An-Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies

Remapping and Unifying the English Terms of Translation Methods and their Arabic Equivalents

By
Noura Farouq Burhan Khalifah

Supervised by
Sufyan Abuarrah
Ekremah Shehab

This Thesis is submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Applied Linguistics and Translation, Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.

2017

Remapping and Unifying the English Terms of Translation Methods and their Arabic Equivalents

By
Noura Farouq Burhan Khalifah

This Thesis was defended successfully on 24/05/2017 and approved by:

Defense Committee Members	**Signature**
Dr. Sufyan Abuarrah / Supervisor	**…………………**
Dr. Ekremah Shehab / Co-Supervisor	**…………………**
Dr. Mohammad Thawabteh / External Examiner	**…………………**
Dr. Rami Qawariq / Internal Examiner	**…………………**

Dedication

To my mother Sana’ and father Farouq who were my first teachers, to my husband Abdulla who trusts my abilities and never hesitates to offer his support, to my children who understood all the times I was away completing this work, to my father-in-law who inspired me to take this journey and to Jamil who always stands next to me. From the bottom of my heart I thank you all for your endless support, help, care and love.

Acknowledgements

Will, determination and patience are the main pillars for the success of any work. I give my thanks to Almighty Allah for allowing me to take this journey which taught me to value the power of determination.

It would not have been possible for this work to come to life without the help and guidance of my supervisors Dr. Sufyan Abuarrah and Dr. Ekremah Shehab who supported me, inspired me and directed me from A to Z. There might be no better place than here to thank them for their generous help.

I want to show my gratitude to the place that taught me the meaning of voluntary work and the value of giving. Thank you Project HOPE, Hakim, Sandy, Nicholas, Anas, Tawfiq, Hassan, the staff and the local and international volunteers for advising, motivating and teaching me.

My family have always guided and supported me throughout my life. Thank you to my parents, children, husband, parents-in-law, aunts, uncles, sisters and brothers for teaching me the valuable principles in my life, for providing endless support, for wishing me the best of the best and for showing me how to appreciate the tiny things before the big things.

I would also like to thank all the teachers who have taught me throughout my education.

My thanks to everyone who took part in this work, without your help it wouldn’t be in your hands now.

الإقرار

أنا الموقعة، أدناه مقدمة الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان:

اعادة تحديد وتوحيد المصطلحات الانجليزية لطرق الترجمة ومكافئاتها العربية

Remapping and Unifying the English Terms of Translation Methods and their Arabic Equivalents

اقر بأن ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة إنما هي نتاج جهدي الخاص، باستثناء ما تمت الإشارة إليه حيثما ورد، وإن هذه الرسالة ككل، أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أي درجة علمية أو بحث علمي أو بحثي لدى أي مؤسسة علمية أو بحثية أخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for other degree or qualification.

Student's Name:	**Noura Farouq Burhan Khalifah**	اسم الطالب:
Signature:	…………………………………………	التوقيع:
Date:	**24/05/2017**	التاريخ:

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

The abbreviations in this thesis are:

ST : Source text

TT : Target text

TL : Target language

SC : Source culture

TLR : Target language reader

CA : Componential analysis

Remapping and Unifying the English Terms of Translation Methods and their Arabic Equivalents

By
Noura Farouq Burhan Khalifah
Supervised by
Dr. Sufyan Abuarrah
Dr. Ekrema Shehab

Abstract

This study addresses the problem of terminology in five overlapping dichotomies of translation methods. These translation methods are Semantic versus Communicative, Documentary versus Instrumental, Covert versus Overt, Direct versus Indirect and Literal versus Free. This study investigates the extent to which the meanings of apparently distinct translation methods converge or diverge. It does so through following a conceptual comparative analytical method and a top down methodology, starting from the existing methods, their terms and definitions then analyzing them into their minimal components in order to differentiate between them. After clarifying the differences between the methods, it was clear that they are related to one or more of the following aspects: the author, the reader, the aim of the translation, the function of the translation, the context of the source text (ST) and the translation's relevance to the audience. However, when it comes to the application of these methods, these aspects are often difficult to apply concretely to make one translation different from another. Moreover, the study examines the Arabic terms of the English methods by investigating their meanings and definitions to characterize their similarities and differences to English equivalents. A

questionnaire was distributed to ten translators and translation students to probe the translators' awareness of the Arabic translation methods. Most of the participants were not able to give correct definitions or even know what the terms meant. Thus at least half of these Arabic terms should be modified with different terms that are more explicating to their contents.

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction:

In the nineteenth century, the science of translation was generally limited to communication between men of letters, philosophers, scientists and their readers. Commercial trade and diplomacy, on the other hand, were conducted in the language of the dominant nation (Newmark, 1981). It was not until the twentieth century that translation skills came to be valued for various political, economic and technological reasons. During the fast growth of translation, much was written about it; it was mainly discussed in terms of literal and free translation. People have always been interested in the methods of translation and their differences, although the evidence shows that there was no clear theory about translation or about its methods in the period prior to the emergence of modern linguistics (Newmark, 1981).

There is a growing need for greater clarity in the field of translation, due primarily to the increased internationalization of written information. Many emerging translation theories are derived from the field of linguistics; this is in part due to the number of linguists who have embraced translation as a testing ground for their own studies (Hatim, 2001). The enthusiasm of theoreticians led to many theories about translation like the theories by Newmark (1981), House (1977), Nord (1991) and Gutt (1989). Translators, teachers of translation and their students refer to these theories whenever the need arises.

Many terms and concepts in these methods overlap, maybe because they are written over different periods of time. For example, the core meaning of overt and covert translation overlaps with direct and indirect translation (they both discuss the same idea, but employ different terms). These methods have several criteria in common; both prioritize attention to the reader, originality of the text, and faithfulness to ST. These terms would in the first place disturb translation practitioners, thus a process of examining the possibility of unifying the number of overlapping translation methods to, first, decrease their number, and second, to increase their practicality in the practice and understanding of translation should be undertaken.

1.2 Statement of the problem:

Particularly over the last three decades or so, both theory and practice have been dominated by a number of dichotomies. We have had ‘literal’ versus ‘free’ translation, the translation of ‘form’ versus that of ‘function’, ‘communicative’ versus ‘semantic’ translation and so on. Of course, there are a number of similarities and differences between these different translation methods which will be explored later in this study. But what is problematic about the continued presence of such distinctions is not only the proliferation of unnecessary terminology, but also the negative impression that such terms give when presented as a conscious choice made by the translator according to the school of thought to which he or she belongs (Hatim,2001).

I agree with Hatim (2013) in his book *Teaching and Researching Translation* with regards to the effect that the proliferation of these terms has. But unlike Hatim I think it is vital to resolve the issue of confusion of terms, primarily because the huge number of dichotomies which rule in both the theory and practice of translation affect the attitude and the way of thinking of translators, students and teachers of translation.

It is true that academia inevitably breeds a plurality of terminology and this plurality can at times be useful. However, I believe that with the terms this thesis discusses, there is a lot of confusion that could be remedied by an academic enquiry into the overlapping of these terms.

The proliferation of unnecessary terms causes a high degree of confusion among the practitioners of translation. Most of the terms which consider the methods of translation have the same content but are named differently. For that reason many students and translators cannot distinguish or know the differences between those terms. Therefore, the application of these terms will be problematic when it comes to practice. In addition to what is mentioned above, when practitioners use the Arabic equivalents for the English methods and terminologies, do they carry the same meaning and have the same function as in the SL Arabic, being different from English linguistically and culturally, could carry different implications.

1.3 Research Questions:

In order to address the problem of term fuzziness and overlap in translation studies, this research seeks to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the similarities and differences between and within the different overlapping dichotomies of translation methods?

2. Is it possible to unify the number of English translation methods to minimize their number and maximize their practicality in the practice and understanding of translation?

3. What are the similarities and differences between the terms of the translation methods when translated from English into Arabic?

4. Where do the Arabic terms of the translation methods overlap? And would it be possible to unify them in order to decrease their number and reduce ambiguity?

1.4 Methodology:

This thesis follows a conceptual comparative and analytical method. In order to define and compare the translation methods featured in this thesis. It defines and clarifies concepts, relates concepts into larger systems and enquires into the possibility of unifying the English and Arabic terms of translation methods. In addition, the study compares definitions, criteria and interpretations by different scholars.

This research addresses the problem of terminology through the examination of multiple methods. The terminology as used in such studies is gathered from different theories and books by different theoreticians like Newmark (1981), House (1977), Nord (1991) and Gutt (1989). It handles some of the concepts following the *Dictionary of Translation Studies* by Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997). For considering and contrasting the Arabic terms, the study uses the translated version of the *Dictionary of Translation Studies by* Jamal Elgezeery (2008). To find out the efficiency of the translation terminology used, the study employs the theory of componential analysis (CA). This method is the same as structural semantic; it examines the elements of the word's different meanings and implications (Ottenheimer, 2006, p. 20). It helps explore the differences between the very similar words. CA helps in tackling the subtle differences between the overlapping methods, to differentiate between them to see if they are similar or not. CA also helps in listing the characteristics of each procedure to be used in the process of translation.

The results from CA are applied to translate a paragraph by Gutt (1989). This was done in order to figure out the differences between these translated paragraphs and the methods used to translate them.

After analyzing the terms, an evaluation took place to see if their Arabic translations are functional and meaningful, according to the criteria from CA. This was done by distributing a questionnaire to ten translators and translation students to ask them about the Arabic names of these methods and what they know about them.

After defining, explaining and characterizing the terminologies in question, they were categorized according to their meaning. If the degree of resemblance among them is overwhelming, then the possibility of their being unified will be encouraged. The study discusses the existing translations, either to maintain them, or suggest modifications to their wording according to their function.

The research follows a top down methodology, starting from the existing methods, their terms and definitions then analyzing them into their minimal components in order to differentiate them.

1.5 Significance of the study:

If the study manages to achieve the anticipated results by analyzing whether the terminology for translation methods needs to be unified or not, it would help all practitioners and teachers in translation studies. The analysis and description of the methods will be useful for practitioners in order to understand and to apply them more effectively. The study can have practical applications in the field of translation; more is likely to influence the practitioners' performance positively. They can choose the most appropriate method for the type of text they are translating. Therefore the study can be a practical guide for students and translators, and it can also be used by their teachers in order to reduce the amount of confusion by the flux of translation terminologies.

1.6 Design of the Study:

This study is divided into four chapters. The first includes the background, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the methodology, the significance of the study and the design of the study. The second chapter reviews the existing literature on the topic and lay out a theoretical background. The third chapter consists of two main sections, each dedicated to address one group of the overlapping methods. Each section examines each of the five overlapping methods separately. They are defined, the reasons behind their inventions discussed and their features examined. After studying each method the same paragraph is translated using each method separately. The end of each section consists of a comparison between the similar methods to find out where they overlap and where they do not. The fourth chapter studies the Arabic translation of the methods. In the conclusion, findings and recommendations of the research are provided.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Many scholars have written about what translation is, and intervened in the evolving science of translation theory, and its relation to linguistics and a variety of different fields such as history, literary works, computer science, economics etc.

People started to practice translation hundreds of years ago. However, they were not sure what they were engaged in until the 1960s, when the theory of translation started to occupy the core of the translation process and started to depend on the science of translation studies. Furthermore, scholars thought of translation as a part of linguistics, especially when it was under the domain of descriptive studies, until the appearance of the two theories at beginning of 1960s. These two theories changed the whole track of translation theory until the present day. The first theory was by Nida in his books *Message and Mission* (1960) and *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964). The other theory was composed by Chomsky in his books *Syntactic Structure* (1957) and *Aspect of the Theory of Syntax* (1965). Chomsky's books resulted in transformational-generative grammar being accepted as a part of linguistics. *Syntactic Structure* also helped Nida to develop his perspective theory toward translation, which flourished and was approved by his translation of *The Bible*, and his book *Message and Mission (1960).*(Edwin, 2001)

The way Nida translated *The Bible* was more practical than theoretical. It was a way to reflect his reaction toward the nineteenth century particularly in its classical view. This is related to transferring the ST and its aesthetic character literally, in addition to being very close to the source culture. This was clear enough in the translation of *The Bible* by Matthew Arnold, and how much it exhausted the reader because it was attached to the ST and required the reader to be familiar with the ST culture (Edwin, 2001).

Nida argues that the way Arnold translated *The Bible*, being too literal, affected it negatively. This was the case in particular at the beginning of the 20th century, when the sense of *The Bible* was completely lost. Therefore, the core of Nida's theory is to transfer the source message as it is across different cultures. The origin of his theory might have risen out of his belief in Christianity and its missionary role. Chomsky did not intend to use his theory as a basis for any science, or as a theory for translation. However, Nida adapted his theory by simplifying it, to make it more credible. One of the examples in George Steiner's *After Bable* (1975) was to emphasize the necessity of expanding the way we deal with Chomsky's theory, and the relations it has to understanding translation (Edwin, 2001).

Catford (1965) proposed a controversial definition of translation. According to him, translation is replacing a ST in the source language with an equivalent TT in the TL. Bassnett (1992) defined translation as writing the ST again in another language. Bassnett (1992) also evaluates the benefits of rewriting as it interferes in transferring history, culture, genres and new concepts. On the other hand it can be considered as a kind of manipulation which interferes and represses innovation.

Translation studies started to call on these trials which aim at having a precise definition of translation theory. On the other hand, translation studies wanted to investigate more about translation methods and how meaning can be transferred from one language to another. These studies tried to be comprehensive by having an inter-disciplinary approach which examined both theory and literary works in one study. The new interdisciplinary approach interfered in wiping the borders between true and false, literal and free, practice and theory. They also considered translation as a work which combines both literary work and theory. Translation studies contrasted new questions regarding the process of translation and how it affected the ST and the target text (TT). They even redefined the original work and the new work by calling them the ST and TT. In addition, the core of the debate was distinguishing between the original writer and the translator and examining the translated text itself instead of studying the absent meaning or the linguistic meaning. This might be the origin and the starting point for having the new dichotomies which wanted to be far from literal and free translation and focus on the TT itself instead of the linguistic meaning. Moreover these new dichotomies wanted to distinguish between the translator and the author of the ST and to what extent the TT should be an original in the TL. These concepts are embodied in communicative versus semantic translation, direct versus indirect translation and covert versus overt translation.

During the 1970s, most translation research either focused on literary works but ignored the theory, or focused on the theory and ignored the literary aspects. The defenders of each aspect used to defend each method by giving limited examples about each. However, young researchers and scholars wanted a different way of looking into translation theory. One of the pioneers was the Dutch scholar James Holmes who conducted a study named *The Name and Nature of Translation* Studies. In this study, Holmes avoided the term "translation theory" as it only reflects the stance the researchers and comparison theorists adopt, which is not always suitable when examining literary works. Instead of that, Holmes used the term translation studies, considering it as a new approach. It differs from translation theory as translation theory is restricted to two ways only of handling translation research (Edwin, 2001).

