



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

Theoretical foundations and practical applications of translation studies

Ijaz Hussain

Assistant Professor at University of Kohat-ijazhussain@gmail.com

Abstract

This review aims to present a comprehensive summary of each chapter in the book, together with my analysis of the authors' writing and any modifications I made based on the particular perspective of Bible translation. It is imperative for Bible scholars to remain current on the most recent concepts and methodologies in Translation Studies, as the field is progressively becoming more interdisciplinary. This phenomenon can be elucidated by taking into account the numerous perspectives that have been expressed, surpassing the multitude of English and multilingual Bible translations that are presently available. These perspectives also encompass, to varying extents, diverse hermeneutical interpretations of the Bible.

Introduction

Professor Jeremy Munday is a well-regarded scholar who focuses his research and teaching in the areas of Spanish studies and translation respectively. He is currently employed as a professor at the highly regarded University of Leeds, which is situated in the country of the United Kingdom. In addition, he has experience working as a freelance translator and has written a number of well-known articles within the field of translation studies. The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies, which he edited and released in 2009, *Style and Ideology in Translation*, which was published in 2008, and *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*, which he co-authored with Basil Hatim and published in 2004 are among his most notable publications. The text provided by the user is just too brief to be reprinted in an academic style.

What Translation Studies Are About

In his research on the concept of translation, Munday provides a definition for the translation process. According to Munday, the translator makes adjustments to the original material in the original language (referred to as the "source language" or "SL") in order to make it more understandable to the target audience. Target language (TL) refers to the spoken language that will be used to produce the written content as a result of the adaptation (Munday 1.1). We'll call this piece of writing "target text" (TT). While the decision was reached "to prioritise written translation over oral translation



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

(the latter of which is commonly known as interpreting...)," there are still five other factors that must be considered. It's impolite to speak so flippantly about the importance of good communication skills. Bible translators, along with anthropologists and folklorists, aren't the only academics who face the issue of committing oral traditions to writing as part of their coursework. That's why this phenomenon occurs. As a result, the severe phonological degradation that occurs in these contexts should be emphasised in any educational material on translation. It is also common practise to recite passages from the Bible aloud in public, especially at religious gatherings like church sessions. The most popular Bible translation, the King James Version, is particularly affected by this. Therefore, it is crucial to remember the medium of communication that will be employed when developing content. Many academic works in the subject of secular modern translation studies fail to properly handle the vital oral-aural dimension. Due to the importance of this factor, this is a significant issue. Munday begins his research by providing a brief overview of the field's origins and evolution (1.3). After that, he lists a number of institutions, publications, journals, and worldwide organisations that are advancing the field of translation studies and offering renowned translation and interpreting courses. The author claims that this field of study was primarily established as such in the second part of the twentieth century. In the first century B.C.E., authors Cicero, Horace, and St. Jerome laid the groundwork for what would become this academic discipline through their writings. Their writings serve as the foundation for this field of study. One of the most influential works in the field of translation studies was published in 1988 by James Holmes under the title "A Comprehensive Overview of the Field of Translation Studies in a Broad Manner" (Holmes, 9). The field of translation studies has benefited greatly from the insights presented in this paper. Three main categories may be identified in Holmes' "map of translation studies," and these are the theoretical, descriptive (as expressed by Descriptive Translation Studies, DTS), and applied (which encompasses translation assistance, translator training, and translation criticism) fields (Holmes, 9–10). There isn't enough room to republish the user's text in a scholarly format as it is. The author then examines the major shifts in translation studies since the 1970s (1.5), paying special attention to the interdisciplinary nature of modern research and the need for proper academic writing (14). Nonetheless, it seems like he shares the earlier



assumption, even though I see things otherwise. This quote gives the false impression that those who advocate "prescriptive" or "pedagogical" techniques either don't know what they're talking about when it comes to translation or don't look into other possibilities. It could also imply that they aren't giving enough thought to other approaches. It is up to the researcher to decide how much weight to give to "the choice of theory and methodology" in accordance with the prescriptive approach. The author provides an overview of the book's goals and organisational structure in the final section of the first chapter (1.6), which also acts as the introduction. The final part of each chapter, as was previously said, is a summary of "discussion and research points." To date, I have not found a translation textbook that includes high-quality translation exercises in workbook form. At the conclusion of each chapter, I will use one of these instances to clarify the subject. It may be challenging to narrow down an issue to a single illustrative case. The translators, trainers, and consultants who contribute to the Bible translation process can't stress the importance of this strategy enough.

