

TEXT LINGUISTIC CRITICISM OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS: AN INTUITIVE HEURISTIC CHECKLIST

Mohammed Akram A.M. Sa'Adeddin
University of Jordan

1. INTRODUCTION

Text linguistics is a designation of any work of language science devoted to the text as the primary object of enquiry (Dijk 1979). Following Beaugrande (1995), 'text' is viewed here as **"an empirical communicative event given through human communication rather than specified by a formal theory"**. This communicative event rests on a **"dynamic dialectic"** between the **"virtual system"** of language and its realisation in the form of an **"actual system"** emanating from **selections made by the text producer** (Sa'Adeddin 1995, 1998). These selections are effectuated in terms of the **expectations** and **presuppositions** (Bloor & Bloor 1991) of the **target world audience** (see Sa'Adeddin 1987a, 1990, 1991) and/or **schemes that the producer has on them**. *A priori*, the field of Comparative Literature is as legitimate an area of investigation for the text linguist as it is for the letrist. This is particularly true given the fact that literature is a form of linguistic performance with special status and value, *par excellence*. As translation is, in the final analysis, a text linguistic activity across language communities and a prime tool for the comparatist, it is feasible to see it as a bridge between the two disciplines. Being essentially Translation-based, Comparative Literature engages the bilingual comparatist in a particular form of 'innate' translation, structured on a complex process of **interpretation** and **re-interpretation** (see Sa'Adeddin 1990). Translation Criticism involves all the constituents which contribute to text-production and **text experiencing** (Sa'Adeddin 1995), and which need to be observed in quality assessment, if the comparatist is to proceed with maximum confidence. The intuitive heuristic checklist suggested here may provide

the initial grounding for a systematic text analysis procedure, which would be of special relevance to the comparative letrist.

In addition, this checklist may also have applications to other fields of research where comparisons can be made between a kaleidoscope of **discourse types and forms** (cf. Abraham et al 1995. Also see, Mann & Thompson 1992), especially in situations where the language in question is common to a variety of linguistic instances. Here, I am thinking, in particular of LSP (language for specific purposes) at large, and DSP (discourse for specific purposes) in particular. In this area of linguistic theory and practice, such text makers as **message content constituents, text form realizants and members of the community** are instrumental in data collection and data analysis. These text makers comprise respectively: a) **mental textuality, genre** (in the sense of Bhatia 1993), **period or time frame, place, intentionality, intertextuality, situationality, context of utilisation, norm of interaction, text end, key, topic, channel, and variety of expression**; b) **macro-grammatical and micro-grammatical interdependencies**; and c) **in-text and out-text participants**. It is quite evident that familiarity with such conditioning factors of text-production and text-experiencing together with their attendant multidisciplinary background helps field researchers measure up to those features of discourse that a neophyte might need to become attuned.

The implication of the above statement is well nigh clear: Any activities in DSP, whether intra-communal or inter-communal, must operate in tandem with a strand of such disciplines, offshoots and intermediaries as cognitive science, anthropology, sociology, general linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, cognitive functional grammar and stylistics. This type of multidisciplinary knowledge will enable us to explore textualisation for communication within given language communities and re-textualisation for communication across language communities with flying colours.

Before pursuing our major topic, it is important to reiterate a tacit assumption, which underlies my view and experience of literature. Given the nature of literary discourse, literature, I opine, is a heightened form of linguistic performance which draws on the creative potentials of communicative competence, and gives expression to these potentials by genre-specific strategies and tactics for mapping the artefacts of creativity onto the surface text. In this sense, literature is a constellation of language

that can be theorised like any other genre of discourse. The implication of this view is that the checklist might be useful for handling literary texts, whether in linguistic procedural investigation or in the classroom situation as a variety of DSP or LSP. (For a simplified view of LSP, see Wilss 1986.)

That said, the approach propounded here rests on the *'Gestalt'* view of human experience, and on the concept of a separate *'Gestalt'* informing the **experiential memories of individual communities** (Sa'Adeddin 1987a, 1989, 1990, 1995, 1996, 1998.) For the purposes of the comparatist and translation critic alike, it is necessary to recognise the existence of individual communal *'Gestalts'*, each presenting its own particular view of the real world. This **world-view** (Fowler 1986,) in its turn forms the frame of reference for the "**principled alternativity**", often-embedded in literary texts as intimated by Beaugrande & Dressler (1981:185).

2. TEXT LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION CRITICISM

Now let us return to our major topic. With the development of text linguistics and discourse analysis in the last two decades or so, translation has come to be seen as text-oriented rather than sentence-oriented "unless the sentence has text status" (W. Dressler as quoted in Wilss 1982:112), or "text-induced text production" (Neubert & Shreve 1992:112). Much of the failure to develop a coherent view of the translation process has been recently viewed as deriving from failure to see the text as a dynamic stage in the middle of a communicative act (Sa'Adeddin 1990). These developments have been accompanied by studies in translation criticism (Wilss 1980, House 1982, Sa'Adeddin 1985).

Translation criticism (TC) is an operation performed on the target language text (TLT), either by translator or critic, to ascertain whether it meets the basic requirements of '**experiential matching**' (Sa'Adeddin 1987b). It involves contrastive textological analysis of the target language text (TLT) and the source language text (SLT) in terms of **interpretive background**, **respondent's role** and **text-centred constituents**, in order to pinpoint areas of strength and failure in the new product. Tucker (1987), whose views still stand, sums the situation as follows:

"Although much discussion of quality (i.e. fidelity of the translation to the original source text and the legibility of the translated text itself) appears in the literature, no effective, universally applicable, quasi objective measure of translation quality - either human or mechanical - has yet been discovered".

A number of scholars have attempted to develop approaches to literary translation (e.g. Belloc 1931, Davie 1975, Day Lewis 1970, Hartmann 1980, Holmes 1970, Lefevere 1975, Selver 1966). However, no systematic approach to translation criticism has yet emerged. For example, Toury (1980) compared a literary text and its translation, but the operations in his model were presented as subjective rules of thumb and were not broken down into testable constructs and categories. The danger of subjectivity in translation criticism is well expressed by Wilss (1982:221):

"It is quite feasible that a translation critic, in reconstructing the transfer processes and their motivation, rejects a formulation without being able to give another explanation than that he is semantically and stylistically "pre-programmed" in a specific way and therefore considers his own version superior to that of the translator".

