

**Translation Salience:
A Model of Equivalence in Translation
(Arabic/English)**

William Trotter

Thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Semitic Studies
University of Sydney
© 2000

Abstract

The term equivalence describes the relationship between a translation and the text from which it is translated. Translation is generally viewed as indeterminate insofar as there is no single acceptable translation—but many. Despite this, the rationalist metaphor of translation equivalence prevails. Rationalist approaches view translation as a process in which an original text is analysed to a level of abstraction, then transferred into a second representation from which a translation is generated. At the deepest level of abstraction, representations for analysis and generation are identical and transfer becomes redundant, while at the surface level it is said that surface textual features are transferred directly. Such approaches do not provide a principled explanation of how or why abstraction takes place in translation. They also fail to resolve the dilemma of specifying the depth of transfer appropriate for a given translation task. Chapter One reviews English and Arabic approaches to human translation.

By focusing on the translator's role as mediator of communication, equivalence can be understood as the coordination of information about situations and states of mind. A fundamental opposition is posited between the transfer of rule-like or codifiable aspects of equivalence and those non-codifiable aspects in which salient information is coordinated. The Translation Saliency model proposes that Transfer and Saliency constitute bipolar extremes of a continuum. The model offers a principled account of the translator's interlingual attunement to multi-placed coordination, proposing that salient information can be accounted for with three primary notions: markedness, implicitness and localness. Chapter Two develops the Translation Saliency model.

The model is supported with empirical evidence from published translations of Arabic and English texts. Saliency is illustrated in Chapter Three through contextualized interpretations associated with various Arabic communication resources (repetition, code switching, agreement, address in relative clauses and the disambiguation of presentative structures). Measurability of the model is addressed in Chapter Four with reference to emerging computational techniques, and further research is suggested (in connection with theme and focus, text type, cohesion and collocation relations).

In English, lectured the linguistics professor, a double negative forms a positive. In some languages, though, such as Russian, a double negative is still a negative.

However, there is no language in which a double positive can form a negative.

A voice from the back of the lecture hall cried: *Yeah, right.* *

• I N M E M O R I A M •
Stan Young & Jenny Skempton

* Unsourced press clipping.

Contents

Figures and Tables

Acknowledgments

Introduction 1

1 Translation as a Subject Area 12

- 1.1 Preliminaries 14
- 1.2 Approaches to translation theory 15
 - 1.2.1 Translator's orientation 16
 - 1.2.2 Indeterminacy 53
 - 1.2.3 Arabic literature on translation 60
 - 1.2.4 Translating between Arabic and English 72
- 1.3 Summary 97

2 Translation Saliency 98

- 2.1 Equivalence 98
- 2.2 Situation, information, meaning and interpretation 123
- 2.3 Computational properties of translation 145
- 2.4 Depth and transfer 163
- 2.5 Contrastive analysis: Arabic and English 175
- 2.6 Translation saliency model of equivalence 186
 - 2.6.1 Markedness 187
 - 2.6.2 Implicitness 200
 - 2.6.3 Localness 206
 - 2.6.4 Saliency 208

3 Translation Saliency in Arabic and English 223

- 3.1 Markedness in Arabic 231
 - 3.1.1 Repetition 234
- 3.2 Variation in Arabic 262
 - 3.2.1 Code switching 266
 - 3.2.2 Deflected and strict agreement 282
 - 3.2.3 Direct and indirect relative clauses 299
 - 3.2.4 Amplified and proclitic presentative substantive structures 309
- 3.3 Summary 320

4 Extending the Translation Saliency Model 322

- 4.1 Orientation and markedness 322
- 4.2 Measurability 326
 - 4.2.1 Theme and focus 327
 - 4.2.2 Text type 339
 - 4.2.3 Cohesion 344
 - 4.2.4 Collocation 349

Conclusion 358

Appendix 360

Luckhardt's *Transfer in Machine Translation*

Bibliography 374

Figures and Tables

List of Abbreviations	11
FIGURE 1: Transfer Metaphor of Equivalence	14
FIGURE 2: Two Transfer Models (Luckhardt, p. 17) –after Koschmieder and Weisgerber	165
FIGURE 3: Transfer Model (Luckhardt, p. 19)	166
FIGURE 4: Depth and Transfer (Luckhardt, p. 44) –attributed by Hutchins and Somers to Vauquois	167
FIGURE 5: Relationship Between Expenditure on Analysis and Transfer (Luckhardt, p. 46)	168
FIGURE 6: Superfluous Analysis and Synthesis in a Multilingual System (Luckhardt, p. 48)	168
FIGURE 7: Optimal Transfer (Luckhardt, p. 49)	169
TABLE 1: Medieval Arabic Grammar Terminology—Unmarked and Marked Categories (Owens, p. 202)	196
TABLE 2: Specificity Hierarchy of the Major Types of Address in Relative Clauses in Classical Arabic—Feminine Head (Bloch, p. 18)	301
TABLE 3: Arabic Presentative Structures (Bloch, pp. 54-55)	310
TABLE 4: Nuclear, Amplified and Proclitic Presentative Structures (Bloch, pp. 58-62)	311
TABLE 5: Divergent Collocations (after Heliel, Abu-Ssaydeh, and Emery)	355

Acknowledgments

My special thanks go to Professor R. Ebied for his valuable contribution and support, meticulous scrutiny of drafts and infinite patience. All errors and omissions are of course my own.

Generous responses to correspondence in the early stages of research were received from Joseph Malone, Brian Harris, Basil Hatim, Peter Emery, A. F. Abu-Ssaydeh, A. Shunnaq, M. Abdel Haleem, Malcolm Edwards and Denys Johnson-Davies.

Thanks also are due to Leo Papademetre, Chris Manning and Sayed Hasan for help along the way; to Arabic teaching from Stan Young, Samar Attar, Ahmed Shboul and Michael Carter; to the services of Fisher Library at the University of Sydney; and to the inspiration and challenge laid down in previous research.

W. T.