Literary Translation

Literary Translation:
Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning

By

Bahaa-eddin Abulhassan Hassan

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

To my family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

PREFACE

This book is a revised version of the author's Ph.D. dissertation and has been developed for all those who embark on the study of literary translation and have little or no prior background in pragmatics. It is also intended for the general reader in linguistics and translation. Because of this, technical terminology has been kept to a minimum. Where specialist terms have been introduced, they are explained in the text.

This book focuses attention on pragmatic aspects in translation such as speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, politeness and deictic expressions. It falls into five chapters. The first chapter explores the different models of translation and the features of literary translation. It provides some facts that are relevant in the subsequent analysis in which focus is given to the importance of examining pragmatic principles in translation. The second chapter explores the translation of speech acts. The third chapter is concerned with translating implicit meaning such as presupposition and implicature. The fourth chapter explains the translations of politeness expressions. The fifth chapter presents the translation of deictic expressions. The book explores the pragmatic problems involved in an English translation of Naguib Mahfouz's Trilogy. The Trilogy, namely *Palace Walk*, *Palace of Desire* and *Sugar Street*, has been translated by Hutchins et al. This translation is compared with the source text. The book tries to figure out whether the translation of the trilogy as a literary text is pragmatically equivalent to the source text or not.

One forever owes a debt to one's professors. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Ibrahim Maghraby for his effort and academic guidance. I am also very grateful to Prof. Ahmed-Sokarno Abdel-Hafiz whose remarks and suggestions contributed to the present outcome of the book. His ideas and advice were momentous. I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr. Nabil Abdel-Fatah, Prof. Laila Abdel-Raziq and Prof. Mustafa Riyad for their help in the structure and development of the book.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SL   source language
TL   target language
SLT   source language text
TLT   target language text
PA   pragmatic approach
SA   speech act
DSA   direct speech act
ISA   indirect speech act
CP   cooperative principle
FTA   face-threatening act

CHAPTER ONE

THE PRAGMATIC APPROACH

Translation plays an important role in bridging the gaps between the different cultures and nations. Literary translations in particular help these different nations reach a universal culture on a common ground. A good translation is not simply concerned with transferring the propositional content of the source language text (SLT), but also its other pragmatic features. The attention given to pragmatic facts and principles in the course of translation can enhance the understanding of the text and improve the quality of translation. The main concern of the study can be elaborated in the following questions:

1- Does the illocutionary force of speech acts in a literary text such as Mahfouz's Trilogy differ in their translation?

2- Do implicit meanings such as presuppositions and implicatures in that literary text differ in its translation?

3- Do politeness expressions in that literary text differ in their translation?

4- How are deictic expressions rendered in the translation of the Trilogy?

Although the study is concerned with the translation of a particular work of Naguib Mahfouz (i.e. the Trilogy), it does not claim to have exhaustive enquiry into the problems that the translator has encountered in the process of translating the Trilogy as a literary text. Since few studies have dealt with all nuances of pragmatic meaning in literary translation, many aspects of this area may still need further investigation. The present study is an attempt to attract translators' attention to the pragmatic features of a text. The study will probably fill the gap in the literature concerning pragmatic translation.

The major concern of the study is to examine the pragmatic meanings involved in literary translation. Therefore, a pragmatic approach is the appropriate framework for the analysis presented in this work. Put differently, in order to look into the way the pragmatic meanings are handled in the translation of the source text, the author relied on some pragmatic models and principles for the explanation of speech acts, inferences, politeness and deictic expressions. The following steps show how the analysis of the translation is conducted:

1- Analyzing the SLT
2- Examining the TLT
3- Comparing utterance meaning in both the SLT and the TLT
4- Back-translation[1] is sometimes given to help in the process of analysis and comparison.
5- Evaluating the pragmatic equivalents that are embodied in modifications, additions, and deletions in the TLT.

1.1 Literary Translation: Different Approaches

Translation plays an important role in increasing awareness and understanding among diverse cultures and nations. Literary translations in particular help these different cultures reach a compromise. The increasing interest in the literature of other languages has required a more studious regard for the problems of literary translation. A translator deals with a text which involves linguistic, pragmatic and cultural elements. Such factors often pose problems to target readers. More often than not, translators pay more attention to linguistic and cultural elements than to the pragmatic aspects of a source text. Blatant disregard for these pragmatic features should result in pragmatic problems in the target text. Thus, the target text is doomed to a complete failure. Landers (2001: 7) argues that

> Literary translation, at least in the English-speaking world, faces a difficulty that texts originally written in English do not: resistance by the public to reading literature in translation… In technical translation, for example, style is not a consideration so long as the informational content makes its way unaltered from SL to TL… In literary translation, the order of the cars – which is to say the style – can make the difference between a lively, highly readable translation and a stilted, rigid, and artificial rendering that strips the original of its artistic and aesthetic essence, even its very soul.

Literary translation is a type of translation which is distinguished from translation in general. A literary translation must reflect the imaginative, intellectual and intuitive writing of the author. In fact, literature is distinguished by its aesthetics. Little concern has been devoted to the aesthetics of literary translations because these translations are popularly perceived as unoriginal (Devy 1999: 183). Belhaag (1997: 20) summarizes the characteristics of literary translations:
    - expressive
    - connotative

- symbolic
- focusing on both form and content
- subjective
- allowing multiple interpretation
- timeless and universal
- using special devices to 'heighten' communicative effect
- tendency to deviate from the language norms

Moreover, literary translations must reflect all the literary features of the source text such as sound effects, morphophonemic selection of words, figures of speech …etc. (Riffaterre 1992: 204-205).

