

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature in four main areas along with a summary: the theory of translation, the principle of translation criticism, the concept of translation equivalence, and translation techniques.

2.1 THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION

2.1.1 Definitions of Translation

Peter Newmark (1981) defines translation as “a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language”.

J. C. Catford (1965) defines translation as “an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another”, and also mentions, “translation may be defined as the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)”.

As quoted in *Theory and Strategies of Translation* (ดวงตา สุพล, 2541, น. 3), according to Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber’s view, translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.

C. Rabin’s study (ดวงตา สุพล, 2541) defines, “translation is a process by which a spoken or written utterance takes place in one language which is intended and presumed to convey the same meaning as a previously existing utterance in another language”(น. 3-4).

According to Brislin (1976), translation is the general term referring to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) to another (thought), whether the languages are in written or oral form; whether languages have established orthographies or do not have such standardization, or whether one or both languages is based on signs, as the sign languages of the deaf. (p. 1).

According to Larson (1984), translation consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure, which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context. (p. 3).

2.1.2 Translation Methods

Peter Newmark (1988) put the methods into two main groups which are source language (SL) emphasis and target language (TL) emphasis, depending on the purpose of the translation and the nature of the readership.

2.1.2.1 SL Emphasis Translation

The following four methods can be categorized as literal translation, maintaining the original structure and culture.

The most preserved method of the SL word order is '*word - for - word translation.*' In this, the words are translated literally by the most common meanings, out of context. Also, cultural words are translated literally. Newmark further states that the main use of word-for-word translation is either to understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as a pre-translation process, and this is often demonstrated as interlinear translation, with the TL immediately below the SL words.

'*Literal Translation*' is the method where the SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, regardless of the context of the source language. However, the syntactic and semantic structures of the original language rather still remain in a translated language. Like the word-for-word translation, this method can suit mainly the pre-translation process.

The next method in this category is '*faithful translation*' that attempts to be completely faithful to the intentions and the text-realization of the SL writer, reproduce the précis contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures, transfer cultural words and preserves the degree of grammatical and lexical abnormality in the translation.

'*Semantic translation*' compromises on meaning that conveys the beauty and the nature of the source language text. According to Newmark (1988), the distinction

between *'faithful'* and *'semantic'* translation is that the first is uncompromising and dogmatic, while the second is more flexible, admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows the translator's intuitive empathy with the original.

2.1.2.2 TL Emphasis Translation

These four methods can be grouped as non-literal translation; meaning and grammatical structure is mostly adapted to suit the target language so that it is more natural and smoother to the readership.

'Adaptation' is the freest form of translation which is mainly used for plays, especially comedies, and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved. In addition, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text written.

'Free translation' reproduces the matter without the manner of the context without the form of the original, and usually it is a paraphrase much longer than the original, a so-called *'intralingual translation,'* often wordy and pretentious, and not translation at all.

'Idiomatic translation' can be defined as *'natural'* translation. It reproduces the message of the original, but not the order of the words or sentences. In addition, the original contexts, culture, tone, or the beauty of the original might be adapted, providing colloquialism and idioms that do not exist in the original.

'Communicative translation' conveys the exact contextual meaning of the original. In addition, both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership. Like the idiom translation, it also renders the beauty of the nature of the original to the translation. The syntactic and grammatical structure is adapted as appropriate so that the reader feels as if they are reading the original source text, not the translated target message.

2.2 THE PRINCIPLE OF TRANSLATION CRITICISM

Peter Newmark (1988) states that any comprehensive criticism of a translation has to cover five procedures.

2.2.1 Text Analysis

In the analysis of the SL text, the translator should include the author's purpose, the attitude towards the topic, characterization of the readership and an indication of its category

and type. In addition, the translator should briefly state the topic or theme but not précis the text, and not discuss the author's life, other works, or general background unless they are referred to in the text.

2.2.2 The Translator's Purpose

The translator has to attempt to understand what the author really wants to communicate and has to have adequate knowledge of SL so that the message will be interpreted correctly. Without this understanding, mis-translation, over-translation or under-translation might occur. In addition, the translator's interpretation of the source text's purpose, translation method and the likely readership is discussed.

2.2.3 Comparing the Translation with the Original

The third section is the heart of the critique. How the translator has solved the particular problems of the SL text, such as cultural words, proper names, level of language and the structure, is discussed. The comparison has to be selective in terms of meaning and TL text. In addition, some examples of the original version are analyzed to compare with the translated version in terms of meaning, target language, and translation techniques that the translator used to provide the reader equivalent effect.

2.2.4 The Evaluation of the Translation

The referential and pragmatic accuracy of translation and the problems or mistakes of translation in terms of meaning and TL text is evaluated by the translator's standards. Overall, the translated version is assessed whether it can provide the target language reader the similar meaning, style and tone and whether the translator's interpretation of the source text's purpose and translation method is proper.

