Chapter 1: Main issues of translation studies:

1. **Jacobson’s** categories of translation:
   a. **Intralingual**;
   b. **Interlingual**;
   c. **Intersemiotic** (verbal → non-verbal).

2. History of the discipline:
   a. From the late 18th to the 1960s – grammar-translation method (replaced by communicative approach in the 1960s and 1970s);
   b. The USA 1960s – translation workshop concept based on Richards’s reading workshops and practical criticism approach that began in 1920s; running parallel to this approach was that of comparative literature;
   c. The USA 1930s-1960s/70s – contrastive analysis;
   d. More systematic, and mostly linguistic-oriented, approach 1950s-1960s:
      i. **J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet** (French/English);
      ii. **A. Malblanc** (French/German);
      iii. **G. Mounin** (linguistic issues of translation);
      iv. **E. Nida** (based on Chomsky’s generative grammar);
      v. **James S. Holmes**’s “The name and nature of translation studies” is considered to be the ‘founding statement’ of a new discipline.
      vi. **Hermans**’s ‘Manipulation School’
      vii. **Vieira**’s Brazilian cannibalist school
      viii. Postcolonial theory
      ix. **Venuti**’s cultural-studies-oriented analysis

The Holmes/Toury ‘map’ of translation studies:
Translation studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>“Pure”</th>
<th>Theoretical (translation theory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>General (1) Medium restricted</td>
<td>(a) By machine: Alone/With human aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) By humans: Written/Spoken; consecutive/simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Area restricted (specific languages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Rank restricted (word/sentence/text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Text-type restricted (genres: literary, business, technical translations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Time restricted (periods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Problem restricted (specific problems e.g. equivalence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Descriptive (DTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Product oriented (examines existing translations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Process oriented (what happens in the mind of a translator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Function oriented (a study of context / socio-translation studies / cultural-studies-oriented translation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>“Applied”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Translator training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Translation aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) translation software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) on-line databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) use of internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Translation criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Holmes mentions also translation policy (the translation scholar advising on the place of translation in society).
Chapter 2: Translation theory before the 20th century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Translation Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up until the second half of the 20th century</td>
<td>'sterile' debate over the 'triad' of 'literal', 'free' and 'faithful' translation</td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st cent. BC</td>
<td>Cicero¹</td>
<td>'Interpreter'</td>
<td>!² 'Orator'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>St Jerome</td>
<td>'Word-for-word'</td>
<td>! 'Sense-for-sense'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1250</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000 years after St Jerome</td>
<td>Western society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heretical (Etienne Dolet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French humanist, who was burnt in 1546</td>
<td>Etienne Dolet</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>Martin Luther</td>
<td>!everyday speech style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 17th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 17th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Cowley</td>
<td></td>
<td>!Imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th century England</td>
<td>John Dryden</td>
<td>Metaphrase</td>
<td>!Paraphrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century England</td>
<td>A.F. Tytler</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Adopt the very soul of the author' (spirit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Schleiermacher</td>
<td>!The reader toward the writer (alienating; foreignization – Venuti)</td>
<td>The writer toward the reader (naturalizing; domestication - Venuti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th-early 20th cent. Britain</td>
<td>F. Newman</td>
<td>! for a wide audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Arnold</td>
<td>! for elite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the centuries debate on form vs. content occurred.

Traduttore, traditore = ‘the translator is a traitor’

¹ +Horace
² Preferred form.
Chapter 3: Equivalence and equivalent effect:
In the 1950s and 1960s the place of circular debates around literal and free translation took the new debate revolved around certain key linguistic issues, among them those of meaning and equivalence, discussed by R. Jakobson in 1959. Over the following 20 years many further attempts were made to define the nature of equivalence.

Jakobson:
1. Meaning: the signifier—the signal of the signified (the concept).
2. There is no full equivalence between code-units of different languages.
3. So, we should substitute not words, but messages.
4. Only poetry is considered ‘untranslatable’ and requires ‘creative transposition’.

Nida’s ‘science of translating (subjective):
1. Meaning:
   a. Linguistic;
   b. Referential (dictionary meaning);
   c. Emotive (connotative).
2. Ways of determining meaning:
   a. Hierarchical structuring (animal → dog, cow etc);
   b. Componential analysis (grandmother, mother, cousin etc);
   c. Semantic structure analysis (spirit can mean demon, angel, god, ghost, ethos, alcohol etc) → meaning depending on context.
3. 3-stage system of translation (Chomsky’s influence: deep/surface structure of a language): SL¹ → (analysis) → X → (transfer) → Y → (restructuring) → TL²
4. Equivalence:
   a. Formal (form and content);
   b. Dynamic (equivalent response of: t2 reader on t2 as t1 reader on t1) (closest natural equivalent).
5. ‘Correspondence in meaning must have priority over correspondence in style’.
6. Reader-based orientation.