Gutt (1991) stresses that in translating a literary work one should preserve the style of the original text. In accordance with Gutt,

> this wider, stylistic dimension of communication is, of course, of special interest to literary studies, and so it is not surprising that theorists concerned with literary translation have paid considerable attention to the preservation of the stylistic properties of texts" (1991: 123).

A writer's style is known "from the words he chooses or the way he constructs his sentences" (1991: 123). According to Savory (1957), literal translation of a literary work does not reproduce the effect of the original. Because literature allows multiple interpretation, there should be freedom in literary translations to consider a wide range of implicatures. Thus, rendering the equivalent effect of the original requires freedom to explore different interpretations. That approach is meant to achieve relevance in translation (1991: 156-157).

Basically, translation consists of transferring the meaning of the source language into the target language. That process is done by changing the form of the first language to the form of the second language. Thus, it is meaning which is being transferred and must be held constant. But what type of meaning a translator should transfer! Generally, linguists distinguish different types of meaning. When it relates language to events, entities, etc., it is called referential / denotative meaning. When it relates language to the mental state of the speaker, it is called attitudinal / connotative / expressive meaning. If the extra-linguistic situation affects the interpretation of text, it is called contextual / functional / interpersonal / situational meaning (Crystal 1997: 237). Larson (1984: 36) adds organizational meaning to the list to refer to the grammatical structure of a text such as deictics, repetition, groupings, and information organization that form a coherent text. Any level in language has its own significance because it plays a role in the total meaning, e.g. phonetic, lexical, grammatical, semantic and pragmatic meanings. In semantics the word

"mean" can be applied to words and sentences in the sense of 'equivalent to' (Hurford and Heasley 1983: 3). In pragmatics it can be applied to speakers in the sense of "intend". This study is concerned with pragmatic meaning in literary translation. Pragmatic meaning is the utterance meaning or the speaker meaning as opposed to the sentence meaning. Grice (1975) distinguishes those two types of meaning as non-natural meaning and natural meaning (Levinson 1983: 16).

The attention given to pragmatic facts and principles in the course of translation can enhance the understanding of the text and improve the quality of translation. A good translation is not simply concerned with transferring the propositional content of the source language text (SLT), but also with its other pragmatic features. The study focuses on such neglected aspects of translation as speech acts, presuppositions, implicatures, politeness and deictic expressions in literary translation. Those features will be explained below in a simple way. Abdel-Hafiz (2003: 230) stresses that ignoring such pragmatic problems may contort the translation and lessen the pleasure of the English reader. El-Zeini (1994: XVI) states that those pragmatic problems produce an inaccurate translation. She clarifies that the English reader's response is different from that of the Arab reader because of the different language systems of Arabic and English (1994: 45).

The main objective of a translation is to "communicate the meaning of the original accurately and clearly to the readers of translation" (Gutt 1991: 66). Meaning with all its various respects should be preserved. To judge the similarity of meaning a translator has to experience the target language text (TLT). S/he should acquire the sense of "the other meaning" (El-Shiyab et al 2000: 283). If there is vagueness in the target language text (TLT), s/he has the license to modify. Translation is defined as "a movement in the words used to make language along the context in which words or sentences are used" (2000: 283). That skill is called "the verbal art" according to (Bakhtin 1981) (2000: 283). A good translator should find a way in which the desired meaning can be expressed in the receptor language even if the TL form is different from the SL form.

Darwish (1989) points out how meaning is conveyed to the target audience. He explains – following Catford (1965) – that meaning belongs to language and concepts belong to the mind. Thus, meaning cannot be translated unless we transfer concepts. Arabic meaning is translated into English meaning through transferring concepts. Concepts are universal.

In addition to the pragmatic approach to translation there are other approaches to translation that may involve other aspects such as structural, cultural, functional etc. However, recent translation approaches can be

divided into linguistics-based approaches and cultural approaches. On the one hand, linguistics-oriented approaches have been accused of being limited in their explanation because they do not consider the social cultural values in translation. They have been also criticized for being directed to specialist linguists. They are repressive (Venuti 1998: 1-26). Yet, Venuti does not suggest abandoning those approaches. Pragmatics is also criticized for its individualism and its idealism. "Individuals are not usually free to manipulate language to achieve their goals, but that they are constrained by social conventions" (Fairchlough 1989 cited in Cutting 2002: 119). On the other hand, cultural approaches highlight cultural differences between the source text and the target text. In fact, both linguistic and cultural studies of translation are important. "Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions"(Toury 2000: 200).

The trend of unifying meaning is opposed by a cultural approach which has underscored the differences of languages and viewed translation as "a locus for the celebration of difference"(May 1994: 42). The cultural approach has stressed the cultural turn in translation (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990). Then, translation is defined as translating cultures not languages (Ivir 1987: 35; Pym 1992; Lefevere 1992; Even-Zohor 1990; Snell-Hornby 1990) (Tymoczko 1999: 21).