The 1980s witnessed the growth of translation studies as a separate discipline in different areas all over the world, until it was finely developed in the 21st century (Bassnett, 1992). For example, Nord was one of the pioneers for the greatest transformation in the evolution of translation theory. The first theory was transforming from source text-oriented theories to TT-oriented theories. The second theory was moving forward to have a better comprehension of the cultural factors. The supporters for this transformation (e.g. Vermeer and Nord) had another definition for translation depending on the functionalist approach. They defined translation as an action done by a person who has a specific communicative purpose, which is, as called by Reiss and Vermeer (1984), the "text's skopos". One of the most prominent figures in creating translation studies was Peter Newmark. He was one of the pioneers in the 1980s and 90s, and one of the leaders to make translation a separate academic field in its own right. His books *Approaches to Translation* 1981 and *Textbook of Translation* 1988 are used as guides for translators and for students of translation. They contain a huge variety of information related to linguistic theory, supported by examples and applied to translation. In these books he introduced the new terms semantic and communicative translation in order to narrow the gap between the emphasis on ST and TT. These two terms received less attention from critics than many others, like Nida's dynamic and formal equivalence, as they have many overlapping aspects.

In his book *Map of Translation Studies* Holmes considers Newmark's terms as only a part of translation theory since they only deal with a few aspects of translation. Although, Newmark argues that a general theory should not suggest a single method, it should be engaged with all varieties of text type, their correspondent translation and the variables associated with them. (Newmark, 1981)

In the 1990s, Gutt (1991) introduced his two new dichotomies which were derived out of the Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986). This theory is built upon the discipline which claims that speakers pay the least effort to transcend the biggest amount of information. Gutt discussed how this discipline of the relevance theory can be applied in the process of translation in his book *Translation and Relevance*: *Cognition and Context* (1991). Gutt encourages translators to apply this theory to translation by allowing the translator to make changes in the form of the ST to achieve maximum communication with the target language (TL) audience. This relevance theory by Gutt challenges the regular definitions for translation, particularly those definitions which define translation as achieving an equal equivalent TT (Edwin, 2001).

Gutt produced several papers to emphasize the importance of Relevance Theory. He states that all kinds of translation can be handled within an interpretive use (Gutt, 1990). Gutt (1991) strongly claims that Relevance Theory alone can be an adequate substitute to a range of unnecessary translation theories. His research results show that the huge number of translation phenomena can be accounted by Relevance Theory. This was also supported in his Ph. D. dissertation.

Gutt (1991) claims that despite of the vast amount of literature about translation, only a few have arrived at a deep understanding of the main topic. His claim was supported by Steiner who states that "despite this rich history, and despite the caliber of those who have written about the art and theory of translation, the number of original, significant ideas in the subject remains very meager" (1975, p. 238). Therefore, the problem of having a comprehensive scientific study for translation started to become more evident, especially when a small number of researchers are dealing with its theoretical plane. According to Gutt, this problem can be solved when using Relevance Theory as the framework for translation. It simply provides what translation theorists have been looking for, particularly when the source language text is not enough for the communication process. Therefore, he came out with his notions direct and indirect translation. Yet he sometimes considered them to be seen as a spelling out of the old free and literal translation (Gutt, 1990). On the other hand, Baker (2001) claims that regardless of how sophisticated the approach was, there is no absolute approach which answers all the questions raised in the discipline. They are all complementary rather than exclusive.

Moreover, the functionalist approach was one of the ascendant approaches in the 1990s. The German scholar Nord was one of the followers of the functionalist approach which relies on the function of the language. She summarized this theory in her book (1997). This book was a good description for the functionalist approach for English language speakers. She also proposed her two terms in that book, documentary and instrumental translation under the claim "goals serve as guidelines for action." With this claim Nord means to translate or interpret in a way that makes your text serve the situation it occurs in or in the way you prefer the text to look, without insisting on having one perfect translation or depending on a certain method for the whole text.

The book by Chesterman (1997) recalls how theories of translation have been developed over years and centuries. Starting from literal translation, how it was endowed as a result of holy texts and biblical translations. When translators had the fear of committing heresy, and had to respect the authority of the source texts, particularly those which were used for worship reasons. Chesterman (1997) supports this claim by mentioning quotations from the Middle Ages and the twelfth century, from different translators who prefer to over translate and be suspicious rather than having the license of freedom in translation. That claim was the inspiration for many different contemporary theories, which had the argument of free versus literal translation. Therefore, many scholars were motivated to produce different theories hovering around this theme of literal versus free, but with different manifestations and terms and over different periods of time. That shaped the dominant field in the literature of translation theory, like the theories by Newmark, Nida, House, Nord and Gutt.

Chesterman (1997) indicates the rise of this meme to the way biblical translations were done when they focused on the form to maintain the source text's authority. It was moved to different kinds of texts, like philosophical and scientific texts that started to pay attention to the form of the ST in order to be faithful to the original work in the seventeenth century.

The book by Gambier (2009) sheds light on the synonymous pairs of terms of translation studies which belong to similar conceptual domains, for example, documentary versus instrumental, overt versus covert and direct versus indirect. Gambier mentions the desire of Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) to reduce the number of terms in their dictionary to a minimum. Furthermore, he mentions Chesterman's review of *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, where Chesterman (1997) mentions the semantic overlap between covert and instrumental which attracts us to the conceptual domains that miss terminological agreement. Moreover this cross reference appears in instrumental-covert translations, and documentary-overt translations. The scholars who introduced these methods refer to each other. For example, Nord and House refer to each other, and Gutt (1989) uses the term direct as a strong equivalent for overt. (p. 52)

Bowker (2009) investigates the duty of terminologists to explore ”knowledge-rich contexts” by exploring the context that offers information about the semantic relationship among concepts in a particular field. His Ph.D. claims individuals can explore the context by looking at the lexical patterns which reveal the semantic relationship among them. The researcher also mentions the duty of terminologists in working on a database which is used as a retrieval tool. This system is not applied yet because of the different impacts by different languages on these patterns. This dissertation is relevant to this study but the difference is that this thesis looks for the semantic relationship among the Arabic translation terms to discover their relevance. While the Ph.D. research looks for a system to be used as a retrieval system. The claim raised in this study as well is similar to the claim raised in this thesis which is about having different meaning indications for the translation terms when they are translated from English into Arabic.

The book by Hassan (2011) focuses on the pragmatic aspects of translation. Hassan sheds light on the different models of translation by different scholars. He claims that all of these models have many things in common. For example, literal and semantic translations focus on text form. Hassan is also aware of the fact that Gutt (1991) was considering dynamic and idiomatic translations as having a resemblance. In addition to all of that, Hassan (2011) was aware of the resemblance between the terms as used by Nord (1991) and House (1977). Nord's difference between documentary verses communicative has been utilized by House's covert and overt translation. Hassan (2011) claims that despite the diversity of so many kinds of translation, they all depend on one conceptual core which is equivalence.

The article by Chesterman (2013), argues that each hypothesis should be tested and verified as widely as possible. Furthermore, it examines if translation studies should have a standardized terminology or not. In this paper, Chesterman believes in challenging the development of translation theory by expanding the Eurocentric and the Western focus; in order to offer different solution to the various trends in translation theory.

He believes that despite the development of so many hypotheses over different places, they should be assessed and evaluated according to different cultures not only according to the place where they have been produced. Moreover, he cites Pym (2011) and his hypothesis which claims that so many different theories have appeared as a result of the problems in the western culture, therefore they are all western focus. For example, Nida came out with dynamic equivalence due to the American biblical concerns to spread *The Bible* in different places all over the world. The Skopos theory as well, was to raise the status and the academic value of translation training in German universities. Additionally, Chesterman thinks that the main reason for the development of these ideas, and for the stimulation of translation corpus studies, is the increasing number of overseas students studying linguistics and translation in the UK. This highlights the idea of culture-specific translation methods.

Chesterman examines the context for the development of each hypothesis in different places. He emphasizes that it is not a matter of place or geographic virtue; whether this idea has come from the west or not. It is a matter of influence. That is, the effect beyond a certain idea merges around a particular approach and a group of scholars in a particular place or country. For example, translation functionalism was developed in German speaking countries, and translation universals were devolved in Finland.

When Chesterman discusses the possibility of producing standardized terms, he mentions the lack of a standard accepted definition for translation, in addition to there not being a clear difference between dialect and language.

In sum, Chesterman believes that, the problem of standardized terminology is an ongoing problem which raises the issue of language policy, institutional power and democracy (2013). Even if we have a standardized terminology in one language the problem remains in its translation into the TL, there may be two or more TL translation. For example, the source language can be translated as اللغة المنقول منها or اللغة الاصل or اللغة المصدر. Regardless of the so many glossaries available in this field, nothing has been accepted as standard yet. Moreover, this study raises the question of whether translation theories are culture-specific or not?

Chesterman's study is relevant to this study in many aspects. Chesterman is fully aware of the terminological overlap and the difficulty of producing a standardized terminology. On the other hand, Chesterman's study does not focus on finding these standardized terms or looking for the differences among these different terminologies, as this study does. He looks instead at the reasons behind having many overlapping theories. Chesterman's study as well, is aware of the terminological problem in other languages rather than the original language which produced the term.

Heyderdin (2016) investigates the concept of method, specifically, how this concept appears in different translation studies, as the solution for different problems related to translation, within the descriptive translation studies. His article studies the concept of method, the way it was developed over the different years of translation studies, and the core of the debate which lies within this concept in order to be applied in the area of translation training.

Heyderdin (2016) claims that in order to find a general developed model of translation, common methods that can be applied in the different environments of the translation training classroom should be found. He also emphasizes the importance of translation methods, and their important role in developing translators' competence and the translation quality, particularly in the global context. Heyderdin highlights the oldest usage of the term “method” within the context of translation studies. Afterwards, it was developed to literal translation versus free translation.

These two extremes have been defined along the different historical eras and upon classical contributions to the field, based on being faithful to the form, meaning and grammar of the ST or not. Thereby Jerome is considered the first to introduce this dichotomy. According to Jerome the idea of method is confined by these two extremes which are literal versus free. The basic ground for the theory of translation in the 1990s, was hovering around grading literality. This was done by creating the bilateral dichotomies, such as Newmark’s communicative versus Semantic translation (1981), ‘documentary’ versus ‘instrumental’ translation (Nord, 1991), ‘overt’ versus ‘covert’ translation (House 1981, 1997), and Gutt’s direct versus indirect translation (1989) amongst others.

Heydерdin thinks that the term “method” has developed over different eras of translation, by being substituted for translation pairs such as direct and indirect. Heyderdin discusses the many different terms which are considered as translation methods, by asking the question whether having these methods is a natural shift or a solution for the problem. According to Catford it is a structural shift which Heyderdin does not agree with. In his opinion it is “a mere method in terms of the nature of their individual dependences”. Jääskelainen (1993) believes that applying the rules depends on the situation when translating. While Heyderdin believes that such confusion among these terms and the problems associated with them, is because of the lack of certainty in defining and locating the methods.

Heyderdin discusses the terminological confusion related to the word method, which means finding solutions for a certain problem. This terminological confusion is manifested in the words, methods, tactics, plans, rules, processes, and methods. Therefore, Chesterman in his book used the word memes to overcome this confusion. Heyderdin suggests different alternatives for the term method used by different scholars. These are tactics, methods and procedure. He compared them to see whether they will carry the same function and meaning or not. On the other hand, this research compares different methods and their Arabic equivalents. At the end of his article Heyderdin suggests different activities to be applied in class for translation training starting with the most traditional ones to the most modern ad-hoc ones. This is done in order to facilitate the process of translation training. The researcher also recommends that more specific research is done for the benefit of finding new paths for translation and translation teaching instead of keeping to one approach. In this way this thesis might be significant for translation students and translation training. This is because, firstly, it will ease the process of applying theory to the process of translation. Secondly, it will help the student to understand the exact differences between the overlapping methods. And additionally, it will open the path of research to find different solutions for the meaningless Arabic equivalents.

The difference between Heyderdin's paper and this is that, Heyderdin is looking for the reasons behind having these overlapping methods. He also believes that these terms are the natural development for the definition of the term method. Moreover he discusses this problem in order to apply these methods in translation training. In contrast, this thesis examines the differences between these overlapping methods and their Arabic equivalents to figure out whether these methods stay meaningful if they are translated into Arabic.

Chapter Three

Defining and Contrasting the Methods

3.1 Introduction:

To answer the main question of this thesis, whether the translated terms of the English methods would carry the same meaning as they do in English, we need to figure out the extent to which the meanings of apparently distinct translation methods converge or diverge. If the similarities are greater than the differences, is there any possibility to reduce the number of these terms in order to simplify translation theory and make it more applicable by practitioners of translation.

The first part of this chapter examines literal translation, semantic translation, overt translation, direct translation and documentary translation. All of these methods are loyal to the ST and to the author. The aforementioned methods are discussed separately by eliciting their features, and focus. Then they are compared, to detect the differences between them.

For example, one of the methods that needs to be examined in this thesis is semantic versus communicative translation. These two terms appeared as Newmark's treatment for literal and free translation. Hatim (1997) is convinced that these two terms have appeared in different translation theories, in different guises and names. This thesis agrees with this suggestion. I think the heart of the debate for having all of these terms is to what extent the ST is changed in the process of translation. According to Hatim (1997) this is related to whether the ST is designed for the audience within the SC or for a wider audience.

The second part of this chapter will examine the features and the characteristics of communicative translation, indirect translation, overt translation, instrumental, and free translation. They will be also discussed separately and compared. It should be noted that examining these translation methods separately will help discover their aspects and features to consider their Arabic translation as terms which is the scope of chapter four.

Throughout an example from Gutt's (1989) PhD thesis will be translated according to each of these methods and the results will be compared.

3.2 Literal Translation:

Literal translation is linguistically defined as a translation made on a lower than sufficient level to that which is required. Its aim is to convey the content of the ST unchanged while preserving TL norms (Barkhudarov, 1969).

Catford (1965) claims that the starting point of literal translation is word for word translation. His definition for literal translation is built on the unit of translation and on matching the TL's grammar. The result of the translation may show group-group or clause-clause equivalence.

Many modern translation studies scholars do not consider literal translation as an appropriate translational method. For example, Nida (1964) claims that there is no absolute correspondence between languages since there is no exact match between two languages in structure and meaning. Therefore, there is no absolute translation. Not far from Nida, Chukovsky (1996) opposed literal translation as it distorts the meaning of the original. This thesis agrees with Chukovsky as literal translation sometimes misrepresents the source text, particularly in practical life interpretation. On the other hand, sometimes literal translation becomes the only refuge for legal and religious texts. That is why it was found to be instrumental in preserving literature, especially those texts which must be accurately translated (Newmark, 1981, p. 38).

Literal translation was used recently used in translation training, to gain more access to the TL structure, as well as translating technical texts (Newmark, 1981). Literal translation is also a good starting step for translating difficult technical texts in order to digest and comprehend the meaning of the ST.

To summarize, literal translation has the following characteristics:

- It keeps the content, the meaning and the unit of the ST unchanged, as much as the TT allows.
- ST has to be accurately translated
- The meaning of the ST is always distorted as it translates the ST out

of its context.

- Loyalty is paid to the source language norms, not to the author.

Gutt (1989) used many examples in his PhD dissertation to explain Relevance Theory and his methods of direct and indirect translation. One of these examples is used to explain the different methods of translation used in this thesis. The example will be translated into Arabic by using the features of literal translation mentioned above. (This example will be abbreviated as example 1)

Source text: "Thus we see that the fact that Jesus is called 'Jesus of Nazareth' is no reason to be embarrassed. Rather, as we have seen, God brought him there in a number of steps, each of which he himself directed, beginning, as our belief demands, in Bethlehem, and culminating in Nazareth."