2.2.5 The Translation's Future

Finally, the work's potential importance within the target language culture is assessed. For example, whether it was worth translating or what kind of influence it has on the language is considered.

2.3 THE CONCEPT OF TRANSLATION EQUIVALENCE

The concept of translation equivalence has been issue in translation studies.

According to Catford (1965), the SL and TL items rarely have ‘the same meaning’ in the linguistic sense; but they can function in the same situation. In total translation, SL and TL texts or items are translation equivalents when they are interchangeable in a given situation, and translation equivalence occurs when a SL and a TL text or item are relatable to (at least some of) the same features of situation substance. (p. 49). He describes the distinction between textual equivalence and formal correspondence as follows:

- Textual Equivalence

Catford (1965) defines textual equivalence as “A textual equivalent is any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion, to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text”, and “A textual translation equivalent translation equivalent is thus: that portion of a TL text which is changed when and only when a given portion of the SL text is changed”. In addition, he also mentions that in some cases there is no TL equivalent of a given SL item, and it is useful to say in such cases that the TL equivalent is nil, reserving the term zero for use.

- Formal Correspondence

Catford (1965) defines formal correspondence as “A formal correspondence is any TL Category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the ‘same’ place in the ‘economy’ of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL”. In addition, he also states that formal correspondence between SL and TL elements of structure operates at ‘corresponding’ ranks which are sentence, clause, phrase, word, and morpheme.

In Popovic’s view (as cited in Translation Studies, Basnett, 1991), translation equivalence can be distinguished into four types:

- *Linguistic equivalence*, where there is homogeneity on the linguistic level of both SL and TL texts, i.e. word-for-word translation.

- *Paradigmatic equivalence*, where there is equivalence of ‘the elements of a paradigmatic expressive axis’, i.e. elements of grammar, which he sees as being a higher category than lexical equivalence.

- *Stylistic (transitional) equivalence*, where there is ‘functional equivalence of elements in both original and translation aiming at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning.’

- *Textual (syntagmatic) equivalence*, where there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, i.e. equivalence of form and shape (p.25).

Nida (1964) describes translation equivalence as follows:

- *Formal equivalence*, where it focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. He calls this type of translation a ‘gloss translation,’ which aims to allow the reader to understand as much of the SL context as possible.

- *Dynamic equivalence*, is based on the principle of the equivalence effect, i.e. that the readership between receiver and message should aim at being the same as that between the original receivers and the SL message.

Nida (1964) also defines the dynamic equivalence translation as follows:

- Equivalent, which points toward the source language message
- Natural, which points toward the receptor language
- Closet, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation

Roger T. Bell (1991) defines the nature of equivalence in semantic and stylistic characteristics as “translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a presentation of an equivalent text in a second language,” and states, “texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent), 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 translation, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence).” In addition, he categorizes the equivalents into two types as follows:

- *Formal equivalents* which preserve the context-free semantic sense of the text at the expense of its context-sensitive communicative value.

- *Functional equivalents* which preserve the context-sensitive communicative value of the text at the expense of its context-free semantic sense.

2.4 TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

2.4.1 Transliteration

Sanchawee Saibua (สัญญาวี สายบัว 2540), defines transliteration as a means to transmit, as nearly as possible, the ‘phones’ of the original language to the letters of the translated.

To convey the absolute meaning of the source text to the target text, transliteration is required. In addition, the transliteration can be more effective as the source text contains ‘specific names’ such as names of people, places, rivers, mountains or institutions, including ‘cultural words’ not able to be translated into the target language semantically in the form of equivalent words. Instead of using the transliteration, the translator might choose to provide some description of those cultural words.

The transliteration principles for translator are suggested as follows:

2.4.1.1 The translator studies how to pronounce the words from the source text and which phones in the words are pronounced, then replace the phones of the source text by the letters and vowels of the target language respectively.

2.4.1.2 Every language has similar phones, and the translator could easily replace the source text by the target one; for example, ‘พ’ is replaced by ‘P’ in ‘Paul’. However, there are some words of the source text which cannot be compared with the translated letters, the closet letters are used. For example, ‘ธ’ is replaced with ‘Th’ in ‘Thomas’.

2.4.1.3 For some phones which do not exist or cannot be replaced in the target language – stressed or unstressed sounds in English or tone in Thai, the phones should be omitted.