In fact, translation is a complex entity, which involves a large number of variables other than reproduction of meaning. In this regard, in the process of translating a text the translator should know not only the languages involved, but also their cultures and rhetorical traditions (Enkvist 1991: 14-15). Being receiver and producer of text, the translator "has the double duty of perceiving the meaning potential of particular choices within the cultural and linguistic community of the source text and relaying the same potential, by suitable linguistic means, to a target readership" (Mason 1994: 23). Baker believes that "no approach, however sophisticated, can provide the answer to all the questions raised in the discipline" (2001: 280). She views the different approaches as "complementary rather than mutually exclusive"(2001: 280). Newmark (1982: 12) argues that "a general theory cannot propose a single method (e.g. dynamic equivalence), but must be concerned with the full range of text-types and their corresponding translation criteria, as well as the major variables involved". Thus, the study does not present a general theory of translation. Rather, it introduces a pragmatic approach to translation.

Different theories and models can be counted in the field of translation. Bell (1991: 23-24) distinguishes between the theory and the model. He shows that a theory explains a phenomenon and is communicated to others

in the form of a model. A model is "an attempt at a description rather than an explanation" (1991: 26). The term "approach" might be more appropriate (1991: 27). Vinay and Darblent (1958: 84) recognize two types of translations:

1- Direct translations where the linguistic features of the SLT are replaced by their equivalents in the TLT, and

2- Oblique translations where complex methods are used to render certain stylistic effects.

According to Jakobson (1959: 114) there are different kinds of translation. He differentiates three ways of interpreting a verbal sign:

1- Intralingual (rewording): a verbal sign is interpreted to another within the same language.

2- Interlingual (translation proper): a verbal sign is interpreted to another in a different language.

3- Intersemiotic (transmutation): a verbal sign is interpreted to a non-verbal sign.

Nida (1976) distinguishes three theories of translation:

1-Philological (Belloc 1931, Cary and Jumpelt 1963, and Brower 1966)

2-Linguistic[2] (Catford 1965)

3-Sociolinguistic (Nida and Taber 1969)

Two centuries ago Tytler (1791) set up a series of do's and don'ts – which act as general laws of translation that teach translators what they ought and ought not to do (Bell 1991:10). Then, linguistics emerged with its descriptive type. According to Bell (1991:10), most translation theorists except Nida, Catford and few theorists follow the prescriptive thinking of the past. The sociolinguistic theory differs from the linguistic theory in that it adds a communicative dimension and a functional perspective to translation (Shaheen 1998: 27-28).

According to Nida (1964b: 127), the nature of the message determines the types of translations. A translation depends on the degree of focus on the form or the content. Two types of translations are distinguished:

1- a formal equivalence translation in which the form and content of the original message is to be preserved, and

2- a dynamic equivalence translation which focuses on creating an equivalent effect in the TLT.

Nida and Taber (1969: 12) direct the attention towards the receptor of the message not the form of the message. In other words, the relationship between the TL receptor and the message should be dynamic to be similar to the relationship between the original receptor and the message.

According to Larson (1984), there are two types of translations:

1- form-based or literal translations which transmit the form of the SLT, and

2- meaning-based or idiomatic translations which "communicate the meaning of the SL text in the natural forms of the receptor language" (1984: 15). This type of translation has been developed by Beekman and Callow (1974) (Gutt 1991: 68). Then, Newmark (1988) presents a pair of terms:

1- a semantic translation in which the SLT semantic and syntactic structures are rendered in the TLT, and

2- a communicative translation which creates an equivalent effect in the receptor language.

It seems that Nida's formal translation, Larson's literal translation and Newmark's semantic translation focus on the form of the text. Nevertheless, literal translation ignores context. Similarly, Nida's dynamic translation, Larson's idiomatic translation and Newmark's communicative translation seek one goal; that is, finding an equivalent effect. This fact has been affirmed by Gutt (1991: 68). Gutt finds that the dynamic translation resembles the idiomatic translation. Both convey the message of the original text to the receptor audience and are equivalent to the original text in a dynamic way.

According to Neubert (1991: 17-26), four approaches of translation can be distinguished out of seven:

1- Linguistic

2- Communicative/functional

3-Psycholinguistic

4-Sociocultural

Abdel-Hafiz (2003: 229) differentiates 3 approaches:

1- Linguistic

2- Pragmatic

3- Cultural

Christiane Nord (1991: 72-73) adds two new terms: "documentary" vs. "instrumental" translations. Documentary translations preserve the original exoticizing flavor of the SLT. An instrumental translation conveys the SL message in a new communicative action in the TL. Nord's difference between documentary and instrumental translations has already been utilized by House (1981) when she differentiated between "overt" and "covert" translations. Literary translation is seen as a type of documentary translation (Nord 1991).

By and large, types of translation are radically diverse but depend mainly on a central concept, that is, equivalence. Therefore, many translation theorists define translation in terms of equivalence relation;

relation between the SLT and the TLT. The translator's objective and the text type determine the type of equivalence used in the process of translation. Equivalence is a relationship of equality between the SLT and the TLT. In fact, the concept is encompassed by vagueness. Historically, it was perceived in terms of accuracy and fidelity (Sager 1997: 25). Vinay and Darblent (2000) deal with the methods of creating equivalent texts (2000: 90). Jakobson (2000) also identifies equivalence as "the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguists" (2000: 114). As Hartman and Stork (1972) summarize the concept, "texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially), in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc.) and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence)" (1972: 713 cited in Bell 1991: 6). With regard to equivalence, translation theorists range from proponents that define translation in terms of equivalence (Catford 1965; Nida and Taber 1969; Toury 1980; Pym 1992,1995; Koller 1995 cited in Kenny 2001: 77) to opponents that reject equivalence (Snell-Hornby 1988; Gentzler 1993 cited in Kenny 2001: 77). According to Sager (1997), pragmatic equivalence and functional equivalence are widely used in the recent time. Sager points out that pragmatic equivalence is used to modify the content (addition and reduction) while functional equivalence is used to preserve the purpose of the original; "a writer intention" and "a reader expectation". Thus, both constitute a dynamic view of translation (1997: 32).