"ولهذا فاننا نرى ان حقيقة ان عيسى يسمى بـ "عيسى الناصرة" ليست سببا للشعور بالحرج. وانما، كما راينا، الله جلبه هناك بعدة خطوات، كل واحدة منها هو بنفسه وجهها، في البداية، كما يتطلب ايماننا، في بيت لحم، ومن ثم بلغت ذروتها في الناصرة."

The text was translated using the features of literal translation. Firstly, it tried to keep the ST order, meaning and unit as much as the TL allows. For example:

1. God brought him there in a number of steps is translated as: الله جلبه هناك بعدة خطوات. The appropriate translation according to Arabic

syntax is جلبه الله هناك بعدة خطوات as the verb is usually preferred to be before the subject, in order to make it far from the English syntax. Loyalty in literal translation is paid to the SL norms and structure. That's why the translation tried to stick to the SL structure as much as the TL allows; for this reason, the TT looks awkward.

2. كل واحدة منها هو بنفسه وجهها 'each of which he himself directed' is better to be translated as كل واحدةمنهاوجهها هو بنفسه according to the Arabic syntax.

3. The size and the unit of the paragraph are saved by producing a similar size paragraph. Word choice in this translation is neutral as literal translation does not pay attention to the context, thus we used the word عيسى instead of يسوع or سيدنا عيسى عليه السلام.

3.3 Semantic Translation:

Newmark (1981) defines semantic translation as an attempt to preserve as much of the semantic and the syntactic structure of the ST as the TL allows, as well as the exact contextual meaning of the original. Semantic translation preserves the original culture and only helps the reader in some essential connotations. It is concentrated and detailed at the same time; it focuses on the message and the thoughts rather than the form; thus, it can be quite complex and awkward. Semantic translation over translates by giving more specific details than the original to include all the possible meanings. This does not mean it ignores the equivalent effect, which aims to achieve the same effect on the target reader, as the one which was produced on the ST reader (Newmark, 1981).

According to Vinay and Darblenet (1976), semantic translation always complies with the usually accepted syntactic equivalent. Newmark (1981) also highlights that any deviation from source language stylistic norms would be reflected in an equally wide deviation from TL norms. The problem is that it is not always easy to formulate that deviation in the TT. For example, if the sentence in the source language is complex because of a certain type of a literary text, or maybe the author has chosen to have complex sentences in his work, the translation may compromise this for the norms of the language and the writer, by reducing the sentence in one way or another. However, if the translator was confused, he or she should choose the writer not the language because semantic translation favors the author over the language (Newmark, 1981). This might be the reason for having many concrete translation theories, which are similar in content, to help the translator reflect the author's style in the TT.

Semantic translation is inferior to the source text; that is why it sometimes contains a loss of meaning. It deals with the transmitter of the message as an individual, and the message in the text as one concrete unit. Therefore it is an objective process which does not deal with the pragmatic meaning of the message. The translation should preserve the figurative language of the original; it is more idiosyncratic and sensitive. Usually sentence length, clauses and word position are saved unless the differences in the norms of the two languages are extensive. It is addressed to one reader, who is the only reader intended by the ST writer. When the language of the speaker is as important as the content, original expressions should be rendered by semantic translation regardless of the text type (Newmark, 1981).

In brief, following the discussion above, semantic translation is a process which:

- Uses the bare syntactic and semantic constrains of the TL, to reflect any deviation in the ST in the TT.
- Preserves as much of the ST semantic, syntactic structure, cultural influences, content, details and context as the TL allows since fidelity is more important than good language.
- Has no cultural adaptation, it just gives the reader essential connotations, since the task of the reader is to understand the author's meaning.
- Targets the same kind of readers in the TL.
- Keeps the equivalent effect; it focuses on transferring the exact meaning of the author to the reader, rather than producing an easy text for the reader.

Example 1 by Gutt (1989) will be translated again, using the features of semantic translation mentioned above.

ولهذا فإننا نرى ان حقيقة ان عيسى يسمى ب "عيسى الناصرة" ليست سببا للشعور بالحرج. وانما، كما راينا، الله جلبه هناك بعدة خطوات، كل واحدة منها هو بنفسه وجهها، في البداية، كما يتطلب ايماننا، في بيت لحم، ومن ثم بلغت ذروتها في الناصرة."

Semantic translation is more concrete and detailed than literal translation. The main difference between them is preserving the context of the source text. As the example we are translating is already detached from its context, the translation of this text using semantic translation will be the same as using literal translation.

The syntax, semantics and even the choice of words of the ST were preserved during the translation process. The words were very attached to the ST by reflecting the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL in order to preserve the author’s tone.

If semantic translation does not require cultural adaptation and gives the reader essential connotations only, how will the context be preserved without cultural adaptation? As culture is supposed to be part of the context. This illustrates that each method of translation is produced for certain reasons and for certain texts and does not apply to all texts. For example, Semantic translation takes place when the intimate flavor of the ST should be preserved, to preserve the author’s idiolects as in autobiographies. Or for texts which have communicative purposes (Newmark, 1981).

3.4 Overt Translation:

House (1977), the founder of the methods of 'overt' and 'covert' translation, defines overt translation as a mode of translation which does not need to be seen as an original text in the TL. According to her (1992), "the addressees of the translated text are quite 'overtly' not being directly addressed" (p. 66). The translation is very much concerned with the source text's cultural and historical context, as in the translation of literary and historical works, which seek to preserve the characteristics and cultural bounds of the original texts. According to overt translation, the translator should achieve an equivalent at the level of language, genre and register. The translator cannot exactly produce the same ST function in the TL since the two languages' origins and the individual function of the two texts differ significantly. Therefore the translator is only translating the linguistic units of the ST without any attempt to find a cultural equivalent. (House, 1977)

Furthermore, in her book (2015), House notes that in overt translation the ST is produced for a specific audience in a unique context. Therefore, the translator might look for a second level functional equivalent in the TT to make the function of the ST more obvious to the target language reader (TLR). In this way, the TLR will have more access to the ST because they are already aware that they are reading a translation.

House (2015) also discusses the sensitivity of overt translation, particularly in texts which have an important status in the source language and culture. The translator must try to keep the translation intact by giving the exact meaning and the necessary transfer to the TL. Thus finding the required equivalent is more difficult for the translator because he or she is conflicted between the preservation of the language and alteration for the source meaning.

The ST is produced for its society and culture, while also being of human interest and "independent of source language origin." It is also valuable in the ST community and other communities; therefore producing "a strict functional equivalent" is impossible via overt translation (House, 1977). One example of this is translating a historical document for an important event in the source's context. At first glance this task might seem easy for the translator, but the problem arises when the translator faces a dialectal issue which is related to that historical period or event. In this instance, the problem of topicalization arises in overt translation, where cultural specificity and uniqueness are more important than providing language user dimensions (House, 2015). After the translator analyzes the ST, and depending on the dimensional schemes (which are the language users and use, and their linguistic equivalents in the TL), the translator works to a TT which has the same dimensions in the TL (House, 1981).

In summary:

- Overt translation does not aim at producing an original text in the TL.

- It is very much concerned with preserving the ST culture, historical context and discourse world.

- The translator tries to make the ST function more obvious to the target reader, by achieving second level functional equivalence, at the level of language, genre and register.

- Translators work at achieving the same dimensional scheme (language users, the language use and their linguistic equivalents) in the TT as is in the ST.

- Overt translation results in an unnecessarily detailed new text, by producing excess meaning when compared to the ST (i.e. it focuses on the information rather than the communication).

Example 1 used by Gutt (1989) is going to be translated again according to the features of overt translation mentioned above.

"ولهذا فإننا نرى ان حقيقة ان عيسى يسمى ب "عيسى الناصرة" ليست سببا للشعور بالحرج.وانما، كما راينا، الله جلبه هناك بعدة خطوات، كل واحدة منها هو بنفسه وجهها ، في البداية، كما يتطلب ايماننا، في بيت لحم، ومن ثم بلغت ذروتها في الناصرة."

Preserving the ST culture, historic context, discourse world and information was done by preserving the word order of the ST without changing any of its information. This was done because it is not always easy for the translator to know the context of the ST. For instance, the ST is intended for a Christian culture as it talks about Jesus. Thus the context and its world discourse might be the history of Christianity and its culture as it appears in the ST.

To translate overtly, the translator does not have the right to predict anything about the ST because its function has to be preserved and the reader has to get access to the ST as it is. That is why the translated text is not different from the previous translated texts according to literal and semantic translation. The main difference between the previously mentioned semantic and literal methods from overt translation is preserving second level functional equivalence in the translation. For example, the reader of a text translated using overt translation should know that the text is a translation. But the source function cannot be achieved because the structure of the ST is preserved; instead second level functional equivalence is achieved.

3.5 Direct Translation:

Direct translation and indirect translation are the two contrasting methods of translation found by Gutt (1989) as instances of interlingual interpretive use. They appear in Hatim's book (2013). Their differences will become apparent when the methods and definition of each case are examined. Additionally, the importance of relevance and interpretation (i.e. contextual factors) and their functions in both direct and indirect translation will be discussed.

Direct translation coincides with the notion that translation must communicate the same meaning and stylistic affect as the original text when presented in direct speech (Gutt, 1989). Direct translation is dependent on several linguistic factors in the original text. These linguistic factors include the use of syntax (word structure), semantics (meaning in language), and lexicon (vocabulary and knowledge of the language).Therefore, it is safe to say that direct translation provides a more fixed concept of translation. Furthermore, it is a concept that is suited to sustaining all linguistic features of the original form (Gutt, 1989).

There is no doubt that the notion of communicative clues is always associated with direct translation. According to Gutt (1998) communicative clues are the properties included in the author's text to lead the reader to the intended interpretation of the text. Gutt (1998) clarifies that these communicative clues are not fundamental for a relevant theoretical account of translation. Communicative clues can be found in two places in the original text, and in the TT which is intended for a certain audience. Translating the communicative clues which were indecently used by the author might be problematic because the target audience might not have enough background about the source text's environment and information. Then producing the author's communicative clues would take a lot of assimilation effort from the target reader which would lead to misinterpretation of both texts. Therefore, Gutt suggests not to use communicative clues when translating.

With direct translation, there is a tendency to encounter a problem of mistranslation. This mistranslation is a language defect which still preserves the context and subject matter, hence why direct translation is subject to restrictions when translating non-literal speech (Gutt, 1981).

According to Gutt (1989) to consider an utterance in the TL as a direct translation depends on the translator's interpretation of the original. Interpreting this is done by sharing all the communicative clues in the ST, assessing the cognitive environment of the original communicator and verifying that they completely resemble the original interpretation of ST. This is not done according to the TT's linguistic resemblance with the source language, as languages do not match in their linguistic properties. Otherwise the result would not be a translation but an actual quote.

Gutt (1989) claims that preserving one function to achieve functional equivalent translation, as covert translation does, is not always successful since preserving one function causes the distortion of another function. This would make the translation nonequivalent in regard to other functions. As Vermeer and Reiss (1984) emphasize, having an adequate equivalent does not assure an adequate translation. Hence why Gutt developed direct and indirect translation.

To summarize direct translation has the following features:

- It reflects the same meaning and the same stylistic effect as the original.
- It depends on the interpretive use of the translator for the original

communicative clues of the ST.

- It does not preserve one function with the original as that causes the lack of equivalence with other functions.

These features will be applied to the translation of example 1:

"وعليه، فان تسمية المسيح بيسوع الناصري ليست بمنقصة. وانما، كما راينا، الله جلبه هناك بعدة خطوات، كل واحدة منها هو بنفسه وجهها ، في البداية، كما يتطلب ايماننا، في بيت لحم، ومن ثم بلغت ذروتها في الناصرة."

First of all, the syntax and the semantics of the ST are preserved by keeping the order of the ST words as much as the TL allows. For example, “Thus we see that the fact that Jesus is called 'Jesus of Nazareth' is no reason to be embarrassed” was translated like this:

ولهذا فإننا نرى ان حقيقة ان عيسى يسمى ب "عيسى الناصرة" ليست سببا للشعور بالحرج. وانما، كما راينا

Instead of

وهكذا نرى ان الحقيقة القائمة على ان السيد المسيح يحمل اسم "يسوع الناصري" ليس لها اي داع للشعور بالحرج

This is more appropriate and readable.

To translate according to direct translation the syntax and the semantics should be preserved. The only way to preserve the syntax in the example is by preserving the ST order, otherwise the text will be more of an indirect translation. At the same time direct translation depends on the translator's interpretation of the functional meaning of the source text, by not depending only on the linguistic interpretation. How the translator will translate the text in his own interpretation while preserving the ST syntax and semantics at the same time. This adds a new defect to the theories related to instructions while ignoring their application. If the translator is interpreting the translation according to his own cognitive interpretation she could be seen to be paraphrasing rather than translating.

3.6 Documentary Translation:

Nord (1991) introduced her translation typology as an elaborated version of House's and Reiss's, depending on the function of the TT.

Documentary translation is the translation which documents the "source culture" for the TLR. It documents a past communication between the author and the ST reader. The target reader is only an observer of that past communication. Therefore, many aspects of the ST are just reproduced without any attempt to change any of them in the TL context (Nord, 1991).

Documentary translation is like producing a text in the TL about the ST or about one or more aspects of the ST. It is documentary because it changes the communicative function of the source text, as there is no direct contact or communicative interaction between the author and the target readers (Nord, 1997).

Documentary translation consists of four forms; interlinear or word for word translation, literal translation, philological translation and exotic translation. All of them pay attention to the different aspects of the ST (Nord, 2001).

When the translation focuses on the syntax, morphology or on the lexical features, it is an interlinear or word for word translation. This type of translation occurs when the aim is to show the “structural features of one language by means of another”, or to reproduce the source language system, as in comparative linguistics or in language encyclopedias.

If the translator wants to reproduce the source language form, by the lexical units of source text, the syntactic structure and vocabulary norms of TL, he or she has to opt for literal translation. For example, this is done in the translation of quotations of news text, reported speeches of foreign politicians in newspaper articles, literary quotations in scholarly literature and intercultural studies for the languages which are not familiar to the reader (Nord, 2001).

When the translation is more literary, with an explanation for some ambiguities in a footnote or glossary, it reproduces the ST form, content and syntactical units. The translator may use philological translation, as in the translation of Greek and Latin classics, Bible translation or for the translation of a distant culture.

Exotic translation is the fourth form of documentary translation. It is when the translator wants to translate modern literary works by reproducing the ST form, content and situation, by preserving the textual units of the ST without changing the source culture (SC) of the fictional work. In this case it appears as a strange culture for the target audience. What is familiar for the ST audience is new information about the source culture, therefore it won't have the same function. (Nord, 2001)

Opting for documentary translation should be determined by the skopos (aim) of the TT. For example, the translator might think that documentary translation is the best for translating an opinion in the ST for a journal which requires the translator's fidelity and loyalty. The translator should look at his target audience and achieve an equifunctional instrumental translation to meet the aims of the TT. Analyzing the ST structure and meaning is one of the essential tasks for the translator to make him/her able to know what to keep and what to change (Schäffner, 2002).