Newmark’s semantic and communicative translation:
1. Replaces Nida’s division with semantic (resembles formal equivalence) and communicative (resembles dynamic equivalence) translation.
2. Nida’s division inoperant if the text is out of TL space and time.
3. Dynamic equivalence: are readers ‘to be handed everything on a plate’?
4. Semantic translation differs from literal in that it ‘respects context’, interprets and explains (metaphors). Literal translation is to be the best approach in both semantic and communicative translation. If semantic translation would result in an ‘abnormal’ TT or would not secure equivalent effect in the TL, then communicative translation should win out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Semantic translation (art)</th>
<th>Communicative translation (craft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmitter/address focus</td>
<td>Transmitter as an individual; should help TT reader with connotations if they’re crucial.</td>
<td>Subjective, TT reader focused, oriented towards a specific lg and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and origin</td>
<td>Not fixed, new translation for every generation.</td>
<td>Rooted in its own contemporary context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to ST</td>
<td>Inferior: ‘loss’ of meaning.</td>
<td>May be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of TL</td>
<td>Tendency to overtranslate.</td>
<td>Tendency to undertranslate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>Serious literature, autobiography, important (e.g. political) statement.</td>
<td>Non-literary, technical, informative, publicity, popular fiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion for evaluation</td>
<td>Accuracy of reproduction of the significance of ST</td>
<td>Accuracy of communication of ST message in TT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koller’s Korrespondenz and Äquivalenz:

¹ Source language.
² Target language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Contrastive linguistics</th>
<th>Science of translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research area</td>
<td>Correspondence phenomena (corresponding structures and sentences of different lgs)</td>
<td>Equivalence phenomena (hierarchy of utterances and texts in different lgs according to equivalence criterion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Langue</td>
<td>parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>L2 competence</td>
<td>Translation competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of equivalence</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How attainable</th>
<th>Research focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denotative</td>
<td>Equivalence of the extralinguistic content of a text</td>
<td>Analysis of correspondences and their interaction with textual factors</td>
<td>Lexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotative</td>
<td>Lexical choices e.g. between near-synonyms</td>
<td>The most difficult</td>
<td>Formality (poetic, slang), social usage, geographical origin, stylistic effect (archaic, plain), frequency, range (general, technical), evaluation, emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-normative</td>
<td>Text types</td>
<td>Functional text analysis</td>
<td>Usage in different communicative situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Nida’s dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>First of all: particular readership</td>
<td>Communicative conditions for different receiver groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Related to the form and aesthetics of the text</td>
<td>An analogy of form un TL, using the possibilities of it and creating new ones</td>
<td>Rhyme, metaphor and other stylistic form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tertium comparationis, an invariant against which 2 text segments can be measured to determine variation.
Chapter 4: The translation shift approach:

1. **Vinay and Darbelnet**’s taxonomy:
   a. Direct (=literal) translation:
      1. borrowing
      2. calque
      3. literal translation (word-for-word)
   b. Oblique translation:
      4. transposition
      5. modulation
      6. equivalence
      7. adaptation
   c. The 7 categories operate on 3 levels:
      1. the lexicon
      2. syntactic structures
      3. the message (context)
      4. word order and thematic structure
      5. connectors [cohesive links, discourse markers, deixis (pronouns and demonstrative pronouns) and punctuation]
   d. 2 possibilities:
      1. servitude (obligatory 4 and 5)
      2. option (non-obligatory)

2. **Catford**’s linguistic approach (shifts)
   a. Distinction between: formal correspondence (a particular ST-TT pair) and textual equivalence (a pair of lgs).
   b. When the 2 concepts diverge, a translation shift occurs – a departure from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL. There are 2 kinds of shift:
      1. A level shift (sth is expressed by grammar in one lg and by lexis in another)
      2. A category shift:
         i. Structural shifts;
         ii. Class shifts (word category);
         iii. Unit/rank shifts (sentence, clause, group, word, morpheme);
         iv. Intra-system shifts (systems are similar, but not always corresponding).