It is worth pausing for a moment to wonder which type of equivalence should be given priority. Translation theorists answered this question differently. Vinay and Darblent (1958) believe that if there is no synonymy in the bilingual dictionary, the translator has to resort to what they called "situational equivalence"; creating a new situation in the target context (Vinay and Darblent 2000: 91). Then, Jakobson (1959) introduces the term "equivalence in difference" (Jakobson 2000: 114). It depends on his semiotic approach to translation; it "involves two equivalent messages in two different codes" (2000: 114). Leonardi (2000: 3) notes that both (Vinay and Darblent 1958) and (Jokobson 1959) "recognize the limitations of a linguistic theory" because they licensed the use of non-linguistic methods such as loan-translation and neologisms.

Nida (1964) introduces two types of equivalence: formal and dynamic; the former focuses on the form and content of the message while the latter on producing equivalent effect. Then, Catford (1965) differentiates between formal correspondence and textual equivalence. He offers "departures from formal correspondence" because of the grammatical and lexical

shifts that occur at the different levels and in the different categories (Catford 2000: 143). Widdowson (1979) presents three types of equivalence: structural, semantic, and pragmatic. The first accounts for the formal similarity between surface forms of sentences. The second relates different surface forms to a common deep structure. The third relates surface forms to their communicative function (El Menoufy 1982: 238-252). Then, Newmark (1977) distinguishes a semantic equivalence from a communicative equivalence which concerns an equivalent effect on the TL reader. According to El Menoufy (1982: 243), it is useless to choose between semantic and communicative equivalence in translation because the translator first starts with the semantic (replacing in the TLT the invariant core of the SLT), then resorts to the communicative.

According to Baker (1992: 5), equivalence is sought "for the sake of convenience". A certain type of equivalence is given priority to other types in a certain situation. She comments, "the ultimate aim of a translator, in most cases, is to achieve a measure of equivalence at text level, rather than at word or phrase level"(1992: 112). She advocates textual equivalence. Baker emphasizes that the job of the translator is to be concerned with "communicating the overall meaning of a stretch of language" (1992: 10). Baker's view does not mean that equivalence at word level should not be sought in some contexts. But at the morpheme level there is no equivalence (Halliday 1967 cited in Newmark 1991: 67). The more a translator seeks equivalence at a higher level the more successful s/he is. One has to move from lower levels (micro levels) to higher levels (macro levels). That has been approved by Halliday (2001) and termed "a principle of hierarchy of values" (2001: 17 cited in Zequan 2004: 9). On the contrary, there is a recent trend that denies equivalence. It defines translation not in terms of equivalence, but in terms of difference. While equivalence works to reduce linguistic and cultural differences, this trend elevates the notion of difference between the original and the translation (cf. Venuti 1998).

1.2 Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning

The pragmatic approach to translation (PA) has gained prominence in the 1990s. It is sometimes classified as one of the text linguistic approaches to translation – along with register analysis and discourse analysis (Fawcett 2001: 123-124). However, it is also classified under the heading "discourse analysis" (cf. Munday 2001: 89). While text analysis has been more concerned with the organization of texts, discourse analysis aims at describing social relationships and interaction through texts.

Pragmatics is mainly concerned with inferences[3]. A pragmatic inference is produced by the communicative situation (Chernov 1991: 27-28). Obviously, the pragmatic approach (PA) utilizes the situational meaning, which plays a decisive role in understanding any text. The message is only interpretable in a given communication situation. Another important issue in pragmatics is the relation between a sender and a receiver of a message. This issue is important in the PA because it will affect communication. The participants' cultural background, the presuppositions that each brings to communication and the other extralinguistic information are employed in the PA. The PA goes beyond the syntactic and semantic code of the text. It is concerned with the use of code for communication.

Traditionally, pragmatics was classified as a division of semiotics. Morris (1938) distinguishes pragmatics as "the science of the relation of signs to their interpreters" (Morris 1938 cited in Horn 1988: 116). In modern linguistics, several conflicting definitions have arisen. According to Crystal, pragmatics is

> the study of LANGUAGE from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the CONSTRAINTS they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication"(1997: 301).

Leech (1983: X) defines pragmatics as "the study of how utterances have meanings in situations". Levinson (1983: 1-35) explores other definitions. He criticizes restricting pragmatics to the grammatical aspects which are formally encoded in the structure of language. He also criticizes Katz's definition (1977: 19) of pragmatics as concerned with interpreting linguistic forms in a context[4]. Levinson also criticizes Gazdar (1979: 2) for defining pragmatics in terms of those aspects of meaning not covered in semantics because the scope of pragmatics will depend upon the kind of the semantic theory adopted; general semantics or truth-conditional semantics (Levinson 1983: 12). Levinson also discards the idea of defining pragmatics in terms of appropriateness adopted by (Van Dijk 1976: 29; Lyons 1977: 574; Austin 1962 and Searle 1969), because it may cause overlapping with sociolinguistics and requires "a culturally homogeneous speech community" (Levinson 1983: 25). Finally, Levinson defines pragmatics as the study of language use (1983: 5,25). Baker (1992: 217) advocates that definition. Bach and Harnish (1979: 81-103) consider that definition so broad that it includes areas as social psychology, sociolinguistics, cultural anthropology, and rhetoric. They restrict the term to the aspects of use that are involved in communication. Green (1989) defines pragmatics as "natural language understanding". Pragmatic

information is described as the "speaker's and addressee's mental models of each other" (Green 2000: 1). However, Stalnaker (1972) determines the major topics of pragmatics: "deixis…, implicature, presupposition, speech acts and aspects of discourse structure" (Levinson 1983: 27).