The four types of documentary translation focus on producing a TT which keeps the ST syntax and wording as much as the TL allows. They are all literal translation but with different subsets for different text types. For example, to include footnotes not, or to translate modern literature or old Greek literary works. In the end the translator will opt for literal translation for all these types of texts in order to preserve the original features of the ST. Therefore the translation of the example this thesis has been using will not differ from the previous translations, as literal translation is the main type of documentary translation

After examining each translation method separately, the features of these methods are illustrated in the following table:

Direct	**Overt**	**Semantic**	**Documentary**	**Literal**
Same ST meaning	Not an original text in the TL, the TR has more access to the ST and its original function	Use the bare syntactic and semantic constrains of the TL to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author	It changes the communicative function of the ST to the aim of the translation.	Convey as much meaning from the ST to the TL as structure and syntax allow
Same ST stylistic effect.	The translator has a minimal right to change the fabric and the function of the ST	Preserve as much of the ST syntax and semantics as the TL allows	It documents the SC for the TLR.	It translates the ST out of its context
Maximal reproduction for ST content	Same ST language dimensions in the TT: language users, language use ad their linguistic correlates	Preserves the ST culture, it gives the reader essential connotations only	The TR is only an observer for a past communication between the author and the ST reader	
Preserve ST linguistic factors	Specific, it produces more details than the ST	Focuses on the content and the message not the form	Many aspects of the ST are just transferred without any change.	
Very specific to ST details: may cause misinterpretatio ns	The focus is on information rather than communication especially when it’s difficult to find cultural equivalence, then the translator translates the linguistic units without finding cultural equivalence	Its specific, the meaning is more important than the language	It includes four forms choosing any of them depends on the aim of the TT.	

	Cultural specificity is more important than providing language users dimensions like translating political speeches.	Fidelity to the ST is prioritized over good language	The translator needs to analyze the ST structure and meaning to know what to keep and what to change.	
	It preserves ST historical and cultural context and characteristics	Any deviation in the SL norms should be reflected in the translation		
	The function of the TT differs from the ST.	Objective. Very close to ST collocation and structure		
		The TR is the same type of SR		
		Important statements should be preserved as closer to the ST structure regardless of the effect on the TR		
		No cultural adaptation, the duty of the reader is to get the author’s meaning		
		Respect the context of the ST		
		It depends on the text type and the ST meaning not the reader		

The method of CA will be applied to the features of the five translation methods mentioned above, to see where they are same, where they overlap and where they differ.

Feature	Direct	Overt	Semantic	Documentary	Literal
Convey as much of the ST meaning as possible	+	+	+	+	+
Maximum reproduction for ST content and style	+	+	+	+	+
Achieve linguistic equivalence (syntactic equivalence)	+	+	+	+	+
Objective, very specific to ST details	+	+	+	+	+
May cause misinterpretation	+	+	+	+	+
TR knows it's a translation	+	+	+	+	+
TR has access to ST function		-			
Same ST language dimension language users, the language use and their linguistic equivalents.		+			-
Focus on information more than communication	+	+	+	+	+
Culture specificity. No cultural adaptation	+	+	+	+	+
Preserves ST context and characteristics	+	+	+	+	-
The function of the ST differs from that of the TT	+	+	+	+	+
Loyalty is more to author	+	+	+	+	-
Loyalty is more to SL norms	+	+	-	+	+
Gives the reader essential connotations only	+		+	+	+
Meaning and loyalty to ST is more important than language	+	+	+	+	-
Achieve equivalent effect	+	+	+		
Any deviation from SL norms should be reflected in the TT	+	+	+	+	+
Change the communicative function of the ST	+	+	+	+	+
The Skopos of the translation decides its translation method.	-	-	-	+	-

The table above proves the existence of overlap between the different methods mentioned. For example, the five methods focus on information more than communication. They try to reproduce the ST content and semantic meaning as much as they can. Firstly, overt translation tries to convey the meaning and content of the source text, since the translator has a minimal right to change the function, the fabric and the language dimension of the ST. Documentary translation also tries to convey the ST meaning and content as much as possible by transferring many aspects in the ST without changing them. Overt translation also produces the same stylistic effect of the ST by preserving its language dimensions. The linguistic correlates of the ST include its stylistic effects as well.

Documentary translation documents the ST for the TR since he or she is only an observer of the past communication between the author and the STR. So the translator tries to keep as many of the ST's stylistic characteristics as possible to show them to the TR.

Overt and direct translation may cause misinterpretation, because they are very specific. Sometimes they over-translate by reflecting every single detail. They are also very attached to ST syntax, semantics and linguistic corollaries. Overt translation focuses on the information rather than the communication. Therefore, the TR may have a problem digesting the ST meaning and its new information.

Semantic translation is the same; it may cause misinterpretation since it is very attached to the ST structure, syntax, culture and to the meaning of the author. It also gives the TR essential connotations only. Thus, the TR may not understand the text or may understand it in a different way. Documentary translation also causes misinterpretation for the TR, because the TR is supposed to be only an observer for a past communication between the author and the STR. Literal translation causes misinterpretation too, detaching the ST from its context. In the five types of translation, the TR knows that he or she is reading a translation, since the TR has access to the ST and an awareness of the translator's high degree of fidelity to the ST. The TR for documentary translation has access to the ST, but he's only an observer in viewing the authentic communication in the ST. The TR can thus access the ST function. In contrast, the TR of literal translation has no access to the ST, because it might be not clear enough for the TR when it is translated out of the ST context. Additionally, the translator of the literal translation might change the ST function without being aware that by translating out of the ST context the TR will lose out on the ST fidelity. The translator of direct and semantic translation has a minimal right to change the ST function; because its main focus is to keep the ST stylistic factors, content and linguistics, as well as, fidelity to the ST function. On the other hand, documentary translation changes the communicative function of the ST, because there is no direct or indirect communication between the author and the TR. Direct translation focuses on the ST details, prioritizing the ST culture is one of the most important details which preserves the traits of the ST.

Although these five methods have many similarities, they still have slight and subtle differences. For example, literal translation might overlap, but when you go further into its aspects, it does not. It does not preserve the ST context, and if the context is not preserved, the meaning function and effect of the ST, and the meaning of the author will not be reflected in the translation. This is the main difference between literal translation and direct, overt and documentary translation.

The basic difference between semantic and literal translation is that semantic translation respects the context of the ST while literal translation does not (Newmark, 1981). Loyalty to the author of the ST (i.e. maintaining the true message of the text) also plays a major role in differentiating between both terms. In semantic translation loyalty is paid to the author while in literal translation loyalty is paid to the source language norms (Newmark, 1981, p. 63).

Direct and overt translations are similar. The main difference between them is that overt translation is the only type which aims at achieving second level functional equivalence by paying the most attention to the reader and keeping the ST function only, rather than any other aspects of the ST. In contrast, direct translation depends on the Relevance Theory, and tries to make the translation as relevant to the target reader as possible, by not only focusing on the function.

Direct and semantic translations are the same except with regard to loyalty to SL norms. Semantic translation prioritizes the author rather than the SL norms, while direct translation prioritizes SL norms rather than the meaning of the author.

Direct and documentary translations have many similarities. The major difference is that documentary translation considers the aim of the translation as the most important aspect which has to be taken in consideration, rather than the function or the effect. Still, it is sometimes hard to distinguish between the aim of the translation and its function or effect. For example, in advertising the aim is to promote a product; this is only obtainable through changing the TR's perception or mental representation about how reality should be. So, promoting a product is never achievable except through changing mental representation. So both, to me, look very much like each other.

Overt and semantic translations only differ in that overt wants to achieve second level functional equivalence while semantic translation doesn't. Furthermore, semantic translation prefers the author over the SL norms, while overt favors SL norms.

Overt translation wants to achieve second level functional equivalence which is considered as the main difference between overt translation and semantic, direct and documentary translation.

Second level functional equivalence is achieved when the same function of the ST is produced for the TR, without making it closer to the TR's culture. Because, the TR would not understand the TT in the same way the SR understood it. But, when it comes to the text itself the same text would be produced if it was translated according to direct, semantic or documentary translation.

The main difference between semantic and documentary translation is that documentary translation does not reflect ST language dimensions, while semantic translation does. Additionally, documentary translation focuses on the aim of the translation while semantic focuses on the author of the ST.

After clarifying the similarities and the differences among these methods, it was clear that the difference in each method was in favor of the author, the reader, the aim of the translation, the function of the translation, the context of the ST or the translation's relevance to the audience. The differences in these methods were created in order to resolve the problem of creating one comprehensive model and to end the hesitation about which translation should dominate: literal or free translation, beautiful or faithful translation, the author or the reader, the source language or the TL.

The four scholars who created these methods were aware of the fact that their methods might overlap. Therefore, they clarified how each method is unique in one aspect which is absent in other theories. For example, semantic translation by Newmark (1981) arose to fill the gap of literal translation ignoring context. While direct translation by Gutt (1989) depended on Relevance Theory and the interpretive use of language to fill the gap of House's (1977) overt translation which focuses on translation quality assessment and functional equivalence. Finally, documentary translation, by Nord (1991), depends on Skopos theory to determine the goal of the translation. All of them sought to reach a well-developed model that would work in the translation needs of many types of texts. But as this thesis seeks to prove the overlap among these methods, it reached to the fact that there is no comprehensive model that covers all aspects of translation, working across all type of texts. Instead, each effectively covers only one aspect and ignores the rest.

Furthermore, when it comes to application, the aspects of each method are even more complicated than the process of translation itself. For example, House (1986) used the term “language dimensions” to refer to the language users, language use, linguistic corollaries and equivalents. When translating overtly, the translator tries to reflect ST language dimensions in the translation House (1977). Respecting the context of the ST means transferring these language dimensions, since context consists of both these dimensions and those used in semantic translation as well. Thus the translator starts wondering if these methods are applicable to facilitate the translation process or even make it worse. Semantic translation focuses on the context Newmark (1981), but if the context of the ST was not available, the translator would only have the source text. Overt translation wants to produce a functional equivalent House (1977). But it’s even more difficult for the translator to define functional equivalence. Also it’s not possible to focus on one function and ignore other functions and measure the quality of the translation by depending only on its functional equivalent. It looks very strict and reflects how House is affected by the strict German culture. Indirect translation wants the text to be relevant to the target audience (Gutt, 1991), but it can also be relevant by preserving the function. Documentary translation focuses on the goal of translation Nord (1991), and instead of adding a new thing it gathers the four methods in one form. In the end, the function, relevance and goal of translation without ignoring the context are all related. It's not beneficial to have a separate model for each of them, a comprehensive model would be of more benefit instead. Additionally, the scholars who found these methods applied them to certain types of text, like advertisements and tourist booklets since the function and the effect required from these texts is clear. They did not apply these models to a variety of texts.

The ST has to be translated according to TL structure. When the translator is asked to translate according to the features of the five methods, he may find that some of these features are theoretical and insignificant in the translation process. For example, how will he or she reflect the ST's function or aim when the translator does not know its context and has to be very loyal to the ST's syntax. Then again he might start thinking of the difference between the aim and the function of the translation and the same problem of the methods overlapping will arise again.

In addition to the theorists' recognition of the differences and similarities among their methods, their results are different when it comes to application. All of the translation methods mentioned above treat the translated paragraph in the same way as they all want to preserve the ST syntax, word structure, order, style, fidelity to author, information and ST context. Even if the main difference between literal translation and other methods is preserving the context of the source text, sometimes, the translator is asked to translate a ST without context. That is why the TT does not differ when translated using literal translation or any other equivalent translation methods. On the other hand, sometimes translating literally might produce an awkward translated text, since translating literally does not depend on interpreting the ST or understanding it; it just deals with words. When the same example was translated depending on the five translation methods mentioned above, the result was the same for all. When it was translated literally the word order and the structure of the translated text were highly affected, since literal translation ignores the context and is very attached to source language norms as in: أالله جلبه هناك، عيسى الناصرة. On the other hand the same elements were affected when translating the text according to the rest of the methods, as they all want to preserve context, function, goal, elements of the source text, the historical culture and the order of the source text. The only resort for the translator to achieve that is the structure, the grammar, the word order, and the choice of word in the translated text, then the same elements were affected again since context is absent and the same elements will be targeted again as they are the things the translator can work on translating, as in الله جلبه هناك، عيسى الناصرة، كل واحدة منهم هو بنفسه وجهها.

The most difficult part when applying these methods to the example mentioned above was when I tried to highlight the difference in each method in the translation. For instance, to translate covertly I had to focus on the functional equivalence of the ST and produce it in the translation. However, the only choice I had was the choice of words in order to save the function of the text. But that was not the main problem, after dealing with direct translation; I had to address Relevance Theory in order to make the translation relevant to the target audience. And I had the same problem for documentary translation when I had to translate the text according to its aim the difference between the function and the aim was not clear. If I want the audience to react to something when reading the translation, I can change the words only in order to produce certain functions on the audience. For example, the illocutionary function of 'turn on the light' is to give the reader an order to do an action. So the aim or the goal is turning on the light and the function is also the same. That leads to the conclusion that function and goal can sometimes be the same in some kinds of texts. On the other hand, if I want to make the translation relevant to the reader, I also have to choose words that are close to the target reader in order to fulfill the function or the "aim" of the text. Then again the three of them lead to the same result and same action which is turning the light on. Furthermore, the function or the aim can be clear in certain types of texts only. For instance, those texts which have orders, or want the reader to react toward something like advertisements and tourism brochures. That's why the scholars who found these methods applied them on these kinds of text. But if the text was declarative or history or literature, how will that difference be clear? Therefore the main differences between these methods are just theoretical and have no significant consequences on application.

The other five overlapping translation methods are free, covert, communicative, indirect and instrumental translation. They will be defined and discussed separately in the following part. They all have redundant and mutual aspects; as they all aim at producing a readable, natural TT which satisfies the target reader. Additionally, the example mentioned in the previous chapter will be translated again according to each method separately. After that, the characteristics of the methods will be summarized and compared in order to determine whether they are similar or not, and if not what are the differences between them.

3.7 Free translation:

As it appears in Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), free translation is defined as the TL oriented type of translation which focuses on producing natural acceptable readable text, rather than preserving the ST wording. According to Barkhudarove (1969) free translation preserves the content while also preserving the TL norms. Regarding the unit of translation, free translation is unbounded; it can be anything up to the sentence level or more. Even if the content of the ST can be reproduced satisfactorily on the level of the word, the translator has more flexibility when translating freely because with free translation, the translator can diverge from the ST by producing a text according to how he or she understands the ST or according to the reason of the translation (Blanchot, 1990). Free translation aims to preserve the ST's content unchanged, but preserving TL norms is the most important priority. It is loose; that is the translator has more choices as she or he can move further away from the ST and produce a smaller or a larger unit of translation.

Example 1 will be translated according to the features of free translation mentioned above.

وعليه، ندرك ان تسمية عيسى (عليه السلام) بعيسى الناصري ليست بمنقصة. بل بعكس ذلك، كما رأينا سابقا، فقد أتى الله به الى هنالك على عدة مراحل قد امر بها جميعها، مبتدأ، كما تنص العقيدة المسيحية، في بيت لحم، ومنتهيا في الناصرة.

This translation implies several key features of free translation, for instance the word choice and method of interpretation. As previously stated, free translation is loose and the translator has the freedom to deviate from the ST as much as they need to. This is clear through the choice of words which are more relevant to Islamic culture like: عيسى عليه السلام. Also the TT shows that the translator wants the text to be applicable to Muslim culture by using عليه السلام and the word اللهinstead of الربand ألدين المسيحي instead of ديننا. Additionally, the TT preserves the norms by staying loyal to the grammar and the structure of the TL in order to look acceptable and natural. For example, the sentence always begins with the verb as in:

يمكننا أن ننظر إلى

and using

بعيسى الناصري

instead of

عيسى الناصرة.

and using

استدعاه الله هنالك

instead of

الله استدعاه هناك

This is understandable but not always preferable if the agent was not defined.