The Equals And Equivalent Effect

Experts in Bible translation should have little trouble determining from this chapter's tone and subject matter that the primary focus is on Eugene A. Nida's process. Munday's early reading included Roman Jakobson's paper "the nature of linguistic meaning and equivalence" (3.1). Intralingual translation, interlingual translation, and intersemiotic translation (sometimes known as "rewording," "translation proper," and "transmutation," respectively) are the three main types of translation that Jakobson identifies (5). This organising principle was proposed by Jakobson. Accordingly, "for the message to be 'equivalent' in the ST [source text] and TT [target text], the code-units will be different. This is because English and Spanish divide up the world in different ways. For translation to work, there must be some kind of "equivalence in difference." (37). Munday spends a lot of time talking about "Nida and 'the science of translating,'" making this chapter one of the longest in the book. (3.2). This includes concepts like "the influence of Chomsky" (3.2.2; deep/surface structure, kernel sentence analysis, functional word classes—events, objects, abstracts, relationals), "formal and dynamic equivalency and the principle of equivalent effect," and "response" (3.2.3) from "the nature of meaning: advances in semantics and pragmatics" (3.2.1; referential and emotional meaning, hierarchical structuring, componential analysis,



semantic structure analysis). Unfortunately, it seems that neither Munday nor a large number of other secular theorists have taken into account the works of "later" Nida¹² or any other authors who attempted to elaborate on Nida's beliefs or adopted a different theoretical approach from his. The same holds true for any other authors who have discussed Nida's legacy. The concept of "dynamic" equivalence is confused with "functional" equivalence, as is the case in *Thirteen Munday*. While Nida agrees that the two concepts aren't "fundamentally different," he does say that the latter is far more nuanced.¹⁵ Due to this, Munday's "examination of the significance of Nida's work" (3.2.4) and the opinions of other critics are a bit dated, but his conclusion is correct: "Nida made significant contributions to the development of a methodical analytical process for translators working with various types of text, and he included the recipients of the TT and their cultural expectations in the translation equation" (44, cf. 52). After wrapping up his analysis of Nida, Munday moves on to P. Newmark's "semantic and communicative translation" (3.3) distinction. When arguing that "Newmark departs from Nida's receptor-oriented line," Munday refers to Nida's core definition (44), which follows his argument. To be effective, a translation must maintain as much of the meaning of the source text as is practically possible. Despite differences in syntactic and semantic structures between the source and target languages, the purpose of semantic translation is to accurately convey the original meaning of a text into another language.¹⁶

Looking into the translation process and product

In this chapter, Munday reviews a number of well-known "linguistic approaches" that try to classify the process of translation by making use of exhaustive lists or taxonomies (Munday, 56). In the beginning, the author gives a detailed explanation of "Vinay and Darbelnet's model" in section 4.1. As a consequence of this, two basic strategies have been devised for the translation of this sentence. These strategies are referred to as the "direct" (literal) approach and the "oblique" (free) approach, respectively. Both a roundabout and a straight route can be used when going about the process of translation; these are called the oblique and direct approaches, respectively. According to the source (56-58), there is a set of seven operations that is engaged in both of these different techniques. For the oblique approach, these operations are known as transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation. For the direct



approach, these procedures are known as borrowing, calque, and literal depiction. V&D propose a fundamental five-step process for transitioning from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT), which incorporates both required and optional alterations (V&D, 59). This methodology can be found below. The methodology includes the following steps: a) the identification of translation units; b) an exhaustive analysis of the text written in the source language; and c) the reconstruction of the "metalinguistic context of the message" on a conceptual level. e) The work that needs to be done right now includes working on the target text (TT), conducting research on it, and improving it. d) Conducting an analysis of the effect that the aforementioned activities have on one's sense of style is an absolute necessity. Following this in-depth introduction is a case study (pages 65-68) that serves as an illustration of the comparative stylistic methodology utilised by V&D. Any basic curriculum for Bible translation instruction might benefit from the addition of their numerous approaches and guiding principles, along with illustrative examples. This would allow for a smooth integration of the content. In the context of translation, the term "shift" was first presented by John C. Catford in his landmark work, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (4.2), where it was described as a first introduction. Catford (1961) was the one who first presented the idea of "level shifts," which refer to transitions between various language levels such as grammar and lexis. In addition to that, he talked about "category shifts," which are transitions between categories such as "structural" and "grammatical," or the change from one component of speech into another. Catford also defined "unit" and "rank" changes, which can take place at a variety of language levels, including morpheme, word, phrase, clause, and sentence levels. Last but not least, he talked about "intra-system shifts," which involve changes that take place within a system, such as the change from singular to plural forms. Catford noted that the concept of translation equivalency is dependent upon factors of communication such as function, importance, context, and culture (Catford, 61), despite the fact that his primary focus was on language. Shortly after Catford's work was published, members of the prominent "Prague School" of linguists and literary theorists came up with the idea of "translation shifts." This idea was elaborated upon in their writings, namely in the context of "literary translation" (4.3). As an example, Jir Lev endeavoured to achieve a "comparable aesthetic outcome" in each and every one of his literary works by giving