According to Crystal (1997: 301), there is no coherent pragmatic theory in the present time because of the various topics it has to explain. The problem is that pragmatics deals with both context-dependent aspects encoded in a language structure and principles of language use that are irrelevant with linguistic structure. Context-dependent aspects that are encoded in the language structure are deixis, presupposition and speech acts (cf. Levinson 1983: 9).

Levinson (1983) recognizes the boundaries of pragmatics. It is the area between semantics and sociolinguistics. He arranges language areas as follows: syntax and phonology/semantics/pragmatics/sociolinguistics (1983: 27). Semantics/pragmatics distinction will be discussed below. Pragmatics/sociolinguistics distinction is clear. They feed each other (1983: 374). Gregerson (1980: 14-16) shows that pragmatics and rhetoric share one goal: a speaker tries to influence her/his hearers.

Drawing a division line between semantics and pragmatics is necessary to understand the nature of pragmatic information. The distinction reflects the difference between linguistic and extra-linguistic information, meaning and use, context-invariant and context-sensitive meaning, saying and implying, literal and nonliteral use, and content and force. Understanding the distinction, linguists can avoid the ambiguity of the semantic representation through pragmatic alternatives (Morgan 1975 cited in Green 1989: 106).

At the present time linguists disagree about the boundary between semantics and pragmatics. Some linguists view them as different aspects of the same general study. Both concern meaning (Kreidler 1998: 18-19). Other linguists see pragmatics as an independent level of language analysis. Whereas semantics relates meaning to logic and truth (linguistic meaning), pragmatics relates meaning to context of utterance (speaker meaning). Others do not consider pragmatics to be a level of linguistic theory but a way of linking language to social aspects. Then, pragmatics is "more akin to sociolinguistics than semantics" (Levinson 1983: 33). Levinson (1983: 33-53) proves that pragmatics is part of competence and a component of linguistic theory. Different approaches to semantics / pragmatics distinction are explored briefly in the study.

Austin draws the distinction by contrasting locutionary and illocutionary acts (1960: 93-101). Later, Grice (1978) advocates a unitary semantics supplemented with conversational implicature. Grice and his

followers, like Atlas and Levinson (1981) and Horn (1989), presume that default implicatures play a role in the interpretation of the semantic representation. It is claimed that implicatures are universal principles of rationality which are rarely lexicalized (Levinson 1996: 192). Leech (1983: 229) depends on the difference between grammar and rhetoric; and between sense and force to explain the distinction.

Bach (1999a) presents an underdetermined semantics in which pragmatic aspects of meaning contribute to what is said. In case of an utterance which is semantically underdetermined, pragmatic processes contribute to reach a proposition. He illustrates that the notion of context cannot be depended upon to formulate the semantics / pragmatics distinction because "context plays a role in semantics as well as pragmatics" (1999a: 6). He differentiates between context in a narrow semantic sense that is restricted to few variables – such as the identity of the speaker and the hearer; and the time and place of an utterance – and context in a broad, pragmatic sense that is the speaker's communicative intention. He acknowledges that understanding semantically incomplete sentence requires pragmatic supplementation. This pragmatic supplementation explains the relationship between semantics and pragmatics. Context can be used to explain how pragmatics complements semantics (1999a: 6). Bach proposes the concept of implicature which includes expansion and completion of what is said. He claims that "pragmatic information concerns facts relevant to making sense of a speaker's utterance of a sentence" (1999a:8). Furthermore, he emphasizes that understanding utterances is achieved through the Gricean notion of reflexive communicative intention.

Later, Carston (1999) assures that pragmatics enriches semantics. Semantic entailments are enriched pragmatically to reach a proposition. Enrichment is achieved either through explicature which is derived by inferentially developing the logical form or implicature which is derived only by inference. Carston's approach is built on the relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986) which replaces rational communication with innate principles of cognitive processes and information processing; it maximizes contextual effects at a minimum of processing cost.

Jaszczolt (1999) proposes an unambiguous default semantics in which intention intrudes to exorcize the ambiguity of the semantic representation. Jaszczolt's approach is built on a dynamic view of semantics and pragmatics in which they are interwoven. Thus, there is no division between semantics and pragmatics.

In conclusion, whether pragmatic factors supplement semantic representation as Bach (1999a) proposes or they intrude into semantic

representation, semantics and pragmatics are distinctive and complementary. The relationship between them is that of feeding eachother. Levinson (1983: 34) explains that "neither semantics nor pragmatics is autonomous with respect to each – information provided by the one component must be available to the other". Belhaaj (1997: 14) comments that "'a marriage of convenience' must be established between semantics and pragmatics". This intermarriage, in the terms of Yus (1999: 9), is necessitated by two facts: "(a) that semantics cannot find purely semantic answers to purely semantic questions, and (b) that pragmatics cannot find purely pragmatic answers to purely pragmatic questions."