3.8 Covert Translation:

Covert translation is one of the translation models that appear in House's (1977) model of translation quality assessment.

House (1977) defines covert translation as the translation which enjoys the status of an original text in the target culture, while the target audience does not know that they are reading a translated text. The translator has to produce a TT which is relevant to the new audience as much as it's relevant to the ST audience, by producing a functionally equivalent text. The new translated text, which looks original in the TL, applies to the TL culture, audience and norms by removing anything that reminds the reader of the source text's environment, origin and "language use" and replacing it with applicable things in the target culture. It is not necessary to have the same audience and culture for the source and TT. Each text might have its own readership therefore the ST does not have to be attached to its cultural context. Doing that does not mean deviating from the genre, function, linguistic and cultural framework of the source text. Meanwhile the translator has to amend the text through utilizing a cultural filter that may require fundamental adaptations of language and/or register.

Covert translation is of non-cultural link. Both texts have equal interests, importance, aims and needs for both languages' addressees. Covert translation aims at producing situational dimensional equivalence by producing a TT which is functionally similar to the source text. The text function is realized by the situational dimensions of language users, language use and their linguistic correlates. Thus the main aim of covert translation is to achieve an equivalent TT in terms of the source text's function and context. It can apply if the stance of the author lacks clarity in the TT by modifying the tenor and field.

Therefore, pragmatic equivalence is more important than the semantic equivalence because it deals with the communicative function of the text.

This definition by House (1977) has two contradictions. Firstly, if the ST does not have to be attached to its cultural context, how will the translator be able to not deviate from the source text's cultural framework? Secondly, as it is about pragmatics, and context is as significant, then how the translation could be functional and non-cultural at the same time?

Culture is background knowledge about conventions. Knowledge is a part of context. Therefore culture is part of context. So it cannot be functional and non-cultural at the same time.

Covert translation aims at achieving functional equivalence, but it is not achieved easily because of the difference in the social background for the source and the target audience. On the other hand, how will the translator know whether his translation was functionally equivalent or not? House's model does not answer any of the evaluation questions between the two texts; as the only measurement for the quality of the TT is the comparison to the source text. (Gutt, 1989)

Gutt (1989) argues that maintaining the function of the ST is not enough to make the translation functionally equivalent. For example, preserving the flattery function in the translation for the tourist booklet may make the translation inadequate to other functions. Gutt (1989) supports his claim by referring to Vermeer and Reiss (1984), to show how serious the problem of measuring the quality of translation by comparing it to the function of the ST only or "functional equivalence" is. From the readers point of view, all that they are looking for in a tourist booklet is relevant information to them and to their plans, not functional equivalence. Therefore having the same copy of the ST is not what is required for the audience and might not be communicative for them. Therefore Gutt thinks that depending on a purely relevant background is more significant than depending on theoretical concepts to discuss the similarities and differences between the source and the TT (Gutt, 1989).

Covert translation is better for texts that are not enveloped by their source's cultural and historical context, such as advertisements, tourist's booklets, technical texts, company letters, UNICCO articles and journalism (House, 1977).

To translate covertly, the translator has to analyze the ST according to the dimensional scheme and the degree to which the ST isn't compatible with the TT's dimensional scheme. This degree of incompatibility reflects the inadequacy of the TT's quality, and therefore this text is translated covertly (House, 1981).

Covert translation is the only type of translation that aims to achieve functional equivalence. Functional equivalence is not achieved easily because of the differences in the social background of the source and the target audience. Moreover, how will the translator know that his translation was functionally equivalent or not? House's model does not answer any of the evaluation questions between the two texts. The only measurement for the quality of the TT is the comparison to the ST (Gutt, 1989).

House (1986) claims functional equivalence is measuring the quality of translation by comparing it to the function of the source text. However, Gutt (1989) argues that maintaining the function of the ST is not enough to make the translation functionally equivalent. For example, preserving the flattery function in the translation for a tourist booklet may make the translation inadequate to other functions. Gutt (1989) supports his claim by referring to Vermer and Reiss (1984) to show how serious the problem of "functional equivalence" is.

From the reader’s point of view, all that they are looking for in a tourist booklet is relevant information for them and their plans not for functional equivalence. Therefore having the same copy of the STis not what is required for the audience and might not be communicative for them. Sometimes depending on a purely relevant background is more significant than depending on theoretical concepts to discuss the similarities and differences between the source and the TT, such as equivalence or faithfulness (Gutt, 1989).

In brief, and following the discussion above, covert translation produces a translated text which enjoys the status of an original text in the TC, by removing anything that might remind the reader of the ST’s environment and origin. It employs a cultural filter to achieve equivalent function and context. It aims to reproduce the ST’s linguistic, cultural framework, function and genre in the TT, without revealing the discourse world of the ST to the TR, since the target audience might be different. Covert translation takes place when the stance of the author lacks clarity in the TT by modifying tenor, field and genre.

Example 1 will be translated again according to the features of covert translation mentioned above:

"وعليه، ندرك ان تسمية عيسى (عليه السلام) بعيسى الناصري ليست بمنقصة. بل بعكس ذلك، كما رأينا سابقا، فقد أتى الله به الى هنالك على عدة مراحل قد امر بها جميعها، مبتدأ، كما تنص العقيدة المسيحية، في بيت لحم، ومنتهيا في الناصرة."

The translation addresses the target reader as an original text for them and not a translation. "Cultural specificity" is related to this translation because it takes the meaning of the culture into account when translating by choosing the words which are related to Christianity like using المسيح and يسوع الناصري and الرب in addition to the word ديننا instead of الدين المسيحي.

3.9 Communicative translation:

Newmark (1981) defines communicative translation as a mode which seeks to produce the same effect on the TLR as was produced by the original on the source language reader by keeping the original function of the source text. The main focus of communicative translation is the reader, who is expected to read the translated text without any difficulties or obstacles and accepts any foreign transfer to his culture or language.

Hervey and Higgins (1992) use communicative translation to refer to cultural transposition. They define it as free translation, when the translator uses a target cultural equivalent instead of a literal translation. Communicative translation is always necessary when literal translation is impossible as in translating communicative clichés (figures of speech). Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) define communicative translation as a term which deals with translation as a communicative process that takes place within a social context. It treats the ST as a message and not a linguistic unit, in order to meet the needs of the TLR and to reproduce its effect on the TL audience.

According to Pergnier (1980), the linguistic parameters which are the ST words and context have to be considered when translating communicatively, regardless of the text type.

In contrast, Roberts (1985) argues that preserving the ST wording causes the distortion of the message. However, communicative translation preserves the wording while also preserving the context. Hence the meaning isn't distorted. Furthermore, the priority of communicative translation is forming the message of the original in a way that conforms to the cultural pragmatic factors and the norms of the TL, rather than saving the word order of the original.

Spilka (1985) believes that the ST message consists of the words and the context in which it occurs, in addition to the non-linguistic parameters that have to be persevered. These non-linguistic parameters are the source, the originator of the message, the intended receptor, the object or purpose of communication and the vector on the special and the temporal circumstances in which the translation was produced.

According to Newmark (1981) the translator has the freedom to interpret the ST to overcome its ambiguities, correct factual errors and smooth out irregularities of style, since these errors may decrease the semantic properties, identity and taste of the source text. The ultimate goal is to fulfill one specific communicative purpose that fits the TLR. Therefore, communicative translation might be the best option for the vast majority of texts, particularly journalistic writing, public notices and non-literary genres.

Newmark believes that the reader is always the winner in the conflict of loyalty between the ST and the TT. He also suggests a solution for this conflict by changing the terms from literal to faithful and then to semantic translation. He also changed the term free translation to idiomatic and then to communicative translation. Does this mean that literal is the same as semantic and free is the same as communicative?

Semantic and communicative translation may coincide if the matter is as important as the manner, or when the message is general and the TLR is as interested as the source language reader. In other words, in some instances they might be the same. This may happen in a religious, philosophical, artistic or scientific text. Regardless of the text type however, any quotation must be translated semantically, even if the fidelity of that quote is compromised due to the distortion of the literal translation (Newmark, 1981).

In summary, communicative translation is a communicative process. It occurs within a social context to produce the same effect as the ST on the TR. It does this by keeping the function of the ST to allow the TR to read the TT without difficulties. To produce a communicative text the non-linguistic parameters of translation should be considered. The message has to be reproduced in a way that confirms the TL norms and the cultural pragmatic factors. The translator has the freedom to interpret the ST and to correct factual errors to improve the original text. He also has the right to remove the identity taste of the ST to achieve the communicative purpose and make the cultural content of the original more applicable and readable to the TR. As the ST is the foundation of the translation the translator has to respect loyalty to it. This is done by documenting the changes in a footnote.

Example1 will be translated again, by applying the features of communicative translation mentioned above.

"وهكذا نرى ان الحقيقة القائمة على ان السيد المسيح يحمل اسم "يسوع الناصري" ليس لها اي داعٍ للشعور بالحرج. بالأحرى، فقد اتى به الله عبر عدد من الخطوات التي اقدم على اتباعها فكانت البداية في بيت لحم كما هو مذكور في ديننا ومن ثم توجت في الناصرة"

This translation tries to keep the function and the effect of the ST so that it can be reproduced again on the target reader. In this case the ST's function is to bring the story of Jesus to more people. The fact that this text was produced for a Christian community is shown by the phrase "our belief" in the source text, and its function is to raise awareness about Christianity. The function and effect were preserved by choosing words which are related to Christian culture like:

"يسوع الناصري"

Additionally, the words and the structure of the translated text are clear and easy to understand as they conform to the TL norms and culture. This helps to keep the effect on the target reader, as the reader reads the translated text without difficulties. For example, the structure of this sentence which starts with the verb then the agent

اتى به الله عبر عدد من الخطوات

3.10 Indirect translation:

Indirect translation is the approach found by Gutt (1989) as a part of the Relevance Theory, which was a result of the covert and overt translation by House, and its strict functional equivalent.

Indirect translation is more of an "interpretive approach" than a prescriptive one (Gutt, 1989). A receptor style language content presented in an indirect manner of translation would be processed on minimal assumptions in terms of the resemblance with the original content. This is a contrast to the maximal assumptions presented by direct translation. Indirect translation involves the maximization of relevance for the audience, since translators are involved in changes they see as being necessary. These specific changes bring forth the idea that indirect translation is in favor of communicating in a more "natural" method (Ibid).

As previously mentioned regarding the misinterpretation which may occur in direct translation, there are several problems that arise in indirect translation as well. For example, when translating texts it is required to represent 'what' is exactly being said. Furthermore, they must represent specific contextual values and recreate 'how' it is being said. This can be further explained by the fact that it is not solely in terms of content, as in a "word-for-word" approach. It requires a technical approach, as the linguistic style must be accounted for (Ibid).

When using indirect translations of speech, a "looser degree of faithfulness" is involved, meaning that a less structured degree of relevance is derived. Indirect translation is subject to interpretation as well as the principle of relevance with respect to the original content. This allows one to create a presumptive translation whereby the interpretation that follows will be sufficiently relevant when processing the choices in translation of speech.

Consequently, when a communicator is involved in an indirect excerpt, the communicator will tend to communicate the assumptions of the original interpretation that they believe to be most appropriately compatible in terms of relevance to the original text. Thus indirect translation is seen as more of an "interpretive approach" rather than a prescriptive one.

If the translator wants to translate indirectly he or she should decide on the contextual effect, the audience information processing and the linguistic resemblance (Gutt, 1989).

Indirect translation is more of an "interpretive approach" than a prescriptive one (Ibid). It is based on the Relevance Theory. It has minimal assumptions in terms of the resemblance with the ST and maximum focus on the audience.

Example1 will be translated again, by applying the features of indirect translation mentioned above.

وعليه، ندرك ان تسمية عيسى (عليه السلام) بعيسى الناصري ليست بمنقصة. بل بعكس ذلك، كما رأينا سابقا، فقد أتى الله به الى هنالك على عدة مراحل قد امر بها جميعها، مبتدأ، كما تنص العقيدة المسيحية، في بيت لحم، ومنتهيا في الناصرة.

This text has to be translated according to indirect translation by following all the characteristics of it which are paying attention to the audience and interpreting the ST according to the translator's own interpretation of it. But if the translator can translate the text in the way he understands or desires then how will the new text be a translation? The result would be a new text and the translation will be as loose as free translation is. But when it comes to application, the translator faces the difficulty of bringing the features into application. Thus he or she starts working on the most understandable and easiest features. Indirect translation depends on the translator's interpretation of the ST, to make it more relevant to the target reader. When I read the STI assumed that it was produced for a Christian community and aims at clarifying facts about Jesus. I also assumed that I was translating it to Arab Christians. Therefore I decided to use words and produce the structure of the text according to the Arabic language as closely as possible. For example, I chose the words (يسوع الناصري، الرب، ديننا) to prove that the result of the translated text using the previously mentioned translation methods may overlap if the reason for translation is the same. On the other hand the structure of the TT is not a big issue because the most important thing is to make the TT relevant to the TR through producing an acceptable text which incidentally applies to TL structure. Again in this case the reason for the translation is producing a text related to Christian community. If I also want to decide on another goal for translating, for instance, producing a text for the Arab Muslim community, that would be possible too, as indirect translation aims to make the translation relevant to the target audience. The choice of words would then be different. For example, saying عيسى عليه السلام، الله تعالى، الدينالمسيحيMoreover, when the translator wants to make the text relevant to the TR, he has to activate a cultural filter which will make the TT acceptable and understandable. Making the text relevant can be achieved by asking different questions. For example, what is the aim of the translation? Who is the target reader? What do they expect from the translation? What function will the translation have among the target readers? And what background do the readers have about the source and the target culture? All of that is related to the functional equivalence in covert translation and to the skopos of translation in instrumental translation and to communicative translation by producing a communicative text. Then, the translator will face the same problem of overlapping methods again and again.

3.11 Instrumental Translation:

Instrumental translation is defined by Nord (1991) as ensuring the TT functions in the target culture similarly to how the ST functions in the source culture. The target reader is not aware of the fact that he or she is reading a translation or text which was used in a different culture by different recipients. This translation is a communicative tool in itself, depending on the ST's function, rather than being a document for a past communicative action between the source text's recipients and the author

As appears in Nord's (2001) book *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*, instrumental translation is subdivided into three types according to its function. Firstly, it either keeps or changes the communicative function of the ST, secondly, it may have a similar or a different function from the source text, or lastly, that function can be determined by the relationship it has between the source and the target reader.

If it has the same function as the ST and the readers are not aware or even interested in the fact that they are reading a translation, then it is named "a function-preserving translation" or "equifunctional translation" (P.47). Often this kind of translation uses clichés and standardized formulas, as in translating instructions, technical texts and tourist information.

When there is a difference between the source and TT function, for example, the ST function cannot be realized in the translation, the translator can adapt a correspondent function which correlates with the author's intention. Another option is to change the satirical function of the ST into an entertaining function in the TT to make it suit the target audience. This type of translation is named "Heterofunctional translation," like translating fiction and plays. For example, when the translator is translating a play for the working class in the source country he has to change the references to the working class in the target country to match the situation for the target audience and make the general appellative function the same as the source text.