This generalisation reflects the impasse in which the discipline of translation finds itself, an impasse arising from basing translation theory on *ad hoc* and speculative solutions. For subjectivity to be minimised, all critical judgement should be based on the principles of diagnosis and justification. After all, no criticism is justifiable unless its bases can be explained.

In this paper, an intuitive heuristic checklist is suggested for the criticism of literary translations, with particular reference to Arabic/English, but with some bearings on other language pairs. The checklist is demonstrated using, for space restrictions, the first three paragraphs of *9inayaan Abdulaziz's* translation, *naas min dublin*, (n.d) of Joyce's *Araby* (1914

reprinted 1981). It should be noted that the checklist is neither exhaustive nor conclusive. It remains provisional, pending further **corpus analysis** (cf. Leech 1991, Svartvik 1992), **contrastive ethnolinguistic/ cross-cultural/pragmatic text analysis** (cf. Sa'Adeddin 1990, Kasper and Blum-Kulka 1993) and **extensive testing**.

3. CHECKLIST FOR THE CRITICISM OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS

The checklist we suggest draws mainly on categories proposed for text linguistics. The components are assumed to be present unless otherwise specified. Translation adequacy is evaluated according to three criteria: (i) presence of the component in the TLT, (ii) availability of an experiential equivalent in the target language (TL), and (iii) appropriateness of the translational tactic for coping with SLT-TL incompatibility. The checklist has three provisional divisions, which may have areas of overlap:

(A) background interpretive constituents, (B) respondent's role, and (C) text constituents.

A. BACKGROUND INTERPRETIVE CONSTITUENTS

A1. Genre:

To what genre and sub-genre does the SLT belong? Does it adhere to the conventions of the genre? If not, to what purpose? Has the TLT approximated these features for the TL audience?

A2. Period:

What period does the SLT represent? **What world view is/was operative?** Has the TLT approximated that period according to the target world knowledge?

A3. Place:

What is associated with **the place of occurrence in the minds of the SLT audience?** If this cannot be directly reproduced, how does the TLT compensate?

A4. Author:

Who is the author of the SLT? What is known of the **author and the place of the SLT in his canon?** What is the author's attitude to the subject, e.g. **ironical,**

enthusiastic, sceptical, reserved, scornful, or sentimental? Has the SLT captured that viewpoint?

A5. Narrator:

Who is speaking? Is the narrator **personal** or **omniscient**?

Does the SLT confuse the **characters** and **narrative voice**?

Does the SLT confuse the **narrator** with the **author**?

B. RESPONDENT'S ROLE

Has the TLT managed to reproduce the "**contract**" of the SLT, i.e. is the TLT reader's task equal or parallel to that of the SLT reader? Have any SLT reader's **tasks** been pre-empted? If so, why? Has this been done to compensate for **experiential disparity** between the two language communities?

C. TEXT CONSTITUENTS

C1. Mental Textuality:

Has the TLT satisfied the local schemata, plans (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981:91) and/or, scripts i.e. conventionalised text plans in the terminology of Schank & Abelson (1977) that figure as **text acts** or **text plan structure** (Sa'Adeddin 1991) in the SLT? If it did, what routines did it use? If not, what constraints have come into play?

C2. Intertextuality:

Which texts inform, illuminate or are referred to in the SLT? How successfully does TLT render intertextuality? If not, why not? Is there any justification to preclude such techniques of **text and convention** as **footnoting, bracketing** and **paraphrasing**?

C3. Function(s) of Text:

Does the TLT match the SLT's function(s), i.e. exposition in time, exposition in space, instruction, argumentation, valuation, and so on, or a blend of some or all?

C4. Tenor(s) of Text:

Does the TLT match the SLT in representing the levels of formality among the in-text and/or out-text participants? If not, why not?

- C5. Mode(s) of Text**
Does the TLT reflect the speakability and/or readability of the SLT, in terms of the phonological, lexical and junctive constituents, which distinguish one from the other?
- C6. Field(s) of Text:**
Does the lexical selection in the TLT correspond with that of the SLT? If not, why not?
- C7. Cohesion:**
Has the TLT coped with differences between SL and TL systems of cohesion? Have ordering of ideas, cohesion and cross-referencing been adequately reproduced?
- C8. Sentence function(s):**
Has the TLT maintained the pragmatic functions and foci of the SLT sentences? For example, are the SLT main clauses and simple sentences subordinated in the TLT, or vice versa? Are phrases or clauses unjustifiably fronted or postponed?
- C9. Tense, Aspect and Voice:**
Has the translator coped with the temporal and/or aspectual contrasts between the two languages, if any?
- C10. Concepts and Relations:**
Has the translator adequately rendered culture-bound, emotive, associative or referential meaning? Have appropriate decisions been made with regard to intentional ambiguity, synonymy, homophony, homography, etc? Has the translator coped with contrasts between the SLT and the TLT with respect to **word order** (Downing & Noonan 1995) and intra-utterance structure? If not, why not?
- C11. Collocations, Clichés, Idioms and Figures of Speech:**
Have collocations, clichés and idioms been adequately translated? (Note that these three language constituents contribute immensely to the native nature of the SLT and TLT). Has figurative language been adequately rendered in the TLT? By literal, overt or covert translation? (Note that adequacy is conditioned by the devices available to the TL community.)

C12. Sound/Print:

To what degree does the translation reflect alliteration, assonance, dissonance, rhyme, scheme, onomatopoeia etc. in the original? Has the most nearly adequate solution been provided in difficult cases? Does the SLT cope with the orthographic differences between SL and TL?

4. DEMONSTRATION PROCEDURES

To ensure objectivity, the following procedures were taken before judging the adequacy of Abdulaziz's translation.

- i) Using the parallel text technique the author analysed Abdulaziz's translation according to the checklist.
- ii) A Dublin-educated Arab academic in the Department of English, Kuwait University, back translated the first three paragraphs of Abdulaziz's translation into English. The punctuation of the Arabic version was preserved. The purpose of the exercise was to pinpoint omissions, additions and problems of punctuation.
- iii) Four native English speaking literati in the Department of English, Kuwait University compared the back-translation and Joyce's original and commented on loss and gain in terms of respondent's role, intertextuality and punctuation.
- iv) A well known, Exeter-educated Arab novelist translated the interaction, which appears in C4 into Arabic for contrastive interlingual purposes.