1.3 Relation between Pragmatics and Translation

A translation should be primarily pragmatic because pragmatics and translation share common features. They are semiotic in nature, aiming at increasing understanding and facilitating communication. Semiotics is "the science that studies sign systems or structures, sign processes and sign functions" (Bassnett 1991: 13). While pragmatics has been recognized by Morris (1938) as a division of semiotics (the relation of sign to user), translation is a kind of semiotic interpretation. Jakobson (2000) defines translation as an interpretation of verbal signs by other verbal signs in a different language. Levy stresses that "[as] all semiotic processes, translation has its PRAGMATIC DIMENSION as well" (2000: 156).

Both pragmatics and translation are communicative, i.e. using sentences appropriately to achieve communication (Widdowson 1979). In the Gricean model, pragmatics deals with interpreting the communicative act. El Menoufy (1982) stresses the contribution of the communicative approach in translation to guarantee effective communication. Many translation scholars such as Bell (1991: 8) and Simon (1996: 9) consider translation as an act of communication (decoding, transmitting and encoding) and translators as participants in communication. In Gutt's terms, translation is placed within the sphere of communication (1991: 22). Moreover, both pragmatics and translation utilize a functional view of language. Functionalism is a mode of explanation by reference to external factors. In pragmatics, "some linguistic feature is motivated by principles outside the scope of linguistic theory" (Levinson 1983: 40). In translation, a functional view should be adopted to compensate for the lack of a similar cultural convention in the TL (Bassnett 1991: 22).

Bell describes pragmatics in terms of situationality, intentionality and acceptability (1991: 209). Thus, the pragmatic approach (PA) can be said to apply these three important features in translation. Situationality refers

to the appropriate use in a particular situation, intentionality to the intention of the producer, and acceptability to the effect of the TL text on the TL receptor. The PA was used before by Widdowson (1973) to refer to the communicative use-value of utterances (Al-Zoubi and Hassnawi 2001).

The PA is characterized by a distinctive orientation. It represents extra-textual or external factors. Those factors in the narrow sense of the word refer to place and time of communication (situationality) and in its broad sense to the relationship between the producer and receptor (intentionality and acceptability) (cf. Wilss 1977; Koller 1979; Reiss 1974). The PA focuses on three aspects: the context of the situation, the writer's intention and the reader's response. As given above, the PA is characterized with three different features: situationality, intentionality and acceptability. Each feature will be explained below.

(1) Situationality

Understanding an utterance involves not only its linguistic meaning but also its appropriate use in a particular situation (El Menoufy 1982: 239). The use of context is part and parcel in the PA (Abdel-Hafiz 2003: 230). Abdel-Hafiz stresses the importance of context in retrieving meaning. Without a contextual situation an utterance could not be interpreted. Understanding or comprehension is fulfilled by associating or connecting the new information verbalized in the text with the knowledge of the world or of a particular situation (Nord 1991: 88-89). This process of "concrete occurrence in a context" is called "actualization" (Lewis 2000: 266).

(2) Intentionality

Intention means the purpose of communication. In successful communication the sender must have intention in producing the message and the receiver interprets the message. The receiver's interpretation should coincide with the sender's intention (Sager 1997: 27). Even if the form of an utterance does not correspond to the intended function, the receiver recognizes the sender's intention. This is true because the sender and the receiver know each other. They share common background knowledge. In translation the writer and the TL reader rarely share common background knowledge. Therefore, the role of the translator is to mediate between the writer and the reader. Ho (1998) believes that the intention of producer is important because semiotic acts are performative in nature. Being performative means specifying certain purposes.

"Translations could not be regarded as synonymity-preserving mappings between texts….[but] as purpose-preserving transformation of expressions or utterances" (1998: 4). The PA confirms that intention should be preserved in translation.

(3) Acceptability

When a reader receives a text, s/he associates it with her or his background knowledge. The impression the reader gets when s/he reads is defined as effect (Nord 1991: 130). Nord comments that

> the recipient builds up a certain expectation as to the intratextual characteristics of the text, but it is only when, through reading, he contrasts his expectation with the actual features of the text that he experiences the particular effect the text has on him" (1991: 37).

Many translation scholars such as (Wilss 1977; Thiel 1974, 1978,1980; Cartellieri 1979; Reiss 1980; Koller 1979) pay attention to the recipient (Nord 1991: 51). In fact, the focus on the receptor has been studied by Benjamin (1923: 16). The intratextual information and the reader's extralinguistic information may not coincide. Then, the reader's expectations will not be fulfilled. Then there will be effect loss. The effect of the target text on the TL reader should be equivalent to that of the source text on the SL reader. Therefore, equivalence of effect should be achieved in a pragmatic translation. Nida (1964) and Newmark (1977) discuss effect equivalence in their dynamic and communicative equivalence, respectively.

Effect loss may destroy the whole text. If a word, for example, is intended by the writer to be polysemous or ambiguous in the source text it will seldom have an equivalent in the target language. This effect loss results in what Blum-Kulka (1986) calls "a shift in coherence" (Baker 1992: 250). Baker suggests that achieving coherence in the text requires translators to "minimize discrepancies between the model of the world presented in the source text and that with which the target reader is likely to be familiar" (1992: 253). Sager (1997: 27) claims that the SL reader is guided by the writer's intention and the reader's expectation. In translation there is no writer's intention to help the TL reader. Thus, preserving intention is important in translation.