3. **van Leuven-Zwart**’s microlevel/macrolevel translation shifts:
   a. The comparative model (a detailed comparison of ST and TT and classification of all the microstructural shifts within sentences, clauses and phrases);
   b. The descriptive model (a macrostructural model, designed for the analysis of translated literature).
Chapter 5: Functional theories of translation:

K. Reiss’s text types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Informative (e.g. reference work)</th>
<th>Expressive (e.g. poem)</th>
<th>Operative (e.g. advertisement)</th>
<th>Audiomedial (e.g. film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lg function</td>
<td>Represent objects and facts</td>
<td>Express sender’s attitude</td>
<td>Make an appeal to text receiver</td>
<td>supplementary’ method (supplementing written words with visual images and music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg dimension</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Dialogic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text focus</td>
<td>Content-focused</td>
<td>Form-focused</td>
<td>Appellative-focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT should</td>
<td>Transmit referential content</td>
<td>Transmit aesthetic form</td>
<td>Elicit desired response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation method</td>
<td>‘plain prose’</td>
<td>identifying (perspective of ST author)</td>
<td>method of ST</td>
<td>‘adaptive’ equivalent effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nord adds to 3 types of language function a fourth ‘phatic’ function, covering lg that establishes or maintains contact between parties involved in the communication (e.g. greetings).

Holz-Manttari’s translational action model for non-literary translations with
1. its roles and players:
   a. The initiator;
   b. The commissioner (contacts the translator);
   c. The ST producer;
   d. The TT producer;
   e. The TT user;
   f. The TT receiver.
2. Content:
   a. Factual information;
   b. Overall communicative strategy.
3. Form:
   a. Terminology;
   b. Cohesive elements.

J. Vermeer’s skopos theory: knowing the purpose and the function of translation is crucial (adequacy over equivalence).

Ch. Nord’s translation-oriented text analysis:
1. 2 kinds of translation:
   a. Documentary translation (a reader knows that he’s reading a translation);
   b. Instrumental translation (a reader doesn’t know that).
2. 3 aspects of functionalist approaches particularly useful in translator training:
   a. The importance of the translation commission;
   b. The role of ST analysis;
   c. The functional hierarchy of translation problems.
Chapter 6: Discourse and register approaches:

Halliday’s model of language and discourse based on systemic functional grammar (Lg=communication):

**Influence:**

- **Sociocultural environment**
  - **Genre**
  - **Register** (field\(^1\), tenor\(^2\), mode\(^3\))
    - Discourse semantics (ideational, interpersonal, textual)
  - **Lexicogrammar** (transitivity, modality, theme-rheme/cohesion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitivity</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Thematic and information structures/cohesion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

House’s model of translation quality assessment:

1. Scheme for analyzing and comparing original and translation texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/text</th>
<th>Field (subject matter and social action)</th>
<th>Tenor (participant relationship: -author’s provenance and stance -social role relationship -social attitude)</th>
<th>Mode (-medium [simple/complex] -participation [simple/complex])</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Genre (generic purpose)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Translation:
   a. Overt;
   b. Covert.

Baker’s text and pragmatic level analysis:

1. Textual function
2. Cohesion
3. Pragmatics:
   a. Coherence (depends on receiver’s expectations and experience of the world);
   b. Presupposition (what the speaker supposes a listener should know);
   c. Implicature (what the speaker implies).

Hatim and Mason’s semiotic level of context and discourse:

Text elements:
1. Stable (translated fairly literally);
2. Dynamic (not).

Chapter 7: Systems theories:

---

\(^1\) What is being written about.
\(^2\) Who is communicating and to whom.
\(^3\) The form of communication e.g. written.
Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory: a literary work as apart of a literary system in the social, cultural, literary and historical framework. It’s important [for choosing the translation strategy] if translated literature has a primary or secondary position in given literature.

Toury and descriptive translation studies (DTS):
1. Situate the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability;
2. Compare the ST and the TT for shifts, identifying relationships between ‘coupled pairs’ of ST and TT segments, and attempting generalizations about the underlying concept of translation;
3. Draw implications for decision-making in future translating.

Norms of translation behaviour can be reconstructed from:
1. The examinations of texts;
2. The explicit statement made about norms by translators, publishers, reviewers and other participants in the translation act

Norms:
1. Initial norm (general translator’s choice):
   a. Subjection to source culture norms → adequate translation;
   b. Subjection to target culture norms → acceptable translation.
2. Preliminary norms:
   a. Translation policy (text selection);
   b. Directness of translation (ST → TT; ST → t2 → TT).
3. Operational norms (the presentation and linguistic matters of the TT):
   a. Matricial norms (completeness of TT);
   b. Textual-linguistic norms (TT linguistic material).

‘Laws’ of translation:
1. Of growing standardization (tending to TT common options);
2. Of interference (ST options transferred to TT, negatively or positively).

Chesterman’s translation norms:
1. Product or expectancy norms;
2. Process or professional norms:
   a. The accountability norm (an ethical norm);
   b. The communication norm (a social norm);
   c. The ‘relation’ norm (a linguistic norm).