5. BACK-TRANSLATION OF JOYCE'S "ARABY"**The Arab Market**

(Tr. A. Abu Sharkh, personal communication)

Quietness prevailed at "North Richmond Road", which is closed except when the pupils of the Christian Brotherhood School left for home (,) and at the end of the road stood an uninhabited two-storey house surrounded by a square yard which isolated it from the neighbouring houses that lined up in

Araby

James Joyce (1914/1981)

North Richmond Street, being blind, was a quiet street except at the hour when the Christian Brothers' School set the boys free. An uninhabited house of two stories stood at the blind end, detached from its neighbours in a square ground. The other houses of the street, conscious of decent

quietness and solemnity (.) as if they knew that they were inhabited by good natured people.

The house remained deserted for a long time after the death of its dweller, a priest, in the back drawing room (,) the rotten air rose high in the rooms and parlours (,) and old books and papers, such as damp-paged volumes and banal yellow diaries were scattered all over the back room. Neglect was obvious in the back garden of the house where bushes were striking their way to life not fully grown (....) Under one of the bushes I found the rusty pump of the deceased priest's bicycle (...) He great philanthropist (...) He left in his will all his wealth for shelters and institutions and his furniture to his sister.

When the short winter days would come and darkness fall before finishing one's dinner (...) the houses would look dark in spite of the faint light of the street lamps (...) The blueness of the sky would turn into ever-changing violet colour (..) We used to meet to have fun and play as the cold air brushed our faces and would not stop until we felt warm (.)

lives within them, gazed at one another with brown imperturbable faces.

The former tenant of our house, a priest, had died in the back drawing-room. Air, musty from having been long enclosed, hung in all the rooms, and the waste room behind the kitchen was littered with old useless papers. Among these I found a few paper-covered books, the pages of which were curled and damp: *The Abbot*, by Walter Scott, *The Devout Communicant* and the *Memories of Vidocq*. I liked the last best because its leaves were yellow. The wild garden behind the house contained a central apple tree and a few straggling bushes, under one of which I found the tenant's rusty bicycle-pump. He had been a very charitable priest; in his will he left all his money to institutions and the furniture of his house to his sister.

When the short days of the winter came, dusk fell before we had well eaten our dinners. When we met in the street the houses had grown sombre. The space of the sky above us was the colour of ever-changing violet and towards it the lamps of the street lifted their feeble lanterns. The cold air stung us and we played till our bodies

And our shouts became loud echoing in the corners of the quiet street. We used to play in the dark muddy streets behind the house (.) running from the cottages to the dark doors of the back gardens from which the smell of burning ashes was coming to the smelly dark stables where the watchman was looking after the horses or saddling them (.) they made musical sounds whenever they shook their heads (..) When we returned to the street we found it drowned in the lights coming from the windows (.) and if it happened and we saw my uncle turning into the street we would run for shelter in the dark shadow of building until he entered the house quietly and safely (..) Similarly, if Mangan's sister appeared at the doorstep and her figure stood out in the beam of light emanating from the ajar door calling her brother (to drink) his tea we would watch her from our hideout as her eyes searched all over the street (..) When we despaired of her going we would leave our place and walk up to her resignedly. I would stand beside the barrier of the steps looking at her while her dress moved with the movements of her body while the braids of her soft hair swung all directions.

glowed. Our shouts echoed in the silent street. The career of our play brought us through the dark muddy lanes behind the houses, where we ran the gauntlet of the rough tribes from the cottages, to the back doors of the dark dripping gardens where odours arose from the ashpits, to the dark odorous stables where a coachman smoothed and combed the horse or shook music from the buckled harness. When we returned to the street, light from the kitchen windows had filled the areas. If my uncle was seen turning the corner, we hid in the shadow until we had seen him safely home. Or if Mangan's sister came out on the doorstep to call her brother in to his tea, we watched her from our shadow peer up and down the street. We waited to see whether she would remain or go in and, if she remained, we left our shadow and walked up to Mangan's steps resignedly. She was waiting for us, her figure defined by the light from the half-opened door. Her brother always teased her before he obeyed, and I stood by the railings looking at her. Her dress swung as she moved her body and the soft rope of her hair tossed from side to side.

6. APPLICATION OF THE CHECKLIST

6A. BACKGROUND INTERPRETIVE CONSTITUENTS

A1. Genre

Araby is a central story in *Dubliners*, James Joyce's collection of short stories.

A2. Period

Araby was published in 1914. It is modern in its sensibilities and worldview; it makes no attempt to influence events or manipulate its reader towards any particular view. Rather, it allows a sensitive, aesthetic narrator to be impinged on by events in the ugliness and sordidness around him. This gradually shows him that there can be no hope for romance in Dublin. In AbdulAziz's translation, the modernity of the story is maintained by using Modern Standard Arabic (MSA).

A3. Place

The story strongly reflects a view of Ireland, and Dublin in particular, as a place, which thwarts men's hopes and dreams. In the translation all this is diluted. The title of Joyce's collection is translated as *naas min dublin*, i.e. People from Dublin, while *dabaalina* or *dabliniyyuun* could have been used. All the crushing power of the place is lost, leaving only boy-meets-girl and visits mercantile centre. The romance ends with the narrator seeing himself *mussayyaran masluuba al-?irrada*, i.e. preordained and with no free will (Abdulaziz n.d.: 58), not "a creature driven and derived by vanity" (Joyce 1981:169).

Joyce's title, Araby, creates a feeling of expectancy and hope, undercut by disappointment at the bazaar billed as a "Grand Fete, Dublin 1894". The bazaar reveals itself as a hall of large, ugly, useless items; a place not of light and excitement, but of darkness and dilapidation; not of love, but of cheap flirtation. This authorial intention is lost at the outset, when the exotic potential of Araby is mundanely spelled out as The Arab Market (al-souq al-arabiyya).

A4. Author

The dominant attitude of the author is ironical. Just as Stephen is mocked subtly in *The Portrait*, the narrator in this story is separated from Joyce himself, to allow the ironies of the situation

and adolescent romance to reveal themselves. Except for a few instances where the translation substitutes one pronoun for another and changes free indirect speech into reported speech, it is obvious that the point of view is maintained in the translation.