Finally, a "corresponding translation" is a "literary translation" which aims to achieve a similar effect and function in the TT as in ST. For example, this is used in the translation of poetry. When the translator translates the hexameter of old Greek poetry into English he should not translate it into English hexameter. Rather he should keep it in the old Greek hexameter since it has its own skopos (Nord, 2001). This is why it is excluded from the proper translation, but rather justified as another form of intercultural transfer.

The concept of instrumental translation by Nord does not mean ignoring the concept of loyalty. Nord (1997) paid a lot of attention to the concept of loyalty. She noted that it requires the translator to mediate between the two cultures without any bias.

To summarize, instrumental translation is a method which depends on how the TT is intended to function in the target culture, without ignoring the loyalty for both cultures and texts. It aims to achieve the same function of the ST, and to appear as an original text in the TL. The process of instrumental translation is considered a communicative instrument in its own right depending on the ST's communicative function.

Example 1 below is going to be translated depending on the characteristics of instrumental translation:

"وهكذا نرى ان الحقيقة القائمة على ان السيد المسيح يحمل اسم "يسوع الناصري" ليس لها اي داع للشعور بالحرج. بالأحرى، فقد اتى به الرب عبر عدد من الخطوات التي اقدم على اتباعها فكانت البداية في بيت لحم كما هو مذكور في ديننا ومن ثم توجت في الناصرة"

The example was translated according to each method separately and not at the same time, to make sure that I would not produce a similar text. But nonetheless this text again looks like the previous texts. I believe this is because this translation aims to look original in the TL and aims at mediating between both cultures, and I still assume the same function, which is producing a new text related to the Arab Christian culture. In order for the text to look original in the TL and not to look like a translation, it has to match with the grammar and the structure of the TL and to use common words and collocation in the target culture. Therefore when translating, I tried to make the translated text as close to the structure of Arabic language as possible by focusing on the sentence structure which starts with the verb as in اتى به الرب عبر عدد من الخطوات and choosing words that are related to the target culture like saying ديننا instead of الدين المسيحي and using بالأحرى instead of انما.

On the other hand, if the translator was not translating this text for Christians, but instead for Muslims, how would the translator make the translation loyal and culturally acceptable in the same time? Does that mean if the text is from one Christian culture to another it would be loyal? And if it is translated from a Christian culture to a Muslim culture it wouldn't be loyal? Then the question of loyalty is raised again. How is it possible to achieve loyalty to cultures and languages when translating across different cultures if the goal is to make the translation function in the target culture?

The features of the translation methods mentioned above are summarized in this table below as follows:

Indirect (audience)	**Covert (function)**	**Communicative (TR effect)**	**Instrumental (Purpose)**	**Free (loose)**
subjective, includes a looser degree of faithfulness	enjoys the status of an original ST in the TC, by removing everything that reminds the reader of the ST culture and environment	Communicative process occurs within a social context to produce the same effect of the ST on the TR to fulfill their needs.	Depends on how the TT is intended to function in the TC, without ignoring loyalty for both cultures and texts by mediating between them.	It preserves the content unchanged
the translator interprets the ST in various ways, but with relevance to the ST with the style needed	utilizes cultural filter and fundamental adaptation of language and register	Preserves the function of the ST.	Aims to be an original text in the TC, the reader should not know that he or she is reading a translation.	It's loose, the translator can move further away from the ST
maximum relevance for the audience	it achieves TT equivalent in terms of ST function and context	It deals with the ST as a message	Where possible it has to achieve the function and effect of the ST in the TT.	The unit of translation can be bigger or smaller than the original text.
communication in a more natural method	reproduces the ST linguistic and function in the TT, without revealing the ST discourse world to the TR	TR should read without difficulties	Sometime the translator cannot achieve the same function as the ST; therefore he has to adopt a function relevant to the author's intention.	Preserves the TL norms.

has minimal resemblance and certainty	ST and TT text might have their own audience and culture, and represent their individual rhetoric separately.	The TT should be produced in a way that conforms to the TL norms and its cultural pragmatic factors.		
gives a subtle feel to the translation	takes place when the stance of the author lacks clarity in the TT	It's a subjective procedure. The translator has the freedom to interpret the ST, to correct its factual errors, and to remove or improve its identity, in order to make the cultural content of the original more applicable.		
	modifies ST tenor, field and genre	The translator has to be loyal to the ST by documenting the changes in a footnote		
	the text function is realized by the situational dimensions of language users, language use and their linguistic correlates	It focuses on form rather than content		
	achieves semantic and pragmatic equivalence which connects the linguistic units together in a communicative way for the language users	It aims to achieve: equivalent effect, same syntax and target cultural equivalence.		

	it deals with the communicative function of the text	TT should be read as an original especially if the ST is a complicated one.		
	it’s of a non-cultural link	The translator should measure the intelligence of the TR		
	To translate covertly; the translator has to analyze the ST according to the dimensional scheme and degree to which the ST isn’t compatible with the TT’s dimensional scheme, this degree reflects the inadequacy of the TT’s quality			
	on the level of text/language, and register the translation doesn’t need to be equivalent with its original			

The method of CA will be applied on the features of the five translation methods mentioned above, to see where they seem to be the same, where they overlap and where they differ.

Feature	**Indirect**	**Covert**	**Communicative**	**Instrumental**	**Free**
subjectivity	+	+	+	+	+
the translator interprets the ST in various relevant ways Flexibility	+	+	+	+	+
maximum relevance for the audience	+	+	+	+	+
Naturalness	+	+	+	+	+
Communication is more important than information	+	+	+	+	+
enjoys the status of an original ST in the TC	+	+	+	+	+
Removes everything that reminds the reader of the ST culture and environment	+	+	+	+	+
Cultural filter (target cultural equivalence)	+	+	+	+	+
Functional equivalent TT	+	+	+	+	+
Contextual equivalent TT	+	+	+	+	+
ST and TT might have different audience, culture and rhetoric	+	+	+	+	+
Takes place when the stance of the author lacks clarity in TT	+	+	+	+	+
It modifies ST genre, tenor, field, text and register	+	+	+	+	+
Same effect of the ST on the TR (equivalent effect)	+	+	+	+	+
The non-linguistic factors in the ST should be considered	+	+	+	+	+
The translator documents the changes in a footnote	-	-	+	-	-
Syntactic equivalent	-	-	+	-	-
The translator should measure the intelligence of the TR	-	-	+	-	-
The TT is intended to function in a certain way in the TC, without ignoring loyalty for both cultures and texts by mediating between them.	+	+	+	+	-
If the translator cannot achieve the same function of the ST, therefore he has to adopt a function relevant to the author's intention	+	+	+	+	+

After discussing the similarities and differences for the first five overlapping methods that have more attachment toward the source text, it was easier to figure out the similarities and differences among the second group of terms that focus more on the target reader.

First of all, free translation differs from indirect, covert, communicative and instrumental translation in its lack of faithfulness. It tries to be attached to the ST but with a loose degree of faithfulness that makes it lack syntactic and contextual equivalence.

Newmark (1981) highlights House's distinction between covert and overt translation by referring to covert as communicative and overt as semantic. This proves that he is aware of the overlap between these methods.

Indirect and covert translations are the same in that they have the same focus and are similar in all aspects. Indirect and communicative translation have very simple differences: the translator of communicative translation should document the changes in a footnote, achieve syntactic equivalence with the ST and measure the intelligence of TR before translating. In contrast indirect and covert translations do not take that into consideration.

Instrumental translation differs from covert and indirect translation in that it focuses on the function of the translation and the ST rather than the reader. It also tries to mediate between the ST and the TT by not being so far from the ST even if it looks like an original text in the TL.

Instrumental and communicative translations are different in many ways. Firstly, instrumental focuses on the function not the audience. Therefore it doesn't have a looser degree of faithfulness. Next, it also doesn't measure the TR's intelligence or even try to find syntactic equivalence. Lastly, even when changes in the ST occur in the translation they are documented in a footnote like communicative translation which has more focus on the author's meaning and the syntax of the ST.

Furthermore, they all claim that almost all approaches will treat translation as communication, which is similar to the main claim of this thesis. In other words, the main claim of this thesis is why do we have so many similar and overlapping terms if almost all translation approaches consider translation as communication.

It is difficult to specify a certain translation method for a certain type of text. Each part of the text may be translated in a different way. For example, definitions, explanations, descriptive passages which should be translated semantically. While recommendations, instructions and value judgments which are written to address the reader should be translated communicatively (Newmark, 1981). Therefore this thesis did not mention the text type for each translation method in the comparison between these methods.

For the example of the translated paragraph, each method's translation is very similar. This is because they all depend on the translator's interpretation of the source text, its function and what is intended to be achieved in the TL and in this instance these were the same in all cases. Additionally, all the translations are similar because they aimed to achieve an acceptable text which looked like an original text in the TL. Choosing the TT words should be applicable to the target culture and reader. That is why the words for the ST can be sometimes related to Christian or Muslim culture depending on the target culture and reader. So if we assume the same target culture when using all the methods, the TT will be the same.

Although there are few subtle differences between the five methods, the results of the translation were the same because these differences are just theoretical, and do not have practical basis and overlap. When it comes to application it becomes very tricky for the translator to highlight the differences and apply them to the translation. While translating what is the difference between the function of text, the aim of the translation, making the text relevant to the new audience and being loyal to ST culture and context? At the end the aim of the translator is to produce an acceptable and understandable text, which fits the aim of the translation, in order to have the required function and effect on the reader. Therefore, these methods are all different faces for one coin and there should be one comprehensive clear model that includes all the stages for a good translation.

Chapter Four

Examining the Arabic Equivalents of the methods

4.1 Introduction:

The following chapter examines the third and the fourth questions of this thesis. The third question aims at examining the similarities and differences between the terms of the translation methods when translated from English into Arabic. The fourth question focuses on the overlapping of the Arabic terms of the translation methods in order to figure out if it would be possible to unify them in order to decrease their number and reduce ambiguity. What even is more important is to examine what makes each method different from the others as in the previous chapter. This section will try to answer the following questions: Do these Arabic translations focus on the functional equivalence as in covert and overt translation? Do they focus on the skopos of translation as in instrumental and documentary translation? Do they focus on the context and the meaning of the author as in semantic and communicative translation? And finally, do they focus on the Relevance Theory as in direct and indirect translation? Do these Arabic definitions highlight these subtle differences for each method in order to make it easier for the practitioners?

The answer to these questions will be clear after examining the Arabic terms and definitions of the methods that appear in the translated version of the Dictionary by Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) translated in

2008 by Elgezeery under the name of "*معجم دراسات الترجمة*". The five pairs of translation methods discussed above will be examined in the following chapter in order to figure out whether the differences between them are articulated in their Arabic translation. The pairs are direct versus indirect, overt versus covert, documentary versus instrumental, semantic versus communicative and literal versus free. Their Arabic terms, the meaning of these terms and their Arabic definitions will be discussed below. Additionally, the results of the questionnaire used to figure out whether these Arabic terms carry the same connotations and meanings as the English ones will be included. Ten professional translators and translation students were asked about the meanings of the terms as they apply them. They were asked how much they know about each method, how often they use each method and what each method means to them.

4.2 Direct and Indirect Translation:

Direct translation is translated as "الترجمة المباشرة" (At-tarjama almubashera). Through the explanation and the definition of direct translation in the previous chapter, it focuses on the Relevance Theory and the effort in the reproduction of the ST content. This aspect is cognitive; it is based on the trade-off between benefit and cost to reach the intended cognitive effect. This appears clearly in its translated definition by Elgezeery (2008, p. 97)). According to him:

"يعمل جت في اطار نظرية المطابقة لمقتضى الحال"

The translator also mentions that:

"يعتبر النص المستهدف مباشرا كان فقط يرمي الى ان يشبه النص الاصلي شبها كاملا من الوجهة التأويلية في السياق المتصور في النص الاصلي"

The word مباشرة (mubashera) is a good equivalence for the attribute 'direct' since both ultimately denote more faithfulness to the ST. As it appears in *"معجم لسان العرب"*the word (mubashera) has different meanings, such as صادق صريح واضح مستقيم اني""حالي.It is not the terms as 'direct' that basically reflect the essence of it as a method of translation; it is however its theoretical orientation as a cognitive and strategic methodology that translators apply to communicate the ST into the TL. I believe this consideration of the theoretical implication of the method is missing in the translation of this method as (mubashera). The reason could be that the theory has no roots in Arabic language and therefore it would be hard for translators and practitioners to discern its full theoretical and conceptual meaning.

The responses in the questionnaire could inform of the translators' awareness of what direct translation is. According to the responses;80 % of the translators know something about direct translation, while 10% know nothing about it and 10% know a lot about it. 88.9% of the respondents use this method sometimes, while 11.1% of them do not use it at all.

But does what the translators know relate to the original meaning of direct translation? The answer is no. The way translators defined direct translation does not relate to its actual meaning at all. Four of them think it is simultaneous translation; one of them thinks it is literal translation and one of them thinks it is a kind of paraphrasing. This indicates that the term "الترجمة المباشرة" needs to be modified to reflect the actual meaning of this method. I suggest the definition should draw on the theory itself; that is, the keywords in Relevance Theory should be applied more practically in the definition of direct translation. The translator may not find this intelligible at the beginning, however, it becomes his/her responsibility to search the theory and understand the keywords as a beginning to understand direct translation as a translation method. As the translation of this method should be modified, the new translation does not need to be a replacement of the available term; it might be an explication added immediately after the term, for example,

الترجمة المباشرة (مراعاة الشبه الكامل للنص الاصلي)

Indirect Translation:

Indirect translation appears as الترجمة غير المباشرة (At-tarjama ghayr al-mubashera). It is exactly the opposite of الترجمة المباشرة. When the translator is asked to translate this way, the first thing to come to his mind is that he does not have to be faithful to the source text. Elgezeery (2008, p. 159) translates its definition as:

" الحاجة الى جعل المعنى الموثوق به للنص الاصلي متاحا لجمهور اللغة المستهدفة دون أن يتأثر هذا المعنى بجهد التأويل للمترجم"

The translator also mentions Relevance Theory, the functional and dynamic equivalence clearly in his translation as the main aspects of الترجمة غير المباشرة (At-tarjama ghayr al-mubashera). Still the translator did not recognize this method from this perspective. When the participants were asked about the Arabic term of indirect translation, 44.4% of participants stated that they knew nothing about it, 44.4% stated that they knew only something about it and11.1% claimed to know a great deal about it. This suggests that the usage of this method is proportional to the amount of knowledge the participant has about it. Regarding the participants' knowledge, one participant knew nothing about its definition. Six participants gave different answers, of which three were far from its meaning and two demonstrated that these participants had a rough idea about what it means. Their answers were:

"أنا بترجم النص بمعانيه وليس بالنص المباشر"

"لا تظهر المعنى الحقيقي للترجمة"

Therefore, this term should be modified. I suggest الترجمه التفسيريه as a more appropriate translationasالتفسيريه(literally translated as interpretive) gives more space to the reader's cognitive processing and effort to reach relevance without being faithful to the source text.

4.3 Covert and Overt Translation:

Overt translation is translated as "الترجمة المكشوفة" (At-tarjama almakshofa).As appears in *المعجم الوسيط,* كشف 'Kashafa' means:

(رفع عنه ما يواريه ويغطيه وكشف الأمر عنه وأظهره)

The translated definition by Elgezeery (2008, p. 234) highlights the meaning of "الترجمة المكشوفة" as:

"وفقا لنموذج هاوس بعض النصوص لها مكانة مستقلة في الثقافة الأصلية.وتتوجه للمخاطبين في اللغة الأصليةعلى وجه التحديد. ولترجمة النصوص الأصلية من هذا القبيل ترجمة مناسبة لابد من انتاج ترجمة مكشوفة او ترجمة لا تتم فيها مخاطبة المخاطبين المستهدفين مخاطبة مباشرة على نحو مكشوف."