Tables of the transliteration of phones from English language to Thai letters and vowels are recommended by Sanchawee Saibua (สัญญาวี สายบัว, 2540, น. 60-62)

Table 1. Transliteration of Phones to Thai Alphabets

Phones	Equivalent Thai Letters	Examples
[p ^h]	พ- / -พ	Pam / แพม Chip / ชิป
[p]	ป- / -ป	Spock / สปก Whippy / วิปปี้
[b]	บ-	Bjon Borg / บจอน บอร์ก
[t ^h]	ท- / -ท	Tyrone / ไทโรน Pat / แพท
[t]	ต- / -ต	Starrs / สตาร์ส Pittsburgh / พิตสเบิร์ก
[d]	ด-	Diana / ไดอานา
[k]	ก- / -ก	Kim / คิม Chuck / ชัค
[g]	ก- / -ก	Skip / สกิป Gail / เกล Granada / แกรนาดา Borg / บอร์ก
[tʃ]	ช-	Charles / ชาลส์
[dʒ]	จ- / -จ	Jimmy / จิมมี่ George / จอร์จ
[ʃ]	ฉ-ช-	Shane / เฉน, เซน

(table continues)

Table 1. (continued)

Phones	Equivalent Thai Effects	Examples
[f]	ฟ- / -ฟ	Farrow / ฟาร์โรว์ Hefner / เฮฟเนอร์
[v] [w]	ว- / -ว	Vivian / วิเวียน Wally / วอลลี
[θ]	-ฟ ท- / -ท	Eve / อีฟ Thomas / โทมัส Smith / สมิธ Cathy / แคธี
[ç] [h]	ฮ-	Huge / ฮิวจ์ Holly / ฮอลลี
[s]	ส- / -ส	Stawback / สตอว์แบค Texas / เท็กซัส
[z]	ซ- / -ซ	Zaire / แซร์ New Zealand / นิวซีแลนด์
[ʃ]	-ช	Rose / โรส, โรเซ Rose / โรเซ
[ʒ]	ร-	Rhine / ไرن
[l]	ล- / -ล	La sale / ลาซาลล์
[j]	ย- / -ย	Europe / ยูโรป Union / ยูเนียน

(table continues)

Table 1. (continued)

Phones	Equivalent Thai Letters	Examples
[w]	See [v]	
[h]	See [ç]	
[m]	ม- / -ม	Millers / มิลเลอร์ส Guam / กวม
[n]	น- / -น	Natiya / นาทียา Marion / แมเรียน
[ŋ]	-ง	Bronco / บรองโก

Note: From หลักการแปล (พิมพ์ครั้งที่ 6, น. 60-62), โดย สัญญวี สายบัว, 2540. กรุงเทพฯ: สำนักพิมพ์

มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

Table 2. Transliteration of Sounds to Thai Vowels

Sounds	Equivalent Thai Letters	Examples
[i]	อิ	Ricky / ริคกี
[ij]	อี	Beatrice / บีทริส
[ɜ]	เอ๊ะ	Ben / เบ็น
[ej]	เอย์	Kays / เคย์ส
[æ]	แอ	Stanford / แสตนฟอร์ด Max / แมกซ์
[a]	อะ, อา, อี้..., ออ	Watt / วัตต์ Utah / ยูทาห์ Bob / บ็อบ
[ʌ]	อะ, อี้...	Hudson / ฮัดสัน

(table continues)

Table 2. (continued)

Sounds	Equivalents Thai Letters	Examples
[ə] [ʌ]	เออะ เออ	Temple / เทมเปิล
[uw] [u]	อุ อุ	Mother Goose / มาเธอร์กูส
[ow]	โอ	Oklahoma / โอลาโฮมา Holy / โฮลี่
[ɔ]	ออ	Paul / พอลล์
[aj]	ไอ	Shriver / ไชรวอร์
[aw]	เอา	Southern / เซาเทิร์น Illinois / อิลลินอยส์
[ɔj]	ออย	Rolls Royce / โรลส์รอยส์

Note: From หลักการแปล (พิมพ์ครั้งที่ 6, น. 60-62), โดย สัจฉวี สายบัว, 2540. กรุงเทพฯ: สำนักพิมพ์

มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

2.4.2 Translation Adjustment

According to Sanchawee Saibua (สัจฉวี สายบัว, 2540), translation adjustment has to be done when transmitting meaning from one language to another language including both literal translation and free translation so that the TL text can convey the absolute meaning as much as possible and provide the readership of the translated language equivalent effect the same as the audience of the source language feels.

Sanchawee Saibua (สัจฉวี สายบัว, 2540) further states that translation adjustment is not the attempt to change the original source language or adapt it relying on the translator's satisfaction. The purpose of the translation adjustment can be done as follows:

2.4.2.1 The translation can be done when the TL text is required to be more understandable. For example, technical terms in the SL text can be readily adjustable for common readers of the target language. In addition, the translator may consider adjusting the grammatical structure and the orders of words or sentences so that the translated version can be more natural, smoother, and especially understandable.

2.4.2.2 The translation adjustment can be done when the translator aims to provide the equivalent meaning as the same meaning of the source language text. Thus, the translator finds if the style of the SL text is preserved, but the meaning cannot be completely transmitted, the translator should maintain the meaning by suitable adjustment such as footnote, word or sentence order, and grammatical structure.

Consequently, the review of literature is a critical device that the researcher needs to analyze the translation of *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness*. The next chapter shows the methodology of the study, and the results of the translation analysis are presented in chapter four which covers the overall literature review and mainly is conducted within the principle of translation criticism by Newmark.