A5. Narrator

Throughout the story, Joyce filters the dialogue through the consciousness of the narrator. There is no formally direct speech, but the narrator, Mangan's sister, the uncle, the aunt, all have their own voices, often rendered in free indirect speech coupled with the narrator's representation of the speech act.

E.g.

"My uncle said he was very sorry he had forgotten. He said he believed in the old saying: All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy."
(Joyce 1981:168 ,18)

Author's back-translation:

"My uncle apologised for this and said the matter had slipped his mind, supporting his apology by the proverb that says: Sound body, sound mind."
(Abdulaziz n.d.: 55)

For another example, consider the following:

"She asked me was I going to Araby. I forgot whether I said yes or no." (Joyce 1981:166) (19)

Author's back-translation:

"I was so confused then that the words died on my lips. She was questioning my going to Araby. I do not remember my answer to her question at that time."
(Abduaziz N.D. :50)

The narrator is of exceptional interest in this story. He is bright and alert, moving from childhood to adolescence in a rite of passage. Above all, his (world) is filled with romance, and builds up an image of his beloved. He intends to fulfil his quest by visiting Araby, and bringing her something back. The syllables of Araby cast an eastern enchantment over him, but not the reality. We are told nothing about him, but we gradually form a picture of an exceptionally aesthetic sensibility in the midst of a sordid city. Apart from major flaws in intertextuality and its attendant

respondent's role, as well as mistranslation of the title, and other flaws in the rendition of concepts and illusions, the point of view appears to have been maintained, given certain language incompatibilities.

6B. RESPONDENT'S ROLE

In the translation, the title of the story loses most of its **experiential value** when rendered as the Arab Market. In English, Araby has a poetic register with definite connotations of the mysterious orient. In the translation, "Arab" still has some egocentric appeal to the Arabic-speaking audience, but this appeal is undercut by "market" which sounds mundane. Joyce meant the reader to discover for himself that Araby is mundane. In making it explicit, the translation pre-empts the task of the respondent to experience the narrator's disappointment. Rendering the title as Araby could have preserved the elements of suspense and disappointment.

Another major flaw in regard to the respondent's role is the omission of the titles of the books, the narrator's preference of "yellow leaves", and the illusion to "the central apple tree." Omitting the titles of the books means a loss of essential detail, both about the priest and the narrator. The book titles all refer to thematic interests within the story, connoting romance, excitement and reversal. By implication, they should enable us to see more of the priest whose books they were, and, more importantly, of the narrator who named them. *The Abbot* by Sir Walter Scott, is a romance about the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots, obviously informing the themes of romance, Catholicism and entrapment. *The Devout Communicant* most obviously relates to Catholicism, which informs all the stories of *Dubliners*. *The Memoirs of Vidocq* tells the story of a French criminal who became chief of detectives, but died poor and disgraced for his part in a crime that he solved. This relates to the themes of reversal, loss of expectancy and the thwarting of escape and ambition, relevant throughout *Dubliners*. Clearly, failure to render the connotations of "yellow leaves" (i.e. French novels and yellow books, creating ideas of naughtiness and

excitement) pre-empts the reader's task in building up a mental image of the character of the adolescent narrator.

6C. TEXT CONSTITUENTS

C1. Mental Textuality

"Araby" presents its translator with no challenges on the level of mental textuality, i.e. internalised text types and text forms. It more or less follows the sub-genre of short story as conventionalised. All that the translator has to do in this respect is to follow the organisation as is. For example, the need never arises for paragraph fronting and postponement, as the case might be when one is translating Arabic editorials into English on account of the socio-linguistic relations that hold between the participants. (For a detailed discussion, see Sa'Adeddin 1987a). In this respect, the ability of the translator has not been put to the test.

C2. Intertextuality

Although Joyce is notoriously difficult to translate, *Araby* should not present a reasonably good translator with major problems. The techniques of bracketing, paraphrasing and footnoting could have solved the problem of intertextuality and other **communally shared concepts** and **allusions**. These have been avoided in the translation, thus breaking the relationship of circularity between the role of the respondent and the knowledge he should bring to the text. After all, one gets out of a text as much as s/he brings to it. The major flaw here is the omission of:

- a) the titles of the books found by the narrator,
- b) the narrator's preference for yellow leaves,
- c) the connotation of the central apple tree,
- d) the social implications in his running the gauntlet of the rough cottages, and
- e) the ashpits, i.e. ash dumps also used as outside toilets.

C3. Text Function

Although message content and message-form complement one another in monolingual communication, form – verse excluded – has lower priority after meaning and effect in translation. With this in mind, the translation, although not exemplary, seems to have maintained the pragmatic functions of the original. For instance, the first paragraph of the SLT maintains the descriptiveness of the

Joyce's. This does not imply that the translation of this paragraph is without its flaws. Within its general descriptiveness, it misses several clues to the textual world, as illustrated by the following examples:

- i) "Blind" (1.2) is rendered as *mughlaq*, i.e. 'closed' (1.2) blocked, barricaded. Arabic offers the paraphrase, *masduud un-nihaaya*, i.e. 'dead-ended.'
- ii) "Detached" (1.7), with its connotation of self-isolation, is rendered as *yaziluhu*, i.e. 'which isolates it' (isolated 1.8). Arabic offers the translator at least two other options: *munfaSilin*, i.e. 'detached, or *munazilin*, i.e. 'self-isolated.' Translating "detached" as 'which isolates it' entails two major changes:
 - (a) The agent 'square yard' has been substituted for the implied 'self.'
 - (b) The connotation of self-isolation has been lost.
- iii) "gazed at one another with brown imperturbable faces" (1.12) is omitted altogether.
- iv) "conscious" (1.9) has been rendered as '*ka?annaha kaanat ta9rifu*', i.e. as "if they knew" (1.11), which is a meagre artefact of the personification of the houses and locations.
- v) "decent lives" (1.10) has been rendered as *saakiniihaa mina TTaiybiin l?akhyaar*, i.e. 'its tenants were good-natured people.' The translation as it stands lacks the connotations of respectable drabness, dreariness and years of silent wretchedness evoked by 'decent lives'. Arabic offers the expression *9aa?ilaatun mastuura*, i.e. poor, but decent families, which evokes connotations more or less similar to those evoked by "decent lives."

