developed from his own practical work from the 1940s onwards when he was translating and organizing the translation of the Bible, training often inexperienced translators who worked in the field.² Nida's theory took concrete form in two major works in the 1960s: *Toward a Science of Translating* (Nida 1964a) and the co-authored *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Nida and Taber 1969). The title of the first book is significant; Nida attempts to move Bible translation into a more scientific era by incorporating recent work in **linguistics**. His more systematic approach borrows theoretical concepts and terminology both from semantics and pragmatics and from Noam Chomsky's work on syntactic structure which formed the theory of a universal generative–transformational grammar (Chomsky 1957, 1965).

3.2.1 The influence of Chomsky

Chomsky's generative–transformational model analyses sentences into a series of related levels governed by rules. In very simplified form, the key features of this model can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Phrase-structure rules generate an underlying or **deep structure** which is
- (2) transformed by transformational rules relating one underlying structure to another (e.g. active to passive), to produce
- (3) a final **surface structure**, which itself is subject to phonological and morphemic rules.

- the use of Translog software at the Copenhagen Business School (Jakobsen and Schou 1999, Hansen 2006), which records the key-strokes made by the translator on the computer keyboard;
- the use of eye-tracking equipment (O'Brien 2006, 2011), which records the focus of the eye on the text. The length of such fixation points, and the dilation of the pupil, may indicate the mental effort being made by the translator.

Potentially fruitful as such developments are, Hurtado Albir and Alves (2009: 73) warn that 'the field needs to put more effort into refining experimental designs and fostering the replication of studies, thus allowing for validation or falsification of previous findings'. Nevertheless, this is one of the most exciting and rapidly developing areas in translation studies.

Case study

Over the years Vinay and Darbelnet's model has exerted considerable influence on translation theorists. We use it as the basis for this case study, applying it to a short illustrative text. This text is a brief extract about the area of Greenwich in London, taken from a tourist brochure for boat tours on the River Thames. Boxes 4.1 and 4.2 are extracts from the English ST and the French TT respectively.⁹

Box 4.1

Greenwich (ST)

The ancient town of Greenwich has been a gateway to London for over a thousand years. Invaders from the continent passed either by ship or the Old Dover Road, built by the Romans, on their way to the capital.

In 1012, the Danes moored their longships at Greenwich and raided Canterbury, returning with Archbishop Alfege as hostage and later murdering him on the spot where the church named after him now stands.