The solution of effect loss lies in the strategies of the PA. They are strategies of modification (Nord 1991: 51-52). Translators have license to cut details presupposed to be known to the reader and overstretch other parts, which are not known to the reader. The PA strategies of

modification will be discussed below. Focusing on the effect of the text on the receptor, the PA guarantees "comprehensibility in the receiving culture (Koller 1979: 186-91; Koller 1989: 99-104)" (Venuti 2000: 121). The PA has a universal prop because contrastive pragmatics elevates common universal understanding. Levinson (1996: 141); Gumperz and Levinson (1996: 227); and Ochs (1996: 425-429) believe that principles of language use have a strong universal basis, though there are local variations among languages and cultures. Equivalence in translation has been considered to be built on universals of language and culture (Venuti 2000: 121).

What matters here is the role of context. To reach equivalence in translation translators should consider the context of the target culture. The first real insights into the theory of context were the works of Malinowsky (1923, 1935) and those of Firth (1935, 1951) (Trosborg 1997: 5). The notion of context has been described by vagueness. Ochs (1979: 1) and Bar-Hillel (1970:80) admit that the scope of context is not clearly limited (Levinson 1983: 23). It includes both linguistic features and non-linguistic features. Lyons (1977: 574) lists the following factors to determine the scope of context:
-"knowledge of *role* and *status*" of participants in the utterances
-"knowledge of spatial and temporal location"
-"knowledge of *formality level*"
-"knowledge of the *medium*"
-"knowledge of appropriate *subject matter*"
- knowledge of "domain determining the *register* of a language" (Levinson 1983: 23)

In fact, there are no "universally applicable criteria" to determine "what does and does not belong to context" (Wilss 1994: 36). Cutting (2002) determines four main types of context:
- situational context
- cultural context
- interpersonal knowledge context
- co-textual knowledge context (2002: 3-14)

Green (1994, 1999) argues that context represents "proposition(s) that the speaker believes or intends" (1999: 3). Thus, mutual beliefs and reflexive intentions between the participants are contextual factors[5]. In fact, context is "a complex multi-dimensional phenomenon" (Wilss 1994: 37). Kreidler (1988: 23) argues that

> [suppose] we hear an utterance, know the language, know the meanings of the words and the sentences formed with the words. We may still not fully comprehend what is said because we don't know what the utterance is about.

Meaning is partially dependent on context. Gumperz and Levinson (1996: 225) recognize that both the semantic theory and the pragmatic theory of meaning have emphasized the role of context. The semanticists gave priority to indexicals and the pragmaticists focused on counting contextual information. Hanks (1996: 232) emphasizes that "linguistic meaning arises only in context". He explores opinions that advocated context dependency. Thus, not only can conversational meaning arise from "the fusion of language form with context", literal sense can as well (1996: 232).

Understanding pragmatic meaning requires identifying a context which makes sense of an utterance. Green (1999: 15) contends that the meaning of a lexical item in an utterance is not fixed by a linguistic system. It is entertained with the help of the context. According to Geoff Nunberg (1978), word meanings are more cultural than linguistic (Green 1999: 15). Green concludes that it is impossible to infer a "core literal meaning" (1999: 15). In other words, the idea of "null context" is not applicable. The role of context in understanding utterances recurs in the various different pragmatic phenomena. Thus, context helps to understand speech acts, implicatures and deixis (Grundy 2000: 72). Speech act context helps to determine the speaker's intentions. Implicature context helps to determine what is conveyed implicitly. Deictic context helps to determine reference (2000: 72). Context also helps to resolve ambiguity and to interpret metaphors (cf. McCabe 1998). Nida (2002) argues that "The real clues to meaning depend on contexts" (2002: 29 cited in Wang 2003: 1-2). Context "actually provides more distinctiveness of meaning than the term analyzed" (2002: 31 cited in Wang 2003: 2). Steiner (1973) confirms that "[no] grammar or dictionary is of very much use to the translator: only context, in the fullest linguistic-cultural sense, certifies meaning" (1973: 19 cited in Wang 2003: 2).

1.4 Recognition of Pragmatic Problems

Pragmatic problems appear when the SL and TL have different pragmatic principles. Different languages employ different pragmatic principles and maxims in the same communication behavior. Leech illustrates that languages have different pragmalinguistic structures and norms and transferring "the norms of one community may well lead to 'pragmatic failure'"(1983: 231). Thus, a principle of politeness in one community may be impolite in another. A cooperative principle in one community may be uncooperative in another. Fawcett (2001: 124) considers this pragmatic difference as part of the translator's competence. S/he has to identify the areas of pragmatic interference between the two

languages. S/he should recognize how the two languages observe a certain pragmatic principle. Pragmatic competence is defined as "the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context" (Thomas 1983: 94 cited in Cutting 2002: 159). Thomas (1983) argues that pragmatic failure occurs when an utterance fails to achieve the sender's goal. It results in misunderstanding and cross-cultural communication breakdown. Pragmatic problems will be evident in case of applying pragmatic principles such as speech acts, presuppositions, implicatures, relevance, deictic expressions and politeness formulas to translation.