In brief, the translation has not faithfully represented the descriptive details of the original. The fugitive atmosphere which Joyce creates by means of the narrator's perceptions, the imagery and ambiguity associated with the houses, and the figurative language which contributes to the poetic style of the original, have almost all been lost. Wilful omissions have further misrepresented the descriptiveness of the original. It is true that Joyce's poetic style is difficult to translate, but Arabic style that generally speaking inclines towards the flowery and poetic could have coped adequately with the task.

C4. Tenor(s) of text

The translation does not seem to have diverged from the general level of formality among the participants within the text. However, later in the story, the translation veers towards the formal, whereas the intimate dominates the original, e.g. the conversation between the young lady and the two English gentlemen (Joyce, 1981:168):

1. O, I never said such a thing!
2. O, but you did!
3. O, but I didn't!
4. Didn't she say that?
5. Yes, I heard her.
6. O, there's a fib!

The vocabulary and grammatical structures used by the translator for this passage are usually associated with the formal, even the frozen. The effect on an Arabic-speaking receiver may be illustrated by back-translating that interaction as it comes through Abdulaziz's (**henceforth A**) translation (n.d: 57).

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <i>kalla...? inni lam ?aqul
haadha muTlaqan!</i> | - Nay (..*) I absolutely did
not say that at all! |
| 2. <i>walaakinnaki fa9alti</i> | - But you certainly did. |
| 3. <i>?abadan lam ?af9al.</i> | - I never did. |
| 4. <i>?alam taqul dhaalik?</i> | - Did she not say that? |
| 5. <i>na9am laqad sami9tuhaa
taquulu dhaalik!!</i> | - Yes I heard say that! |
| 6. <i>eih...haadha talfiiq</i> | - What...this is a fabrication |

This can be compared with an alternative translation provided by a noted Arab novelist (Hani Al-Raheb **henceforth H.R.**, personal communication):

H.R. Back-translation

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. <i>yeh, ?ana maa qultu
shai?an kahaada ?abadan</i> | O, I never said such a thing! |
| 2. <i>.yeh, ?anti qulti</i> | O, but you said (that) |
| 3. <i>yeh, ?abadan !</i> | O, never! |
| 4. <i>?amaa qaalat dhaalik?</i> | Didn't she say that? |
| 5. <i>na9am sami9tuhaa.</i> | Yes I heard her |
| 6. <i>eh, huwa dha li...ftiraa !</i> | O, there's a fib. |

The translation can best be compared for text tenor by analysing the specific vocabulary and grammatical features used in each, and the corresponding interpretation they evoke in native Arabic receivers.

Line (1)

A: *kalla...?innii lam ?aqul haadha muTlaqan!*

- *kalla* = archaic form of 'no', with definitive negation connotation; usually encountered in pre-Islamic discourse, never in conversation.
- *?inni* = emphatic umbrella that covers all the information to follow.
- *lam ?aqul* = definitive negation, used in very formal Standard Arabic.
- *MuTlaqan* = 'absolutely', very formal, not common in conversation- al Arabic.

HR : *yeh, ?ana maa qultu shai?an kahaadha ?abadan!*

- *yeh* = Exclamation, preserves the exclamatory connotation of 'O' in original.
 - *maa qultu* = standardised form of the colloquial *maa ?ilt* (did not say) in Syrian and Lebanese Arabic; *maa gilt* in Baghdadi Arabic; *maa ?ultish* in Egyptian, Jordanian and Palestinian Arabic; and *maa qultish* in Maghribi Arabic. Purists among Arabic-speaking creative writers tend to use Standard Arabic-grammaticalised colloquial to create the effect of conversation.
- shai?an kahaadha ?abadan* = 'such a thing ever' which through the semantic and syntactic relation - ship it holds with *maa* (not) comes to mean 'never said such a thing.' Another marker of informality and colloquiality is *?ana*, the 1st person singular in Arabic. When used at the beginning of a sentence, it indicates close social relationship or conversationality. Suffixing the verb with an embedded 1st person singular may create a distancing effect in formal Arabic.

Line (2)

A: *walaakinnaki fa9alti*

walaakinnaki - was (continuative conj.) + contraj + connected fem. pron.), is a formal written contrajunction that serves an emphatic informal contrastive relationship. The conversational Arabic equivalent is usually the non-emphatic contrajunctive, *laakin*, followed by a non-embedded pronoun. *fa9alti* is an unsatisfactory substitute for *qulti* in 1.1. In Arabic, substitution normally makes the utterance shift towards the formal. In such cases Colloquial Arabic seems to resort to repetition, not substitution.

HR: *yeh, laa ?anti qulti!*

Exclamation is maintained by *yeh*. Conversational informality is rendered by the 2nd person singular, *?anti*, followed by *qulti*, a repetition of the verb in 1.12.

Line (3)

A: *?abadan. lam ?af'al*

lam ?af9al is structurally and functionally the same as *lam ?aqul*, which is an unsatisfactory substitute for *?aqul*.

HR: *yeh, ?abadan!*

Exclamation is maintained by *yeh*. The informality of this conversational exchange is rendered by deleting "I did not."

(Unlike English, Arabic has no contracted forms).

?abadan = never, is elliptic. It recalls to the mind of the reader or co-conversant the ellipted *?ana maa...kahaadha* (1.1, HR).

Line (4)

A: *?alam taqul dhaalik?*

?alam taqul is another instance of formal Arabic prose. Informality would normally be expressed by using the colloquial expression, *?amaa qaalat*, in MSA grammaticalised form.

HR: *?amaa qaalat dhaalik?*

MSA-grammatical colloquial expression.

Line (5)

A: *na9am laqd sami9tuhaa taquulu dhaalik!!*

laqad, a formal particle which emphatically reinforces the completeness of the verb it precedes; not common in informal speech except in Saudi Arabian and Yamani Arabic.

taquulu dhaalik adds to the formality of style by supplying the ellipted constituents in the original

HR: *na9am, sami9tuhaa*

An elliptical form, equivalent to the English original.

Line (6)

A: *eiih..haadha talfiiq*

"O" is translated as *eiih* = 'what' (Exclamation with connotation of anger); hesitation is wrongly represented in punctuation.

talfiiq = fabrication, formal lexical selection for informal "fib".

