

two \*\*\*The smallest unit which we would expect to possess individual meaning is the word. In English, teeth are brushed, but in German and Italian they are 'polished', in Polish they are washed" and in Russian they are 'cleaned'. \*\*\*

### 2.2.3 Evoked meaning

Evoked meaning arises from dialect and register variation. A dialect is a variety of language which has currency within a specific community or group of speakers. It may be classified on one of the following bases:

1. Geographical (e.g. a Scottish dialect, or American as opposed to British English: cf. the difference between lift and elevator);
2. Temporal (e.g. words and structures used by members of different age groups within a community, or words used at different periods in the history of a language: cf. verily and really);
3. Social (words and structures used by members of different social classes: cf. scent and perfume, napkin and serviette).

Register is a variety of language that a language user considers appropriate to a specific situation. \*\*\*

## 4 IN OTHER WORDS

1. Field of discourse: this is an abstract term for 'what is going on' that is relevant to the speaker's choice of linguistic items.
2. Tenor of discourse: an abstract term for the relationships between the people taking part in the discourse. the tenor of discourse right in translation can be quite difficult.
3. Mode of discourse: an abstract term for the role that the language is playing for its medium of transmission (spoken, written).

Different groups within each culture have different expectations about what kind of language is appropriate to particular situations. \*\*\* it is rarely possible to define even the basic propositional meaning of a word or utterance with absolute certainty. \*\*\*

## 2.3 THE PROBLEM OF NON-EQUIVALENCE

The choice of a suitable equivalent will always depend not only on the linguistic system or systems being handled by the translator, but also on the way both the writer of the source text and the producer of the target text, that is the translator, choose to manipulate the linguistic systems in question; on the expectations, background knowledge and prejudices of readers within a specific tempora and spatial location; on translators' own understanding of their task, including their assessment of what is appropriate in a given situation; and on a range of restrictions that may operate in a given environment at a given point in time, including censorship\* and various types of intervention by parties other than the translator, author and reader, \*\*\*

### 2.3.2 Non-equivalence at word level and some common strategies for dealing with it

Non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word which occurs in the source text. The type and level of difficulty posed can vary tremendously depending on the nature of non-equivalence. Different kinds of non-equivalence require different strategies, some very straightforward, others more involved and difficult to handle. Since, \*\*\*

#### 2.3.2. 1 Common problems of non-equivalence

- (a) Culture-specific concepts  
The source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom or even a type of food. Such concepts are often referred to as 'culture-specific'. Speaker (of the House of Commons)
- (b) The source-language concept is not lexicalized in the target language  
The source-language word may express a concept which is known in the target culture but simply not lexicalized, that is not 'allocated' a target-language word to express it. The word savoury has no equivalent in many languages, although it expresses a concept which is easy to understand. The adjective standard, yet Arabic has no equivalent for it. Landslide has no ready equivalent in many languages, although it simply means 'overwhelming majority'
- (c) The source-language word is

semantically complex. The source-language word may be semantically complex. This is a fairly common problem in translation. Words do not have to be morphologically complex to be semantically complex (Bolinger and Sears 1968). In other words, a single word which consists of a single morpheme can sometimes express a more complex set of meanings than a whole sentence. We do not usually realize how semantically complex a word is until we have to translate it into a language which does not have an equivalent for it. An example of such a semantically complex word is *arruacao*, (d) The source and target languages make different distinctions in meaning. The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. What one language regards as an important distinction in meaning another language may not perceive as relevant. For example, Indonesian makes a distinction between going out in the rain without the knowledge that it is raining (*kehujan*) and (*hujan*), (e) The target language lacks a superordinate. The target language may have specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field. Russian has no ready equivalent for *facilities*, meaning 'any equipment, building, services, etc. that are provided for a particular activity or purpose'.\* It does, however, have several specific words and expressions which can be thought of as types of facilities, for example *sredstva peredvizheniya* ('means of transport'), British Sign Language (BSL): BSL has no direct equivalent: the opposite problem is that BSL is frequently much more specific than English. ( Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words If the concept expressed by the source item is not lexicalized at all in the target language, the paraphrase strategy can still be used in some contexts. **Instead of a related word, the paraphrase may be based on modifying a superordinate or simply on unpacking the meaning of the source item, particularly if the item in question is semantically complex.** Example A In the words of a Lonrho affidavit dated 2 November 1988, the allegations. Example C Source text Brintons – press release issued by carpet manufacturer, 1986): They have a totally integrated operation from the preparation of the yarn through to the weaving process. Under house, English again has a variety of hyponyms which have no equivalents in many languages, for example *bungalow, cottage, croft, chalet, lodge, hut*, G. Physical perspective has to do with where things or people are in relation to one another or to a place, as expressed in pairs of words such as *come/go, take/bring, arrive/depart* and so on. H. There may be a target-language word which has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. (e) Translation by paraphrase using a related word This strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalized in the target language but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target language (see section on common problems of non-equivalence above, items (i) and (i). Example B: *Kolesterol-super* is rich and concentrated in its make-up which gives a product that resembles cream ... The paraphrase in the Arabic text uses comparison, a strategy which can be used to deal with other types of non-equivalence. We can identify two distinct morphemes in *girls*: *girl + s*, but we cannot do the same with *men*,\*\* According to Cruse, we can distinguish four main types of meaning in words and utterances (utterances being stretches of written or spoken text): propositional meaning, expressive meaning, presupposed meaning and evoked meaning. This is because expressive meaning relates to the speaker's feelings or attitude rather than to what words and

utterances refer to. 2.2.2 Presupposed meaning Presupposed meaning arises from co-occurrence restrictions, that is restrictions on what other words or expressions we expect to see before or after a particular lexical unit. It is usually easier to add expressive meaning than to subtract it. In other words, if the target-language equivalent is neutral compared to the source-language item, the translator can sometimes add the evaluative element by means of a modifier or adverb if necessary, or by building it in somewhere else in the text. So, it may be possible, for instance, in some contexts to render the English verb *batter* (as in *child/wife battering*) by the more neutral Japanese verb *tataku*, meaning 'to beat', plus an equivalent modifier such as 'savagely' or 'ruthlessly'. Arabic, for instance, has no ready mechanism for producing such forms and so they are often replaced by an appropriate paraphrase, depending on the meaning they convey (e.g. *retrievable* as 'can be retrieved' and *drinkable* as 'suitable for drinking'). The hair is washed with 'wella' shampoo, provided that it is a mild

**Example B** Source text (The Patrick Collection – a leaflet produced by a privately owned museum of classic cars): The Patrick Collection has restaurant facilities to suit every taste – from the discerning gourmet, to the Cream Tea expert. Expressive meaning cannot be judged as true or