careful consideration to a number of different aspects. These aspects included denotative significance, connotation, stylistic organisation, grammar, sound repetition (such as rhythm), vowel duration, and articulation. Jir Lev's works are examples of this type of endeavour. I apologise, but I am unable to be of any assistance because you have not provided any text or context. Give it to me in writing. Frantisek Miko's work was motivated by the need to preserve not only the expressive quality of the ST but also its operativity, iconicity, subjectivity, affectation, prominence, and contrast (Miko, 2019, p. 62). The cardinal number "thirty" is the number that comes after the number "twenty-nine" and before the number "forty." After conducting an exhaustive investigation of the results of translation, Munday swiftly moves on to discuss the mental process of translation (Munday, 63). In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to investigate the cognitive processes that are utilised by translators themselves (Munday, 64). A possible approach is Lederer's "interpretive model," which he describes as a "three-stage process" that includes the "re-expression" of the text in the target language, the "reading and comprehension" of the source text, and a cognitive "deverbalization" (Lederer, 63). Lederer's "interpretive model" is one prospective methodology. It appears that you have not supplied any text for me to modify, and I apologise for the inconvenience this causes. Despite Munday's best efforts to downplay their relevance, the similarities between the aforementioned method and Nida's three-step "analysis—transfer—restructuring" process³² are not entirely coincidental. In fact, the similarities are not even somewhat coincidental. On the other hand, Bell's method, which is referred to as "semantic structure analysis," makes use of functional and pragmatic language categories. These categories include clause structure, propositional content, theme structure, register traits, illocutionary force, and speech act. This strategy provides a more direct means for addressing the "deverbalization" process (Bell 64), which can be advantageous in some circumstances.³⁴ is indicated as being the figure in question here. Following that, Munday offers a condensed analysis of "relevance theory," which bases communication on a causal and consequential framework of inference and interpretation (63), by utilising translation as an example to illustrate his points. The translator is tasked with determining whether or not it is possible to convey the information that was intended, selecting either a descriptive or interpretive translation approach, determining the level of resemblance to the source



text (ST), and utilising various communicative clues in the ST to arrive at appropriate conclusions (for further details, see page). Regrettably, Munday's analysis does not conduct a comprehensive investigation into the significance of these unclear instructions or their possible translation into common English. The topic of conversation at this point is the number 33. In the final part of his exhaustive analysis of translation products and processes, Munday delves into a variety of empirical research approaches. The collection of observational data that can contribute to an understanding of the decision-making processes involved in translation is the major goal of these approaches. "Think-aloud protocols" and computer software that tracks a translator's eye fixation and keystrokes while they work are two of the methods that were utilised in this study (65). The succeeding "topic of discussion" (69) will come up for discussion when the Bible is being translated. This "topic of discussion" has been adjusted (inside square brackets) so that it aligns with the primary "case study" of the chapter.

Conclusion

Three things that stood out to me in Munday's brief summary were his timely warning, his insightful analysis of a concrete example, and his final words of encouragement. To see an example of this, check out page 84 of Logos 4 Bible Software, BART by SIL International, Paratext by the United Bible Societies, or Adapt-It by Word for the World. The English Department at Göteborg University published a book in 2005 titled "New Tendencies in Translation Studies," edited by Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad. Some observations and viewpoints are offered on page 19 of this article. Andrew Chesterman investigates the meaning of consilience in his piece "Towards Consilience?" Chesterman's concerns appear to be made even more complicated from a modern viewpoint, which can be summed up as follows: "There is no straightforward resolution to any of these difficulties." Because of the widespread use of many languages in today's world, the metaphor of translation has taken on new depths and dimensions. Our goal is to rethink the translation discourse in light of recently coined terms and concepts. Interdisciplinary research that crosses traditional academic boundaries is necessary to achieve this goal. The specific definition and delineation of translation, as well as its bounds, carry relatively less weight inside an epistemological framework, which may explain this phenomena. Arduini and Nergaard, in their seminal work titled



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

"A New Paradigm," claim that translational processes are crucial to the emergence of new cultural phenomena, the maintenance of existing ones, and the promotion of social and economic values. This is supported by their findings in sections 8, 9, and 13. Is the very idea of translation at risk from this so-called "new paradigm" that seems to be taking shape? This bibliography entry is for a review article written by Jeremy Munday and published in the year 2012 in the 25th volume of the magazine *Original Texts and Editions*. Pages 424–454 of the article are covered, but here we'll zero in on page 449. Theorists of Bible translation should keep up with the newest developments in translation studies to avoid the possibility of a problematic or redundant "consilience" within their own field of study. Insights from the Bible translation industry could contribute significantly to the study of translation. Consideration of oral-aural aspects of texts during the translation preparation phase; (c) utilising the increasingly sophisticated electronic text processing tools that are currently emerging; and (d) broadening the scope of the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies are all examples of ways in which the field could be improved. In the final illustration, we examine King Alfred's translation of Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae* in great detail.