HR: *eh, hadha huwa li... ftiraa!*

Exclamation is maintained by *eh*; 'there is' is translated by its Arabic functional equivalent, drawing attention to and emphasizing what follows.

"a ... fib" is translated as *l-ftiraa'*, an MSA lexical item, reimported into colloquial to indicate a small, unimportant lie; usually with joking implications.

Overall, the above comparison shows that, although the layout and content of this interaction are maintained in Abdulaziz's translation, the level of formality among the participants has been raised. The major causes of this shift in text tenor are:

- i) syntactic structures usually associated with formal Arabic style;
- ii) lexical items that native Arabic receivers would expect in highly flown literary prose and formal contexts; and
- iii) literal rendition of certain English structures, thus adding to the formal alienation of the text.

C5. Mode(s) of Text

The transaction, which we have already discussed, points to the translation's failure to capture the conversational nature of this transaction. The informality of tone, implied in 'O', has been rendered as rudeness of tone *eiih*, i.e. 'What.' Lexical selection is not much better: the informal 'fib' has been translated as *talfiq*, i.e. fabrication. Syntactic structures are characteristic of Arabic writing, not speech. Grammatical inexplicitness, which Arabic-speaking writers frequently use in their representation of speech, is made explicit. Excepting *eiih*, which misses the tone of the conversation, there is no trace of grammaticalised colloquial, which Arabic creative writers use to create the effect of speech. The layout and punctuation aside, the above text lacks almost all markers of speakability in Arabic.

C6. Field(s) of Text

The original text does not face its translator with problems of field terminology. The translation, however, leaves much to be desired in its treatment of imagery and figures of speech.

C7. Cohesion

Perhaps the most noticeable misrepresentation in the translation is the deletion of the communal "we" (1.38). This grave error, considering what follows, breaks the narrative sequence down because it keeps appearing until much later (1.44). Failure to translate the 1st person plural gives the impression that the translation is either unconscious of the speaker, or else unwilling to include this point of view in the earlier narration. It is to be noted that the expression could have been rendered as *9ashaa?ina*, i.e. "our dinner", which could have at least kept the narrative sequence intact. Another example is the relationship between the speaker and his playmates on the one hand, and the sky. In 1.42, "the space of the sky above us was the colour of ever-changing violet" becomes *tataHauwalu zurqatu al-samaa?i ?ilaa launin banafsajiyyin kaaliH*, omitting "above us," although the one-to-one Arabic equivalent is *fauqanaa*.

The translation presents us with several instances of confusion in translating reference because of the contrasts between Arabic and English with regard to reference. For example, compare Joyce's original and Abdulaziz's translation:

Joyce	Abdulaziz
'to the back doors of the dark dripping gardens where odours arose from the ashpits' (1.53-55)	' <i>?ilaa ?abwaabi al-Hadaa?iqi al-khalfiyyati al-muballalati al-mu9timati al-latii tanba9 ithu minhaa raa?iHatu ramaadin yaHtariq.</i> ' Author's back-translation. ('to the doors of the back wet dark gardens from which the smell of burning ash arose.')

We will not comment here on the mistranslation of "odours arose from the ashpits" or the misplacement of "back," which describes "the doors," not the gardens. For an Arabic reader of the translation, 'which' in 'from which the smell of burning ash arose' refers to *?abwaab* (doors) not 'the gardens', because *Hadaa?iq* i.e., "gardens", in this context, qualifies the head *?abwaab*; *Hadaa?iq*, itself, is qualified by *al-khalfiyya* (back), *al-muballa* (wet), and *al-mu9tima* (dark).

C8. Sentence Function

The translation seems to have maintained the pragmatic functions of sentences, but sometimes shifts their focus, causing damage to the sentence-presented information. In 1.14, the translation shifts the focus from "the former tenant" in Joyce's original to "the house". The following is a morpheme translation of the first sentence as it appears in Arabic with comments on its structure:

<i>wa</i> and	<i>qad</i>	<i>dhalla</i> remained	<i>al-baitu</i> the house	<i>mahjuuran</i> deserted
	VP		NP	
Inter- utterance conj.	Particle injecting emphasis in the following state or event, expressed by the following verb	verb	Det. + N	Adj. expressing the state of the preceding noun

<i>fatratan</i> period	<i>Tawiilatan</i> long	<i>ba9da</i> after	<i>?an</i> ...	<i>maata</i> died	<i>l qissu</i> the priest
			VP		
N	Qual	Prep.time	Particle expressing completeness of event	V	Det + HN

<i>fii</i> in	<i>ghurfati</i> room	<i>l ?istiqaali</i> the reception/drawing	<i>l khalfiyya</i> the back
Prep. Ph.			
Prep.	N	Det + N + (Qualifier)	Det+Adj (Qualifier)

There is an obvious failure to maintain the distinction between the uninhabited house and the speaker's house, which is where the dead priest lived. What follows in the narrative concerns the speaker's house, but the connection has been lost in the translation.

C9. Tense, aspect and voice.

Although tense and aspect may seem problematic in the back-translation, particularly in Paragraph 3, the translation generally copes with tense and aspect in the original, considering that Arabic is primarily aspect-, not tense-biased. However, the translation seems to misrepresent the relationship between the subject and the narrator's role. For example, "I found" (1.21) is translated as *tanaatharati l-ikutubu* 'books were scattered', thus changing the agent's role.

C10. Concepts and Relations

This is the area where the translation appears weakest, resorting to casual approximation, not translational exactitude. The senses in which concepts and relations as would be perceived by Joyce's intended audience are often missed; reference, relations and implications are confused, if not mistranslated, omitted or introduced without sufficient interpretive background. Some examples are:

Joyce

'set free' (1.4), with connotation of entrapment.'

Abdulaziz

'*saa9ata ?inSiraafi talaamiidhi* i.e. the hour when pupils are due to leave: a non-committal expression.

'wild' (1.28), with implications of individual life.

'*?ihmaal*', i.e., neglect, with implications of moral evaluation.

'central apple tree' (1.29)

Significant omission, obliterating important connotations of Eden that the speaker may be, and Joyce certainly is, aware of.

'staggeling' (with implications of untidy, spreading in different directions) (1.30).

'*ghaira muktamilati al-numuw*', i.e., not fully grown, missing the implications of looseness and unkempt-ness.