This definition is confusing. How could a translation be (makshoufah) and (mubashera) at the same time? Anyone reading the last part of the definition should be in a state of confusion with regards to what this kind of translation should achieve. The Arabic definition does not seem to be helpful to guide the translation to achieve a certain function through this method. One possible reason is that it was not even easy for the translator of the definition to delimit direct and overt translations as different without being trapped in their overlapping features. This translated definition also focuses on the second language functional equivalence by expressing that as follows:

"نظرا لرسوخ النص الأصلي في الثقافة الأصلية ليس بالإمكان الحفاظ على وظيفته الأصلية (بالنسبة للسياق والجمهور الخ) في النص المستهدف"

This translated definition expresses quite well the meaning of overt translation and why it's overt; however it does not focus on the main aspect of this method which is functional equivalence. The Arabic definition does not help the reader to understand what functional equivalence is; the lack of clarification to this aspect will not help the reader to understand and apply overt translation (At-tarjama almakshofa) properly.

According to the questionnaire; 77.8% of participants do not know anything aboutالترجمةالمكشوفة and the remaining 22.8% are only partially aware of it. Further questioning suggests that not all those who are aware of الترجمة المكشوفة use it, with only 11.1% of participants saying that they employ this method. This means that 11.7% of participants know الترجمة المكشوفة but choose to disregard it. Those that do use it say they only do so some of the time. Six participants do not know what الترجمة المكشوفة means; three participants were able to identify it as the type of translation which aims to make the ST and its culture overt. Another participant said that the meaning of الترجمة المكشوفة is clear; it means that the form is not important. The meaning of الترجمة المكشوفةwas not clear enough among the participants; this indicates that this Arabic term of overt translation may need to be modified.

The term itself is a past participle "اسم مفعول"in Arabic language, “Makshoof” or “overt” indicates that something was hidden then it was made overt through translation. Suggesting another word instead of “Makshoof” like “thaher” "ظاهر"does not propose a serious solution for the vagueness of the term, as it gives similar meanings which do not differ from its synonym. “thaher” "ظاهر"is a present participle "اسم فاعل" means "اللفظ الدال على معناه"; a clear word that donates its meaning and reveals the truth to the audience. Both terms if related to translation indicate a clear text easy to comprehend by the recipient or a text revealed after hiding it; therefore, suggesting a synonym for the word might not be a perfect solution. To make the term more understandable and explicating to the function of this method, I would add suggest the following translation:للقارئ الترجمة المكشوفة. This translation implicates that the ST and culture are more important to the TL reader.

Covert translation:

There was a difference between the covert translation and the translation of *لمعجم الوسيط*.Covert translation is translated as "الترجمةالخفية" (At-tarjama alkhafeya). It appears *in المعجم الوسيط* as (اخفى الشيء ستره وكتمه).This means translating without showing the target reader that the TT is a translation. "khafey" "خفي"indicates that something is hidden by an absent agent, this hidden action is the process of translation which generates a new text to the audience in order to hide the fact of translation to the readers. The problem in this term is that it doesn't help the translator to understand the need of producing a text with a similar function as the original text.

The translated definition by Elgezeery (2008, p. 83) reflects the main aspects of covert translation clearly as follows:

"الهدف من الترجمة الخفية إنتاج نص مستهدف ملائم نفس الملائمة المباشرة والأصيلة التي تكون للمخاطبين في اللغة الأصلية. ولذلك يمكن النظر لإنتاج الترجمة الخفية على انه محاولة اخفاء كون النص المستهدف مترجما وذلك بإنتاج نص مكافئ وظيفيا للنص الأصلي".

The definition is clearer than the explanation by House but the problem of the term covert "خفية" still remains. About 87.5% of participants are entirely unaware ofالترجمة الخفية, with only 12.5% of participants having some knowledge on the subject. Again, the statistics were the same when participants were asked how often they use it. This implies that those who are aware of the method use it only occasionally. Five participants were not able to identify it and said that they do not know what it means. One participant gave an answer very different from its definition. Another said that it is the same as covert translation. Since none of the participants were able to identify the Arabic term of overt translation, this implies that this Arabic term needs to be modified.

To suggest another word instead of "خفي"“khafey” like “mustater” "مستتر"does not help in solving the problem of giving a comprehensive meaning to the method. The main difference between these two words is that, the agent of khafey is not known while the agent of the word "مستتر" “mustater” is known, the agent to these action is the translator. To resolve the dilemma, I would suggest (الترجمة باخفاء النص الاصلي) as more appropriate and faithful to the content and function of this translation.

4.4 Semantic and Communicative Translation:

Semantic translation is translated as"الترجمةالدلالية" (At-tarjama ad-dalaleya).As appears in"*المعجم الوسيط*" (الدلالة تعني الارشاداو ما يقتديه اللفظ عند أطلاقه).Its definition is translated by Elgezeery (2008, p. 294) as:

"يحاول المترجم في ظل القيود التركيبية النحوية والقيود الدلالية للغة المستهدفة أن يعيد إنتاج المعنى السياقي الدقيق للمؤلف"

I find this definition clear and easy as it reflects the main aspects of semantic translation which are the context and the specific meaning of the author. On the other hand, its Arabic term (Ad-dalaleya) الدلالية may not reflect the important aspect of semantic translation as دلالة means guiding in Arabic. That does not give the reader the implication that he or she needs to preserve the context and the specific meaning of the author. The participants' view was similar to mine. A third of participants were entirely unaware of الترجمة الدلالية, with 22.2% considering themselves to know a lot about the subject and 44.4% saying they knew nothing at all. A third of participants claim that that they never used the method; the other two thirds of the participants demonstrated that they sometimes used it. Three participants did not know what it meant while the other participants defined it in different ways. One of the participants took it as the opposite of literal translation where the text seems original and not translated. Another participant defined it as rendering both the form and content of the source language into its nearest equivalent in the TL, thus allowing a contextual value. The third participant defined it as:

"“'هي اللحظات في النص حيث يجب اننلتجئالى هذا النوع من الترجمة للإيفاء بمتطلباته"

Lastly, the fourth participant defined it as:

"إعطاء ترجمة للمعنى المراد إيصاله بغض النظر عن الكلمات والمصطلحات المستخدمة أصلا"

These definitions which mean to use this method whenever the need arises in order to fulfill the needs of translation, and to translate while focusing on the intended meaning regardless of the words and the terms used. These different definitions indicate that the translators have a good idea about الترجمة الدلالية, as they are very close to Newmark’s definition particularly the second definition. The remaining two participants identified it as “to translate without giving the direct meaning” and “maybe it means to use the connotative not the denotative meaning of the words”. These two definitions are quite far from the real meaning of الترجمة الدلالية. The majority of the participants gave very close answers to the real meaning of الترجمة الدلالية; this means that there is no need to modify the Arabic term for semantic translation.

Communicative translation:

Communicative translation is translated as”الترجمة الاتصالية” (At-tarjama al-itisaleya).The word “اتصال” always gives the meaning of two people planning to communicate or meet. It appears in*معجم المعاني الجامع*as

"الالتقاء المباشر أوالالتقاءبالشخص أو التفاعل بين الأفرادأو تبادل المعلومات"

All of these meanings demonstrate that there must be two communicators, a sender and receiver. Therefore, the translator who sees this term may understand that he or she should translate the text in a communicative way to help the reader digest the information easily or directly. Its Arabic definition by Elgezeery (2008, p. 63) reflects its aspects specifically as he highlights them in the translated definition in Arabic as follows:

“يحاول فيها المترجم ان يحدث نفس الاثر على قراء اللغة المستهدفةالذي أحدثه النص الاصلي على قراء اللغة الاصلية”

He also highlights the range of freedom for the translator in order to achieve one specific communicative function:

"من خلال سعيه لجعل النص المستهدف يقوم بوظيفة اتصالية واحدة ومحددة يحددها نوع قارئ اللغة المستهدفة المتوقع"

In this Arabic definition the translator gives the Arabic reader the main aspects forالترجمةالاتصالية(At-tarjama al-itisaleya). On the other hand, Elgezeery does not mention preserving the context in his translation, because it’s clear that this translation can’t be communicative to the target reader without preserving the context. Only 11.1% of participants considered themselves to know a lot about الترجمة الاتصالية, while 22.2% knew some information and 66.7% knew nothing at all. 12.5% stated that they used this method a lot, with the same number saying they used it some of the time. A further three quarters of those interviewed stated that they never used it. Five participants answered "I do not know what it means". Only two participants gave a short definition of it; one was very accurate and the other said “to focus on the meaning”. Having only one person who knows whatالترجمة الاتصالية means reveals to us that this Arabic term for communicative translation must be modified. I would suggest the Arabic word "التواصلية"as a better translation for this method. “Atawasoleya” ensures the continuity of the communication process between the sender and the receiver. Therefore, this word is better than its closest synonym "اتصالية" “itisaleya” as this word indicates that the communication process might stop for some reasons.

4.5 Documentary and Instrumental Translation:

Documentary translation is translated as”الترجمة التوثيقية” (At-tarjama at-tawthikeya).This term indicates that this kind of translation might be for documenting the ST for the TLR. The meaning of التوثيقية in *المعجم الوسيط* is available from the verb وثق. It means:

”اخذ الأمر بالوثيقة أو بالثقة أو تسجيل الأمر بالطريق الرسمي لجعله موضع ثقة“

This means the target reader will be confident enough that he is reading authentic content which is very similar to the ST. Elgezeery’s definition (2008, p. 99) focuses from the beginning on the function of the TT in the target culture as he translates its definition as follows:

"إحدى أنواع الترجمة التي يتم تعريفها وفقا لقيام النص المستهدف بوظيفته في الثقافة المستهدفة "

I find this definition clear, as it gives the reader the special aspect of this method from the beginning, which is the function of the TT in the target culture. According to the questionnaire, equal numbers of participants (44.4%) said that they either knew something or nothing about (At-tarjama at-tawthikeya)الترجمة التوثيقية while 11.1% believed that they knew quite a lot about it. Regarding how often they use each method, 22.2% opted to use it some of the time, while 77.8% chose not to use it at all. The answer to the third question about the meaning of الترجمة التوثيقية, it demonstrates the following. Four participants said that it means nothing to them and three participants gave a definition that was very different to Nord's. Only one participant was able to give an accurate definition, and this participant seems to have extensive knowledge of it. Having only one person who knows الترجمة التوثيقية very well is not enough. This indicates that this Arabic term for documentary translation may need to be modified. The same technique might be used for documentary translation by adding a short explication to its Arabic term, for instance, الترجمة التوثيقية (توثيق النص الاصلي للقارئ).

Instrumental Translation:

Instrumental translation is translated as"الترجمة الذرائعية" (At-tarjama Ath-thara'e'eya). This term appears to be somehow complicated when a translator is asked to translate according to الترجمة الذرائعية. At the beginning it will take a lot of time to absorb its meaning. The word "ذريعة"appears in *المعجم الوسيط* as:

"الوسيلة أوالسبب إلى الشيء وتعني أيضا ما يستتر به الصائد"

After looking at its meaning, the translator may understand that this kind of translation may use the translated text as an instrument. When looking at its other meaning the translator may see himself as a hunter who wants to hunt the exact meaning of the ST, and then send it invisibly to the target reader, without showing the target reader that he is reading a translation. Its Arabic translation highlights its major aspect directly from the beginning as Elgezeery (2008, p.165) mentions:

"مصطلح تستخدمه نورد للإشارة إلى أحدى نوعي الترجمة الذين تعرفهما على وفقا للوظيفة المبتغاة من النص المستهدف في الثقافة المستهدفة "

This definition facilitates the whole process of digesting the term for the Arabic reader. The participants' responses were very clear; none of those interviewed knew anything aboutالترجمة الذرائعية. Consequently, they had never used this method of translation and were unable to define it. This result indicates that this Arabic term of instrumental translation definitely needs to be modified. For this term, it might be better if we replace this translation with الترجمة وفقا لمراعاة الهدف من الترجمة. This translation explains the function of this method and leaves no uncertainty about its meaning.

4.6 Literal and Free Translation:

Literal translation is translated as"الترجمة الحرفية" (At-tarjama al-harfeya). This term gives the impression of translating the source text's wording and grammar exactly. It is translated by Elgezeery (2008, p. 194) as follows:

" ترجمة يتم القيام بها على مستوى اقل مما يكفي لتوصيل المضمون دون تغيير عند مراعاة أعراف اللغة المستهدفة "

Many definitions are included in Elgezeery's translation for the advocators and opponents of literal translation who think literal translation is sometimes a good option and sometimes it is not. On the other hand, it's not mentioned clearly that literal translation translates out of context. Literal translation is always connected to the other pair of the pole which is free translation. Many translators Arabs or non-Arabs are aware of this dichotomy. They even comprise many types and methods of translation under these two methods. These methods are very well known in the Arab world as "الترجمة الحرفية والترجمة الحرة", many translators do not even distinguish literal translation from word for word translation. As was noticed from the questionnaire the translators think that any type of translation which has to be close to the ST is literal translation. Due to the fact that "الترجمة الحرفية" is well known and understandable, there is no need to investigate the meanings of its Arabic term.

When the participants were asked about how much they know about literal translation, 50% of the translators know something about it, while 40% know a lot about it; only 10% know nothing about it. Moreover, when they were asked about how much they use it 66.7 % use it sometimes, 22.2% do not use it at all, and 11.1% use it a lot. For how they defined literal translation and what it means to them, it means almost the same for all of the participants who claimed to understand it. Seven defined it as translating word for word like Google, without paying attention to the whole meaning or to the cultural differences. One of the translators defined literal translation as “a method which highlights the form and the value of the source text, by converting the SL grammatical construction into the nearest TL equivalents”. The way the translators defined literal "الحرفية" translation, reveals that they almost all know what it means. Therefore, there is no need to change its Arabic term.

Free translation is translated as”الترجمةالحرة” (At-tarjama al-hora) this type of translation is very popular. Many translators may define all the translation types that tend to detach from the ST as free translation. The Arabic term also indicates the looseness of this translation method which gives the translator freedom in translating the source text. Its definition is translated by Elgezeery (2008, p.135) as follows:

"ترجمة يتم القيام بها على مستوى اعلى من المستوى اللازم لتوصيل المضمون دون تغيير مع الالتزام بمعايير اللغة المستهدفة"

This definition gives the reader a comprehensive definition of free translation by focusing on its main aspects which are over translating and being far from accuracy and sometimes truth. The term free or "حرة" is the clearest among the participants; 11.1% of participants knew nothing about الترجمة الحرة, with equal numbers of the remaining participants knowing either a lot or something about the subject. In terms of usage, a third of participants said they used the method a lot, 44.4% said they used it some of the time and a further 22.2% said that they never used it at all. Two participants said that they do not know what it means while seven participants gave an adequate answer and were able to give a definition of it. This result implies that this Arabic term of free translation does not need to be modified.