First, preserving the force of speech acts may be problematic. Mistranslating speech acts is due to the difference between the sense and the force of utterances; in other words, locutionary and illocutionary acts (Hatim 2001: 179). Literal translation of speech acts will not produce the desired effect. Translators are invited to reproduce locutionary acts and preserve illocutionary acts to achieve the same perlocution (effect) in the target language (Blum-Kulka 1981). Furthermore, the illocutionary force of the whole text should be paid attention to and preserved in the TLT. In fact, the global organization of the text has been recently highlighted in translation. The text is viewed as a whole. Text illocutionary force is assessed in the sequence of the whole speech acts in the text. The hierarchical organization of speech acts in the whole text is called text act. Translators should render "this overall picture" of speech acts because this illocutionary structure of the whole text is part of text coherence (Hatim 2001: 180).

Second, translating implicit meaning may be problematic for translators. Implicit meaning include presuppositions and implicatures. Presuppositions depend on shared knowledge between the writer and the reader. In translation it almost happens that the writer and the TL reader does not share this sort of knowledge. El-Gamal (2001) suggests that translating presuppositions as assertions will distort meaning. Presuppositions should be preserved in the target text. Translating implicatures may also be problematic. The concept of implicature is built on deliberately flouting one or more of the cooperative maxims. Some implied meaning is inferred beyond what is said. The problem lies in the fact that the target language may employ a different maxim to produce the SL implicature. Baker (1992: 236) stresses the importance of being aware of the different cooperative principles employed in the SL and TL. An implied meaning in the original should be matched by an equivalent implied meaning in the TLT (Hatim 2001: 181). Blum-Kulka (1981) proposes that implicatures should be compensated for in the TLT. Thus, preserving what is implied

will increase the effectiveness of the TLT. If a maxim is flouted in the SLT, an equivalent or different maxim is flouted in the TLT. The most important is the equivalence of effect, which is achieved by preserving the intention of the writer and the function of the utterance, not the form of the utterance.

Translating figures of speech is also important in the PA because they are considered forms of flouting or exploiting the cooperative maxims. Translating metaphors, irony and other forms of figures of speech pose problems for translators. Larson (1984: 21) argues that

> translators who want to make a good idiomatic translation often find figures of speech especially challenging. A literal translation of *blind as a bat* might sound really strange in a language where the comparison between *a blind person* and *a bat* has never been used as a figure of speech.

Translators either relay the sense of the utterance or reproduce an equivalent figure of speech in the TLT. In fact, this problem is the predicament of translators. Translations are either faithful without being beautiful or beautiful without being faithful.

In a pragmatic translation, the effect and function of the original is retained. Transferring the message of the original is not enough. Translators have to find an equivalent figure of speech in the target linguistic community and preserve the sense of the original as possible as they can. Thus, the same figure of speech as well as the full sense of the original is retained. A pragmatic translation should keep the sense and effect of the original message. To reconcile the dilemma of faithfulness–beauty contrast Lewis (2000: 268) suggests that "a good translation should be a double interpretation, faithful both to language/message of the original and to the message-orienting cast of its own language". That solution benefits in literary texts. In other cases Newmark (1988) suggests other solutions. He argues that

> conventional metaphors and saying…should always be conventionally translated…but unusual metaphors and comparisons should be reduced to their sense if the text has a mainly informative function (Newmark 1988: 15 cited in Gutt 1991: 388).

If there is mismatch between the source language and the target language, a figure of speech should be explicated.

Metonymy, malapropism and irony are good examples in which the pragmatic approach can be used in translating them. Translating

metonymy could not be achieved with the help of the lexicon. Interpreting the meaning of a metonymic utterance is achieved through linking the lexical form with pragmatic information (Lascarides and Copestake 1998: 389). Malapropism is intended to generate fun feeling in the readers. A word may be intended to be polysemous or ambiguous in the SLT to arise a certain effect. It should be rendered with its original effect. Irony is best translated with the help of the PA because it is a relevance-based approach. Relevance, as intended by Gutt (1991), means, "achieving maximum benefit at minimum processing cost" (Hatim 2001: 182). Applying relevance to translation means creating inferential resemblance i.e., the target text should resemble the source text interpretively (Hatim 2001: 182). A translation is relevant if the TLT reader adequately interprets it as the SLT reader interprets the source text. The TLT reader associates intratextual information with background knowledge to produce various contextual effects. The more contextual effects a translation offers the more relevant it is. In other words, the less processing effort a translation involves the more relevant it is (Hatim 2001: 182).

1.5 Strategies of the Pragmatic Approach

Obviously, translators have to avoid pragmatic failure in translation. Translating the explicit meaning is not enough to produce pragmatically successful translations. Translators are required to convey the implicit meaning of the original (El-Shiyab et al 2000: 276-277). They resort to modifications, additions, deletions and other strategies (Chernov 1991: 29). These shifts are recommended to achieve "a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort" which Levy (2000: 156) calls "a minimax strategy". Baker (1992: 250) illustrates that

> anything that is likely to violate the target reader's expectations must be carefully examined and, if necessary, adjusted in order to avoid conveying the wrong implicatures or even failing to make sense altogether.

These adjustments are lumped together under the category of modification. The PA strategies of modification lie between two opposite extremes: mere preservation and adaptation. However, adaptation is a broad term which means changes made in the target text when the context referred to in the SLT does not exist in the target culture (Bastin 2001: 5-8). The aim of adaptation is to preserve the function of the original text, if not the form as well. As Bastin (2001: 8) comments, "it is often argued that a successful translation is one that looks or sounds like an original piece of work, which would seem to imply that the translator is expected to intervene