'charitable' (associated with his sister, a reminder of the proverb: *charity begins at home*) (1.35)

'*muHsin*', i.e. philanthropist, loses the ironical attitude towards the priest whose charity did not begin at home. The irony could have been maintained by indirectly referring to the Arabic proverb: *al-?aqrabuuna ?aula bi al-ma9ruuf*, which is functionally equivalent to the English proverb.

'ran the gauntlet of rough tribes from the cottages' (1.52)

The translation omits reference to this anthropological, class-based discourse, which socially marks the dangerously poor in this part of the town. Instead, the translation makes '*min al-?akwaakh*', i.e. from the cottages function as an adverb. of place, while it functions in the original as adjectival. prep. ph. qualifying "rough tribes".

'coachman' (1.57)

'*Haaris*', i.e. watchman.

'where a coachman smoothed and combed the horse or shook music from the buckled harness' (1.57-59)

'Haithu waqafa l-Haarisu ya9tanii bilkhuyuuli ?au yusrijuhaa, wa kaanat tuHdithu ?aSwaatan muusiiqiyatan kullamaa htazat ru?uusuha', i.e., where the watchman stood looking after the horses or saddling them, and they made musical tunes every time their heads shook.

Three points are worth commenting on here:

- 1) *ya9tanii*, i.e., 'looking after' is dull, neutral and bland. Joyce's "smoothed and combed" suggests the coachman's pleasure in his work.
- 2) *'yusrijuhaa'* ('saddling them'), indicates that the translation is done without seeing the text in toto. At this hour of the day, the coachman is not likely to be saddling the horses; he is cleaning them after a day's hard work and preparing to bed them down.
- 3) The horses did not make music; the coachman 'shook music from the buckled harness'.

'until we had seen him safely housed' (1.64-65).

'Hatta yadlifa ?ilaa lmanzili bihuduu?in wa sakiina', i.e., 'until he sauntered into the house quietly and peacefully'.

The translation misrepresents how the boys feel towards the uncle. They regard him a threatening kind of animal: Joyce's 'housed' suggests 'caged'. The translation misleads the Arabic text receiver by getting him to see in the boys' behaviour affectionate and tender concern for the uncle. Joyce's 'safely' refers implicitly to the boys' feeling of security, not the uncle's.

'call her brother in to his tea' (1.77-78).

tunaadii ? akhaahaa litanaawuli shaai', i.e. 'calling on her brother to have his tea'.

In this instance, the translation conveys the message, but not its content. Tea is a minor, but ceremonious hot meal in the British Isles, served at six o'clock. In the Arabic-speaking world, it is just a hot beverage sipped at all hours.

'We waited to see whether she would remain or go in and, if she remained, we left our shadow and walked up to Mangan's steps resignedly' (1.70-74).

'Hattaa ?idha maa ya?isnaa mina nSiraafiha taraknaa makananaa wa tajahnaa ?ilaihaa raaDikhiina saghiriin'.
 'If we despaired of her going in, we left our place and subdued, walked up to her resignedly.'
 (Author's translation).

It is obvious that the translation alters the boys' attitude towards Mangan's gentle sister, whose patience and devotion they test in a game-like manner'. The lexical selection in the translation, e.g. *'ya?isnaa'* (despaired), 'subdued' (*raaDikhiin*), makes them in the native Arabic, dislike her. In the original, their resignation refers to the evening's playtime coming to an end, not directly to her presence. The narrator clearly steps, and only indirectly to her. This indirectness half-disguises that he does actually walk to the girl, but with this too direct translation the subtle recreation of the self-deception working in an adolescent boy's mind is obscured.

'teased' (1.77)

The omission this time adds to divorcing the element of game, which the boys play with Mangan's sister.

C11. Collocations, Clichés, Idioms and Figures of Speech

If one compares Para.1 where Joyce meticulously etches a concise but detailed description of the scene of the story, with Abdulaziz's translation, one realises how far the translation lags behind the original in respect to figurative language. One example is the description of the houses (1.8-12). Their personification by such terms as "conscious", "gazed at one another", and "with brown imperturbable faces" are all lost except for a meagre survival in 'as

if they knew'. Another example is the image of the "lamps of the street" lifting "their feeble lanterns" towards the sky (1.44-45). A third example is the mistranslation of "housed" (implying caged) (1.65) as *yadlif* (saunter, walk slowly). A fourth example is mistranslating "tossed" (like a horse's mane) (1.82) as *'ta?arjaHat'* (swung).

A glaring flaw in the translation of cliché is the translation of the proverbial cliché "*all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy*" (Joyce 1981: 168, 18) into "sound body, sound mind" (Abdulaziz, n.d.:55). The translation, it is submitted, shifts the connotation of the proverb from the fun side to a physical career, thus reducing the psychological allusion intended by Joyce to a mundane haranguing statement.

C12. Sound/Print

There is a further complexity, which is not readily obvious to the ethnocentrically Standard Average European mind, when contrast between systems of punctuation comes into play. For instance, the system of Arabic punctuation is based on the separation of information units for oral delivery by lexical and phonological devices whose import is perceived by native Arabic text users.

On the other hand, modern English punctuation is "a visual configurational feature" of English grammar, which "cannot be properly understood unless the other grammatical features of the language are also understood" (cf. Sa'Adeddin 1987b). By the same token, it cannot be imported into the writing system of another language without proper adaptation to the grammar of that language and its system of cohesion, which has unfortunately been the case since punctuation was introduced into Arabic in the 19th C. What has not been understood is that while linking, separating, enclosing and omission punctuation may indicate a number of English cohesive relationships, Arabic makes these relationships explicit by the wording of the text. Evidence for the confusion that emanates from using both systems of punctuation can be drawn from Abdulaziz's translation. In (1.4) a comma is used where Joyce uses a full stop. An inter-utterance *wa*, i.e. 'and' which functions, here, as a separating conjunctive introduces the new topic in the translation. (For a brief note on the functions of '*wa*', see Sa'Adeddin 1991.) A full stop is inserted between *waqaar*, i.e.

'solemnity', and *ka?annahaa*, i.e. 'as if', on the assumption that what follows is a new breath group carrying another unit of information. Most of the confusion seems to arise from using two different punctuation systems that accomplish more or less different functions. (For a detailed study of the morphologised Arabic punctuation system, cf. Sa'Adeddin 1987b).