The questionnaire results demonstrate that half of these Arabic terms do not need to be modified. However, the other half must be modified, as most of the participants were not able to give a correct definition or even know what these terms mean. These Arabic terms are:

الترجمة المباشرة، الترجمة المكشوفة، الترجمة التوثيقية، الترجمة الخفية، الترجمة الاتصالية والترجمة الذرائعية

The alternatives for these confusing terms should be clear and compatible. They also need to illustrate the components of the methods to reflect their definitions and meanings to make it easy for the practitioners and students who study the theory of translation. The replacement for the terms mentioned earlier may be a short explication of the method, instead of one word to describe the whole method. This raises the question of why we often prefer to describe the whole method in one word which may not be clear enough to reflect the meaning of what it covers.

The criteria available in this research, which manifest the features of each method, would help for a new research to find the replacement for the confusing Arabic terms according to the standards of the Arabic language. Though I have introduced some translations for the methods in Arabic language, I should admit that we need more qualified research by people who may understand the content and function of the methods and who can find more solid as well as comprehensive terms to further reduce their ambiguities and increase their practicality in Arabic language. This, by itself, should be a topic for further research.

Conclusion:

This thesis aimed at addressing the problem of overlap in five translation dichotomies. It measured the extent of overlap between these methods .The study examined the differences and similarities among them to prove that they overlap and have very similar content but different names. Moreover, this thesis aimed to study the Arabic translated names of the methods to examine their meaning and whether their content overlaps under ambiguously translated terms.

The results demonstrate that these methods do overlap. They only have subtle differences which are also problematic when it comes to application. Each method prioritizes one aspect and minimizes the others which overlap with the other methods .Each scholar was fully aware that his or her method overlaps with the others, and highlights the difference in his or her method. But, when it comes to application, these highlighted differences in each method overlap again. For example, House (1977) focuses on the functional equivalence in overt and covert translation, Nord (1991) focuses on the skopos (aim) of translation in documentary and instrumental translation, Gutt (1989) focuses on the Relevance Theory in direct and indirect translation and Newmark (1981) focuses on the communicative function in semantic and communicative translation. The translator will face the problem of differentiating between these aspects. For example, when the translator has to translate a text that has a function or an aim, then the text is communicative and relevant. If the function or aim is achieved, the reader absorbs and understands the message and reacts to it. Therefore, the function and the aim are the same.

In this study, the same text was translated according to each method separately but despite this each time the TT was very similar. Therefore, there is no comprehensive model that covers all aspects of translation across all types of text. Instead, each method focuses on only one aspect effectively and minimizes the rest.

Moreover, there are some overlapping differences. In semantic translation loyalty is paid to the author. While in literal translation loyalty is paid to the source language norms. Overt translation focuses on achieving second level functional equivalence and source language norms by paying the most attention to the reader and only keeping the source text's function, rather than any other aspects of the source text. Semantic translation prioritizes the author rather than the source language norms, while direct translation prioritizes source language norms rather than the meaning of the author. Documentary translation considers the aim of the translation as its most important aspect, rather than its function or effect. But again when the text was translated according to each method the same text was produced. The linguistics and syntax of the ST were the most attainable features, as all the methods aimed to preserve the source text's stylistic effect.

There are slight differences between the second pairs of methods which focus on the TLR. Free translation differs in its loose degree of faithfulness that makes it lack syntactic and contextual equivalence. Indirect and communicative translation has very simple differences. The translator of communicative translation should document the changes in a footnote, achieve syntactic equivalence with the ST and measure the intelligence of the target reader before translating. In contrast, indirect and covert translation do not take the target reader's intelligence into consideration. Instrumental translation differs from covert and indirect translation in that it focuses on the function of the translation and the ST rather than the reader. Instrumental and communicative translation are different in many ways. Firstly, instrumental translation focuses on the function not the audience. Therefore it doesn't have a looser degree of faithfulness. It also doesn't measure the target reader's intelligence or even try to find syntactic equivalence. Lastly, even when changes in the ST occur in the translation they are documented in a footnote like in communicative translation, which has more focus on the author's meaning and the syntax of the source text.

There was a clear problem with the Arabic names of these methods. The questionnaire demonstrated that these Arabic terms do not reflect the content of these methods, and should be modified. The majority of the participants gave incorrect definitions of the methods. For instance, الترجمة المباشرة was understood as simultaneous interpretation which takes places immediately after the speaker finishes the sentence. One of the terms was الترجمة الذرائعية which was completely misunderstood. The questionnaire results demonstrated that these five terms should be changed for better more comprehensible ones:

الترجمة المباشرة، الترجمة المكشوفة، الترجمة التوثيقية، الترجمة الخفية، الترجمة الاتصالية والترجمة الذرائعية

The results of this study were fulfilling and answered the questions of this thesis, as they proved the overlap between and redundancy of these methods. They also proved the lack of sense in some of the Arabic terms of the English methods. Thus this thesis will help in the area of translation training, particularly among translation students who are supposed to study the theory of translation and find it difficult to differentiate between these overlapping methods. As this study contains a brief detailed description of each method and the differences and similarities between them, it can be used as a guide for these students, and for new translators who face difficulty in deciding on a method. This study will clarify for them what translation method is more appropriate for a certain type of text. It can also be used by their teachers in order to reduce the amount of confusion between their students. It also opens the door for researchers who want to introduce more comprehensive Arabic terms to replace the existing ones, which should be changed.

References

- Arnold, D. L. Balkan, R. Lee Humphres (et al). (1994). ***Machine translation: An introductory Guide***. Manchester& Oxford: NCC Blackwell.
- Barkhudarov, L. (1969). ***Urovniyazykovoyiyerakhii I perevod*** *[“Levels of language hierarchy and translation”]*, in ***Tetradiperevodchika*** *[the Translator’s Notebook]* 6, 3-12.
- Bassnett, S. (1992). ***Translation/History/Culture***. Routledge.
- Blanchot, M. (1990) [1971]: “***Translatinh***”, Translated by Richard Seiburth, Sulfur, 26, pp. 82-86.
- Bowker, L. (2009). **Lexical Knowledge Patterns, Semantic Relations, and Language Varieties: Exploring the Possibilities for Refining Information Retrieval in an International Context**, Lynne Bowker PhD School of Translation and Interpretation, University of Ottawa, P.O. Box 450, Station A, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 6N5, Canada E-mail: lbowker@uottawa.ca.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). ***A Linguistic Theory of Translation***, London: OUP.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). ***Memes of Translation: The spread of Ideas in Translation Theory***. John Benjamin Publishing Amesterdam, Philadelphia, Netherlands.

- Chesterman, A. (2013). "***Translation Studies Forum***: universalism in translation studies" *Translation Studies 9:1* pages51-66 published online (2013, August 21) accessed in August 9th 2016,

- Chesterman, A. and Williams, J. (2014). ***The Map***. Fifth edition. USA\New York: Routledge.

- Chomsky, N. (1957). ***Syntactic Structures***. The Hague : Mouton

- Chukovsky, K. (1996). ***Vysokoeiskusstvo*** *[A High Art]* [Collected Works, Vol. 3,237-627]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennya literature.

- Edwin, G. (2001).***Contemporary Translation Theories***. Clevedon, UK.

- Elgezeery, J. (2008). ***Dictionary of translation studis[معجم دراسات الترجمة]***. Egypt, Cairo: National Center For Translation.

- Gambier, Y.(2009). ***The Metalanguage of Translation***. John Benjamins Publishing,

- Gutt, E. (1998). Textual properties, communicative clues and the translator.***Summer Institute of Linguistics.*** Paper presented at the Susanne Hobner Seminar, at the University of Zaragoza.

- Gutt, E. (1991).***Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context***. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Gutt, E. (1990). A theoretical Account of Translation - without a translation theory. ***Target: International Journal of Translation Studies****2/2 (1990), pp. 135-164.*

- Gutt, E. 1989. PhD. ***Translation and Relevance****:* Department of Phonetics and Linguistics University College London.

- Haseeb, H. (2015). ***Communicative and Semantic Translation***. Retrieved in September 15th 2016 from http://www.slideshare. net/Haseeb949/semantic-andcommunicativetranslation

- Hassan, B. (2011). ***Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning***. Cambridge School Publishing, Newcastle.

- Hatim, B. (1997). ***English- Arabic /Arabic-English Translation. A Practical Guide***. London: 26 westbourne Grouve.

- Hatim, B. (2001).***Teaching and Researching Translation***. London: Pearson

- Hatim, B. (2013).***Teaching and Researching Translation: Second Edition***. New York: Pearson Longman.

- Hervey, S& I Higgins. (1992). ***Thinking Translation: A course in Translation Method: French to English***. London: Routledge.

- Heyderdin, H. (2016) *"A Closer Look into Concept of Method and its Implication for Translation Training"*. ***Babel*** 62:1(2016), 86–103.

- House, J. & Kulka, B. (1986). Acquiring translation Competence in Interaction. In Eds. J. House, Sh**, [*Interlingual and Intercultural Communication***], (pp. 179) Tubingen, Gunter: Narr.

- House, J. & Kulka, B. (1986). ***Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies***. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

- House, J. (1977). ***A model for Translation Quality Assessment***. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

- House, J. (2015). ***Translation Quality Assessment Past and Present***. London and Newyork: Routledge.

- House, Juliane (1997). ***Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited***. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

- Meza, K. (2013).***Overt and Covert Translation***. Retrieved in September 15th2016 from https://prezi.com/wp7esir-jr4o/overt-and-covert-translation/

- Munday, J. (2008). ***Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application***.2nd Ed. London and Newyork: Routledge.

- Munday, J. (2009). ***The Routledge Companion to Translation studies***. London and Newyork: Routledge.

- Newmark, P. (1981) ***Approaches to translation***. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nord, C. (1991a). ***Text Analysis in Translation***. Amesterdam: Rodopi.
- Nord, C. (2001). ***Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.**
- Nordquist**,** R**.** (2017). ***Cliché***. Retrieved in March 8th 2017 from https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-cliche-1689852
- Oser, E. (1983*)*. ***International Organization***, in Catriona Picken (ed.), 171-82.
- Ottenheimer, H. J. (2006). ***The Anthropology of Language***. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Pergnier, M. (1980). ***Lezfondementscociolinguistques de traductcion***, Paris: LibrairieHonore Champion.
- Reiss, k. Vermeer, H. (1984). Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained. Taylor & Francis.
- Sagor, R. (2000). ***Guiding School Improvement with Action Research*.** Retrieved in April 27th 2015 from http://www.ascd.

org/publications/books/100047/chapters/What-Is-Action-Research%C2%A2.aspx

- Schaffner, C. (2002). ***The Role of Discourse Analyses for Translation and in Translator training***. Britain: Short Run Press Ltd.
- Shuttleworth & Cowie. (1997). ***Dictionary of translation studies***. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). ***Relevance: Communication and Cognition***. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Steiner, G. (1975). ***After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation***, Oxford University: Press Oxford.
- Toury, G. (1995).***Descriptive translation studies and Beyond***. Amsterdam &Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Vinay, J. P. & J. Darblenet. (1976). ***Stylistique compare du francais el delanglais***. Didier: Paris.

المصادر العربية:

- إبراهيم مصطفى / أحمد الزيات / حامد عبد القادر / محمد النجار (2010): **المعجم الوسيط**، مجمع اللغة العربية: دار الدعوة القاهرة.
- ابن منظور (1968): **لسان العرب**، دار صادر، بيروت.

Questionnaire

1. How much do you know about "الترجمه الحرفية"?
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

2. How much do you use "الترجمه الحرفية"?
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

3. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الحرفية؟

____
____
____
____
____

4. How much do you know about "الترجمه المباشرة"?
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

5. How much do you use "الترجمه المباشرة"?
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

6. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة المباشرة؟

____
____
____
____
____

7. **How much do you know about "الترجمه المكشوفة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

8. **How much do you use "الترجمه المكشوفة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

9. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة المكشوفة؟

10. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الدلالية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

11. **How much do you use "الترجمه الدلالية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

12. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الدلالية؟

13. **How much do you know about "الترجمه التوثيقية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

14. **How much do you use "الترجمه التوثيقية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

15. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة التوثيقية؟

16. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الغير مباشرة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

17. **How much do you use "الترجمه الغير المباشرة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

18. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الغير المباشرة؟

19. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الخفية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

20. **How much do you use "الترجمه الخفية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

21. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الخلفية؟

22. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الاتصالية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

23. **How much do you use "الترجمه الاتصالية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

24. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الاتصالية؟

25. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الذرائعية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

26. **How much do you use "الترجمه الذرائعية"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

27. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الذرائعية؟

28. **How much do you know about "الترجمه الحرة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

29. **How much do you use "الترجمه الحرة"?**
حدد دائرة واحدة فقط.

- Not at all
- some
- A lot

30. ماذا تعني لك الترجمة الحرة؟

جامعة النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا

إعادة تحديد وتوحيد المصطلحات الانجليزية لطرق الترجمة ومكافئاتها العربية

اعداد
نورا فاروق برهان خليفة

اشراف
د. سفيان أبو عرة
د. عكرمة شهاب

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالا لمتطلبات نيل درجة الماجستير في برنامج اللغويات التطبيقية والترجمة، كلية الدراسات العليا، جامعة النجاح الوطنية، نابلس، فلسطين.

2017

اعادة تحديد وتوحيد المصطلحات الانجليزية لطرق الترجمة ومكافئاتها العربية

اعداد

نورا فاروق برهان خليفة

اشراف

د. سفيان أبو عرة

د. عكرمة شهاب

الملخص

تعالج هذه الدراسة مشكلة المصطلح في خمس مفارقات متداخلة من طرق الترجمة. طرق الترجمة المذكورة في هذه الدراسة هي الترجمة الدلالية ومقابلها الترجمة الاتصالية، الترجمة التوثيقية ومقابلها الترجمة الذرائعية، الترجمة المكشوفة ومقابلها الترجمة الخفية، الترجمة المباشرة ومقابلها الترجمة غير المباشرة، الترجمة الحرفية ومقابلها الترجمة الحرة. تبحث هذه الدراسة مدى تلاقي او تباعد معاني هذه الطرق، من خلال اتباع منهجية التحليل والمقارنة للمفاهيم ومنهجية تبدأ من الأعلى للأسفل، ابتداءً من مصطلحات الطرق الموجودة وتعريفاتهم ومن ثم تحليلهم الى مكوناتهم الاساسية من أجل تسهيل عملية المقارنة بينهم. وبعد توضيح الاختلافات بين الطرق كان من الواضح انها مرتبطة بجانب او بأكثر من الجوانب التالية: المؤلف، القارئ، الهدف من الترجمة، وظيفة الترجمة، سياق النص الاصلي وعلاقة الترجمة بالقراء. ولكن عند تطبيق هذه الطرق، كان من الصعب تطبيق خصائصها بشكل ملموس خلال عملية الترجمة لجعل كل ترجمة تختلف عن الاخرى. بالإضافة الى المذكور سابقا تعالج الدراسة المرادفات العربية لطرق الترجمة الإنجليزية من خلال دراسة معانيهم وتعاريفهم لتوصيف أوجه التشابه والاختلاف من معادلاتهم الانجليزية. كما اعتمدت الدراسة على استبانة تم توزيعها على 10 مترجمين وطلاب ترجمة للتحري عن وعي المترجمين بطرق الترجمة العربية، حيث لم يتمكن معظم المشاركين من اعطاء تعاريف صحيحة او حتى معرفة ماذا تعني هذه المصطلحات، ولذلك فانه ينبغي تعديل نصف هذه المصطلحات العربية على الأقل بمصطلحات اخرى اكثر توضيحا لمحتوى الطرق.