Other DTS models:
1. **Manipulation School** (‘a continual interplay between theoretical models and practical case studies’);
2. **Lambert and van Gorp** – the scheme for the comparison of the ST and TT literary systems and for the description of relations within them:
   a. Preliminary data;
   b. Macro-level;
   c. Micro-level;
   d. Systemic context (data compared and norms identified).
Chapter 8: Varieties of cultural studies:

Chapter 8 "Varieties of cultural studies" examines Lefevere (1992), who treats translation as "rewriting" and identifies ideological pressures on translated texts. This chapter also looks at the writing of Simon (1996) on gender in translation, and at postcolonial translation theories which stress the part that translation has played in the colonization process and the image of the colonized (cf. Bassnett and Trivedi 1999).

Lefevere (1992) treats translation as "rewriting" and identifies ideological and poetological pressures on translated texts. Translation functions are controlled by the following factors:

1. Professionals within the literary system;
2. Patronage outside the literary system:
   a. The ideological component;
   b. The economic component;
   c. The status component.
   d. If a-c come from the same source – patronage is undifferentiated; if not – differentiated.
3. The dominant poetics:
   a. Literary devices;
   b. The concept of the role of literature.

Simon compares the status of translation throughout the centuries to that of women’s and presents pro-feminist methods in translation.

Postcolonial translation theories:

1. Spivak: ‘translationese’ eliminates the identity of politically less powerful individuals and cultures.
2. Spivak: compares the status of translation throughout the centuries to that of colonies.
3. Power relations: translation as the colonizer’s device used against the colonized.
4. S. Bassnett and H. Trivedi’s translational linked to transnational (translation=battleground).

Brazillian cannibalism: the colonizers and their lg are devoured, their life force invigorating the devourers, who transform it according to their needs.

The Irish context: postcolonialism in Europe.

Chapter 9: Translating the foreign: the (in)visibility of translation:

A. Berman’s ‘negative analytic’ of translation that prevents the foreign coming through.

‘Deforming tendencies’:

1. Rationalization;
2. Clarification;
3. Expansion;
4. Ennoblement;
5. Qualitative impoverishment;
6. Quantitative impoverishment;
7. The destruction of rhythms;
8. The destruction of underlying networks of signification;
9. The destruction of linguistic patternings;
10. The destruction of vernacular’ networks or their exotization;
11. The destruction of expressions and idioms;
12. The effacement of the superimposition of languages.

‘Positive analytic’ = literal translation.

Venutti:

1. The invisibility of the translator in contemporary Anglo-American culture.
2. Domestication (dominant in connection with the translator’s invisibility) – ‘the author towards the reader’.
4. ‘Call for action’ – ‘visibility’ + ‘foreignization’.

\(^1\) Lg.
Chapter 10: Philosophical theories of translation:

Steiner’s hermeneutic\(^1\) approach to translation as ‘the act of elicitation and appropriate transfer of meaning’. The parts of the hermeneutic motion:

1. Initiative trust;
2. Aggression (penetration);
3. Incorporation (embodiment);
4. Compensation (restitution)

Ezra Pound’s energy of language: translation as a tool in the cultural struggle, and the revitalization of the past.

W. Benjamin’s task of the translator: translation gives the original ‘continued life’; pure language = coexistence of SL and TL; literal rendering of the syntax.

J. Derrida’s deconstruction: capturing the meaning? No stability in the signified-signifier (meaning-sign) relationship; the opposition between SL and TL.

1. Letter=Judaism=justice;
2. Spirit=Christianity=mercy.

Chapter 11: Translation studies as an interdiscipline:

M. Snell-Hornby’s integrated approach.

Harvey’s combination of linguistic analysis and critical theory.

---

\(^1\) Hermeneutyka - w filozofii, nauka, sztuka, umiejętność interpretacji tekstów literackich i źródeł historycznych, a w szerszym znaczeniu, także wszelkich treści symbolicznych. Wraz z poetyką i retoryką tworzy swoisty kanon filologiczny. Tak bowiem jak retoryka chce służyć sztuce mówienia, a poetyka sztuce poetyckiej i jej ocenie, tak też hermeneutyka służy sztuce rozumienia i interpretacji wytworów kulturowych, jak język, tekst, słowo. Ujęta w związku z teorią poznania (epistemologia) i metodyką nauk humanistycznych (metodologia), hermeneutyka u Heideggera i Gadamera stała się ogniwem łączącym filozofię z rozumieniem egzystencji, głównym składnikiem ontologicznej struktury rozumienia jako takiego.