This said, the translation is not flawless in this respect. Most conspicuous are the unjustified use of triple and double full stops, and the omission of triple full stops where they indicate hesitation. One example is the substitution of the hesitation marker for two dots (..) and the addition of three dots after *talfiiq*, i.e. 'fabrication' (Cf. C4).

7. CONCLUSION

Although further applications to authentic texts are yet to be done, and details of the above constituents remain to be further described and taxonomized, the lineaments of the linguistic approach to the criticism of literary translations, proposed here, seem to be plausible. The above illustrative example shows that it works. However, intuitions remain pre-hypothetical until they pass the test of replicability and irrefutability.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions and comments of Peter John Vernon, Mick Short and Nelson Taylor to the first oral presentation of this paper which was given to the PALA-GB Conference on 22nd April 1987. Since then, the paper was shelved for further maturation and the final write-up. It was most opportune that this should coincide with my arrival in Jordan to take up my position with the Department of English Language and Literature.

References

- Abdulaziz, 9. (n.d.)
(transl.), *Nas min Dublin*, Dar Saad, Cairo.
- Abraham, W., Givon, T., and Thompson, S. A. (eds) (1995)
Discourse Grammar and Typology: Papers in Honour of
J. W. M. Varhaar. Bengamin: Amsterdam and
Philadelphia.
- Beaugrande, R. de (1995) "Text Linguistics", in Verschuerer et. al.
Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler W. (1981)
Introduction to Text Linguistics. Longman, London and
New York.
- Belloc, H.(1931)
On Translation, Clarendon, Oxford
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993)
*Analysing Genre, Language Use in Professional
Settings*. Longman, London.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (1991)
"Cultural Expectations and Socio-pragmatic Failure in
Academic Writing", in *Socio-Cultural Issues in English
for Academic Purposes*", (eds.) Adams, P., Heaton, B.,
Howarth, P. MacMillan Publishers Ltd., London &
Basingstoke.
- Davie, D. (1975)
Poetry in Translation. The Open University Press,
Milton Keynes.
- Day Lewis, C. (1970)
On Translating Poetry. Abbey Press, Abdington-on
Thames.
- Dijk, Teun van. (1979)
The Structures and Functions of Discourse. Lectures at
the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras.
- Downing, P. & Noonan, M. (1995)
*Word Order in Discourse, Typological Studies in
Language 30*. Benjamin, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia.
- Fowler, R. (1986)
Linguistic Criticism. OUP, Oxford, New York.

- Hartmann, R.R.K. (1980)
Contrastive Textology. Julius Groos Verlag,
Heidelberg,
- Holmes, J. (1970)
"Forms of Verse Translation and Translation of Verse
Forms", in J. Holmes (ed.), *The Nature of Translation:
Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary
Translation*. Mouton, The Hague.
- House, J. (1982)
A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Gunter
Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Joyce, J. (1981)
"Araby", in C. Bain, J. Beaty, J.P. Hunter (eds.), *The
Norton Introduction to Literature*. Norton, New York
and London.
- Kasper, G & Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) (1993)
Interlanguage Pragmatics. OUP, Oxford.
- Leech, G. (1991)
"The state of the art in corpus linguistics". in Aijmer and
B. Altenberg (eds.), *English Corpus Linguistics: 8-29*.
Longman, London and New York.
- Lefevere, A. (1975)
Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint.
Van Gorcum, Assen and Amsterdam.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A (eds.). (1992)
Discourse Description. Benjamin, Amsterdam/
Philadelphia.
- Neubert, A. & Shreve, G. (1992)
Translation as Text. Kent State University Press, Ohio.
- Sa'Adeddin, M. Akram. A. M. (1985)
"On the Quality Assessment of Translated Literary
Texts"(Arabic). in R. Sabbath, M.S Aware and A.
Farghali (eds.), *Proceedings of the First National
Symposium on Language Teaching in Kuwait*.
University Press, Kuwait.
- _____ (1987a)"Target World Experiential Matching",
uereme, Studies in Modern Languages. University of
Bath

- _____ (1987b) "Three Problem Areas in Teaching Translating to Native Arabic Literate," *Anthropological Linguistics*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- _____ (1989) "Text Development and Arabic-English Negative Interference", *Applied Linguistics*. OUP, Oxford.
- _____ (1990). "Towards a Viable Applied Linguistic Theory of Translation", in P. Fawcett and O. Heathcote (eds.), *Translation in Performance*. University of Bradford, Bradford.
- _____ (1991) "Writing Across Language Communities," in Adams, et.al. Heaton and P. Howarth (eds.); *Socio-Cultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes*. McMillan & the British Council, London and Basingstoke.
- _____ (1995) "Towards a Model for Systematic Islamization: A General Linguistic Blueprint", *AJIS*. AMSS and IIIT, Herndon, Virginia.
- _____ (1996) "Masochistic Streaks of Modern Arab Linguistic Thought against Its Constitutive Self" (Arabic), in *Ishkaliyat al Tahayyuz*, A. Al Masiri (ed.). IIIT, Herndon, Virginia.
- _____ (1998) "Teaching Arabic in the 21st Century: Problems, Challenges and Suggestions. (Arabic) *At-Tajdid*. IIU Press, Kuala Lumpur.
- Schank, R. & Abelson, R. (1977)
Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding.
Earlbaum, Hillside, N.J.
- Selver, P. (1966)
The Art of Translating Poetry. Baker, London.
- Svartvik, J. (1992)
Directions in Corpus Linguistics. Mouton de
Gruyter, The Hague.
- Toury, G. (1980)
In Search of Theory of Translation. Jerusalem
Academic Press, Jerusalem.

- Tucker, A. B. (1987)
"Current Strategies in Machine Translation Research and Development", in *Machine Translation*. S. Nienburg (ed.). OUP, London and New York.
- Verschuerer, J., Ostman, Jan-Ola, Blommaert, J. (eds.) (1995)
Handbook of Pragmatics. Benjamin, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Wilss, W. (1980)
"Semiotik undbersetzungswissenschaft", in *Semiotik und Ubersetzung*, W.Wilss (ed.) Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- _____ (1982) *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- _____ (1986) "The Prospects for Translation Courses from the Point of View of the University of the Saarland, Saarbrücken (West Germany), in *International Conference on Translation: The Role of Translation in National Development*. The Malaysian Translators Association, Kuala Lumpur.