References

"Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Pages 276-289 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Dissemination." Pages 314-315 in *Nation and Narration*. Edited by Homi K. Bhabha. London/New York: Routledge, 1990. (Pp. 314-315 reprinted in *Translation [Inaugural Issue]* [2011]: 24-25).

Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965/2000.

Chaume, Frederick. "Film Studies and Translation Studies." *Meta* 49/1 (2004): 12-24.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. ———. "Towards Consilience?" Pages 19-28 in *New Tendencies in Translation Studies*. Edited by Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad. Göteborg: Göteborg



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

University, Department of English, 2005. Chesterman, Andrew and Rosemary Arrojo. "Forum: Shared Ground in Translation Studies." *Target* 12/1 (2000): 151-160.

Crisp, Simon and Brian Harmelink. "Computers as Translators: Translation or Treason?" *The Bible Translator* 62/2 (2011): 59-60. Derrida, Jacques. "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" Pages 423-447 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004. Discenza, Nicole G. *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." Pages 199-204 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. Godard, Barbara. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation." Pages 87-96 in *Translation, History, and Culture*. Edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Gutt, Ernst-August. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1991/2000. ———. *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation*. Dallas/New York: SIL and UBS, 1992. Halperin, David. *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman, 1990. ———. *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge, 1997. Hermans, Theo. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1985. 452 Wendland, "Review article: Jeremy Munday," *OTE* 25/2 (2012): 421-454



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

Hodgson, Robert and Paul A. Soukup, eds. *From One Medium to Another: Basic Issues for Communicating the Scriptures in New Media*. New York: American Bible Society, 1997.

Holmes, James. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." Pages 180-192 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Holz-Mänttari, Justa. *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie and Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1984. House, Julianne. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1997/2011.

Koller, Werner. *Einführung in die Uebersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg/Wiesbaden: Quelle and Meyer, 1979.

Lederer, Marianne. *Translation: The Interpretive Model*. Translated by N. Larché. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1994/2003.

Levy, Jirí. "Translation as a Decision Process." (1967). Pages 148-159 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 1st ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2000.

Maxey, James and Ernst R. Wendland, eds. *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, forthcoming. Miko, Frantisek. "La théorie de l'expression et la traduction." Pages 61-77 in *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Edited by James S. Holmes. The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1970.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2008. ———. *Style and Ideology in Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, 2008. ———, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 2009.



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

Munday, Jeremy and Basil Hatim. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon, 1981.

Nida, Eugene A. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions*. New York: Harper, 1954.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Nord, Christiane. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis*. *Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur*, vol. 94. Translated by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. ———. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Noss, Philip, ed. *A History of Bible Translation*. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007. Pound, Ezra. *The Translations of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber & Faber, 1953. Pym, Anthony. "Venuti's Visibility." *Target* 8/1 (1996): 165-177.

Wendland, "Review article: Jeremy Munday," *OTE* 25/2 (2012): 421-454 453 ———. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London/New York: Routledge, 2010.

Rafael, Vicente L. "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire." *Translation (Inaugural Issue)* (2011): 51-52.



(Online) ISSN 2709-7633 (Print) | ISSN 2709-7641

Publishers: Nobel Institute for New Generation

<http://shnakhat.com/index.php/shnakhat/index>

Reiss, Katharina. "Text-types, Translation-types, and Translation Assessment." Translated by Andrew Chesterman. Pages 105-115 in *Readings in Translation Theory*. Edited by Andrew Chesterman. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 1977/1989.

Reyburn, William D. "Certain Cameroon Translations: Analysis and Plans." *The Bible Translator* 9/4 (1958): 171-182.

Sager, Juan C. and Marie-Josée Hamel. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

Sangrey, Mike. "When Summarizing Is Too Hard." No Pages. Cited 7 March 2012. Online: <http://betterbibles.com/2012/03/07>.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. "Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer: A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany." Pages 79-86 in *Translation, History, and Culture*. Edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London/Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975 (3rd ed., 1998). Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies—And Beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge, 1995/2008. Vermeer, Hans. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." Pages 227-238 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Edited and translated by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. Translation of *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier, 1958 (2nd ed. 1977). de Waard, Jan and Eugene A. Nida. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible*