

Reference and Representation in Translation: a Look Into the Translator's Resources

Abdullah Shakir

Volume 40, Number 4, décembre 1995

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/004122ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/004122ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)

1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Shakir, A. (1995). Reference and Representation in Translation: a Look Into the Translator's Resources. *Meta*, 40(4), 693–701. <https://doi.org/10.7202/004122ar>

Article abstract

This study investigates the effect of schematic knowledge on the appropriateness and communicative acceptability of the translation rendered of four ambiguous contextless texts. The four texts (a road sign and three advertisements) were translated in two separate sessions by twenty-eight students pursuing a B.A. in English language and literature. In the first session, the students were provided with the texts decontextualized; while in the second they were provided with the same texts in the contexts they usually occur in. In the two sessions the students were asked to explain in a separate sheet why they translated each text in the way they did. Two notions, closely related to the translating process, are discussed in the analysis of the translation provided. These notions are "reference" and "representation". The analysis has shown that the student translators resorted to referential strategies in the process of translating when they were aware of the relevant contextual dimensions of the target text. Their translations in this case retained the registral, rhetorical, and formal characteristics of the types of texts they translated. The analysis has also shown that when unaware of the pertinent contextual dimensions of the text, the student translators resorted to representational (introspective) strategies whereby contexts and world realities deriving from experiences and worlds other than those intended by the SL text producer were created, and the translations bore rhetorical, registral, and syntactic features relevant to the contexts and world realities the translators created.

REFERENCE AND REPRESENTATION IN TRANSLATION: A LOOK INTO THE TRANSLATOR'S RESOURCES

Résumé

L'auteur étudie les effets de la connaissance schématique sur la justesse et l'acceptabilité communicative de la traduction de quatre textes ambigus et hors contexte (un panneau routier et trois publicités).

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of schematic knowledge on the appropriateness and communicative acceptability of the translation rendered of four ambiguous / contextless texts. The four texts (a road sign and three advertisements) were translated in two separate sessions by twenty-eight students pursuing a B.A. in English language and literature. In the first session, the students were provided with the texts decontextualized; while in the second they were provided with the same texts in the contexts they usually occur in. In the two sessions the students were asked to explain in a separate sheet why they translated each text in the way they did.

Two notions, closely related to the translating process, are discussed in the analysis of the translation provided. These notions are "reference" and "representation." The analysis has shown that the student translators resorted to referential strategies in the process of translating when they were aware of the relevant contextual dimensions of the target text. Their translations in this case retained the registral, rhetorical, and formal characteristics of the types of texts they translated. The analysis has also shown that when unaware of the pertinent contextual dimensions of the text, the student translators resorted to representational (introspective) strategies whereby contexts and world realities deriving from experiences and worlds other than those intended by the SL text producer were created, and the translations bore rhetorical, registral, and syntactic features relevant to the contexts and world realities the translators created.

INTRODUCTION

In addition to being competent in the lexical and syntactic systems of the source language (SL), translators and interpreters need to be well aware of the cultural, pragmatic, and communicative dimensions of the text they are dealing with. Research in cognitive theory¹ refers to this multi-dimensional knowledge as schematic knowledge. According to cognitive theorists, schematic knowledge represents information acquired and accumulated as abstract configurations of world events and experiences, and stored in the language user's memory in forms and structures reflecting the pattern and manner in which the events and experiences typically happen in the culture concerned. What is stored is not only the linguistic representation of the event or experience, but also the situational features which motivate and / or co-occur with the linguistic expression of the event.

Situational aspects include, among other things, the medium of presentation, the form of linguistic presentation (the way the linguistic constituents are typically arranged), the space and location of presentation (a road sign, a no-smoking sign, an advertisement, an editorial in a certain magazine or newspaper), and the cultural background underlying and motivating

the verbal expression of the event or experience in question². These aspects seem to be an integral part of the cognitive network that contribute to giving the translator's linguistic competency its discursive and cultural dimensions. They tend to function as processing controls and terms of reference in text reception and production or re-production (as in the case of translating).

When texts are stripped of their contexts, they tend to appear as verbal bodies constituting of linguistic symbols which might be or seem to be void of clues as to the intended function and content of the text in question. In such a case, the task of the interpreter/translator becomes even more demanding as the linguistic components of the text concerned fail to trigger relevant, feasible, and appropriate experiences that can be mapped onto textual components in an attempt to extract the meanings intended to be there. In other words, the linguistic constituents of the text prove to be opaque.

Activated schemata can perform three major functions in the process of interpreting incoming information³. Firstly, they functionalize the cultural background knowledge to guide the recipient's processing of the verbal and non-verbal (e.g. road signs) texts, thus constraining the interpretation of ambiguous texts. Secondly, schemata set foundations for filling gaps in a given text, thus activating inferencing strategies that come into play in rendering a given translation or interpretation. Thirdly, they establish *meta-cognition* (Casanave 1986), or a correspondence between prototypical knowledge and the givens in a text. Through this meta-cognitive knowledge, language users monitor their interpretation/translation, relying on the givens in the text under consideration. In this view, a text has a potentiality for meaning rather than a pre-scribed meaning. Language users explore it for clues that can activate relevant information. To this effect, Carrell (1983 : 200) writes "meaning does not just reside in the text; rather, meaning is constructed out of the interaction between a reader's activated background knowledge and what's in the text." In this respect, Brown and Yule (1985) speak of two types of context : co-text and context. The first is of help in seeking the intended meaning when the textual givens (e.g. lexical items) interconnect and interact, thus revealing references and referents, relationships, and worlds intended to be envisioned in the linguistic expression of the text. The second, on the other hand, is often clued by the co-textual one. However, heavy reliance on contextual features/elements occurs when the linguistic givens in the text prove to be opaque or ambivalent.

Cognitive theorists⁴ also speak of *cognitive addition* in the process of interpreting/translating. This cognitive addition represents that type of information originally not intended by the SL speaker/writer but is created by the language recipient as he/she comes across an opaque, or culturally alien content, or when he/she makes associations between senses and experiences not intended by the SL speaker/writer but which are created as they are more favorable in their

connotations. This notion of cognitive addition is worth investigating, especially when we want to account for reasons underlying instances of translation considered inappropriate or irrelevant.

THE STUDY

In order to understand the student translators' attempts to retain a TL (Target Language) version equivalent to the SL text in terms of expression, function, and content, translator trainers and teachers of translation in general need to be aware of the resources the students derive from in the process of translating/interpreting. They also need to be conversant with the resources SL speakers/writers derive from to inject the meanings they intend to convey via the utterances/texts they produce.

During the Gulf War, a Jordanian T.V. team interviewed Iraqi citizens in Bagdad about their stance as regards the political, military, and economic embargo imposed on Iraq. One Iraqi lady responded (in Iraqi dialect):

ihna l- iraqiyyin fog in -naxal
We def. Iraqis on top def palm trees

A literal and uninformed translation of the above utterance would certainly yield a meaningless version as it (the translation) may lack knowledge of the SL speakers' resources, and ignore two central dimensions to the utterance. The first is the connection between palm trees and hard environmental conditions. Palm trees adapt to the harsh desert climate and grow to a great height and yield a rich type of fruit. The second dimension is the then prevailing political, military, and economic embargo and the resulting shortages of food, water, and medicine. Awareness of the above dimensions is in other words awareness of the speaker's resources and long-established frames of reference. It is also an awareness translators and interpreters need to be equipped with in their attempt to render a communicatively acceptable translation of the Iraqi lady's utterance (and utterances of comparable nature). Needless to say that a bilingual dictionary will not be of much help in revealing the intended meaning of the utterance: "We, Iraqis, are steadfast, patient, and will keep our heads high."

In this paper, I will discuss two notions related to world knowledge and its relevance in the process of translation. I will also highlight their potential bearing on rendering appropriate or inappropriate translations of contextless texts. These notions are *reference* and *representation*.

According to Widdowson (1987: 10) a referential power of a lexical item refers to its indexical value, which stands for "...a set of indications as to where meaning is to be found in the contextual circumstance of the utterance." In this view, the meaning of a lexical item in an utterance cannot be viewed as stable or readily specifiable; rather it relies in its interpretation on the recipient's ability to associate it with relevant aspects of knowledge stored in his cognitive memory

about worlds comparable to that of the utterance under consideration.

Reference, thus, relates to perceiving the relationship that holds between some of the sense-components of a lexical item or constituents of an utterance and relevant contextual elements the SL speaker / writer had in mind in the process of producing the text in question. Hence, the expression *palm trees* takes on an indexical / referential value in the translation provided, as its sense-components associate with relevant contextual elements the text is encapsulated in: what a palm tree stands for in Iraqi tradition.

Representation, on the other hand, is used here to refer to cases where meanings are not perceivable via indexical / referential values of the constituents of the text. Rather, meanings are derived from contexts created by the translator / interpreter and generated by sense-components and associations deriving from culture-specific experiences other than those intended by the SL text producer. Key or focus lexical items in this view give rise to an introspective power whereby the search for meaning assumes a process of creating realities other than those meant to be sought in the SL text. The creation of such realities can be viewed as one of the translators' / interpreters' resources when the text at hand proves to be opaque and the meanings incorporated in it are inaccessible.

Purposes of the study

This study aims to explore the endeavors student translators make to handle ambiguous / contextless texts, and the resources available to them in the process of translating / interpreting such texts. In addition, the study will set forth suggestions, based on the results of the analysis, as to the teaching of translating.

Subjects

The subjects of the study are twenty-eight English school teachers who graduated from junior colleges in Jordan and who are pursuing a B.A. degree in English at the Higher College for the Certification of Teachers. The students are required to do three translation courses in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Materials

The subjects were asked to translate into Arabic four short texts: one road sign and three advertisements. These are:

Text 1: HEATED ATTENDANT PARKING

Text 2: RESUME SPEED

Text 3: SWAP A CHILD THIS SUMMER: FAMILY CENTER SPECIAL EDUCATION CENTER

Text 4: CHILD SUMMER SALE

Methods of collecting Data

Data were collected in two translation sessions.

Session 1: The subjects were provided with the texts stripped of their physical or linguistic contexts. Each

subject was asked to translate the texts and explain in a separate sheet why he / she translated each text in the way he / she did. More precisely, each subject was asked to specify what elements in the text influenced his / her translation. They were allowed to use dictionaries to look up unfamiliar words.

Session 2: This was carried out the day following the first session. The students were not informed in advance that they were going to translate the same texts. This time the subjects were provided with the same texts they dealt with in session 1, but each was contextualized. The subjects were also asked to translate each text and specify what elements in it they relied on in their translations. The two translations of each text were then collected, together with the students' explanations. The data were then studied with a view to:

- calculating the frequency of both appropriate and inappropriate translations in the two sessions;
- analyzing the students' explanations (henceforth will be referred to as protocols) as to why they translated the texts in the way they did in both sessions.

The aim of the analysis was to find out to what extent the student's world knowledge can influence the nature of content they inject into their translations of the texts.

DISCUSSION

A sample of the translations in session 1

A look at table 1 below reveals that, except for text 2, the frequency of inappropriate translations exceeds that of appropriate ones. Appropriateness here means whether the translation provided:

- maintains the type and focus of the text in question;
- retains a complete content of the SL text without skipping or missing key aspects of its content;
- renders a translated version equivalent to the SL text as regards characteristic registeral features, underlying rhetorical function, and schematic content organization.

Text	% appropriate	% inappropriate
1	4.3	95.6
2	74.6	25.4
3	26.0	73.9
4	45.5	54.5

Table 1
Percentages of appropriate and inappropriate translations of the texts in session 1

Below are examples of the students' translations of texts 1, 3, and 4. (Text 2 will be discussed at a later stage, as it did not cause serious difficulties to the students).

Text 1 HEATED ATTENDANT PARKING

- (1) 1a. *lā tuš il in-nāra fi l-muntazahāt il waṭaniyyah*
do not-lay def.fire in def-parks def.national
(do not lay / make a fire in national parks)
- 1b. *lā tuḡḏib ḥāris il-muntazah*
do not make-angry guard def.park
(do not make the guard of the park angry)
- 1c. *lā tarmi z-zibālāh fi l-muntazah li'anna l-ḥāris sa-yagḏah*
do not- throw def.garbage in def.park
because def.guard will-become-angry
(do not throw garbage in the park because the guard will be angry)
- 1d. *lā tuqif sayyārataka huna li'anna hunāka harikun fi l-mawqif*
do not park car-your here because there a
fire in def car park
(do not park your car here because there is a fire in the car park).
- 1e. *iḏā ḥamiyat sayyāratuka fa-alayka 'an tuqifaha wa tushihaha*
if gets over heated car-your must-you to
stop-it and repair-it
(if the engine of your car gets over heated,
you must stop it and get it repaired).

Text 3 SWAP A CHILD THIS SUMMER: FAMILY CENTER: SPECIAL EDUCATION CENTER

- (3) 3a. *la tuḡadil it-tifl: 'al-'usrah markaz it-ta-lim il-'awwal*
do not argue-with def child: def family
center def education def first
(do not argue with your child: the family is the first (central) place for education)
- 3b. *'i-tani bi t-tifl fi l-ijazah s-sayfiyyah: 'al-'a'ila hiya markaz it-ta-lim il-vas*
look-after prep.def.child in def.vacation
summer: def.family is center def.education
def.special (look after your child during the summer vacation: the family is the special educational center).
- 3c. *jari tiftaka fi l-utlati-sayfiyyah: 'al-'usrah hiya l-markaz il-'awwal li- ta-lim il-'atfal*
understand child-your in def.vacation def Summer: def family is def center def first
for-educating def children (understand how your child thinks in the Summer vacation: the family is the first center of special education)
- 3d. *ta-awn ma'a tiftika fi l-'ijazah s-sayfiyyah li'anna l-usrah hiya l-makani l-'awwal li-ta-lim*
cooperate with child-your in def vacation
def Summer because def-family is def place
def-first for-def-education (cooperate with your child during the summer vacation because the family is the central place of education).
- 3e. *sawim tiftaka hada s-sayf: 'al-'usrah hiya l-markazi l-'awwal li- t- ta-lim*

bargain with child-your this def summer:
def family is def center def first for-def-
education. (Do a deal with your child this
summer: the family is the first place of
education)

Text 4 CHILD SUMMER SALE

- (4) 4a. *'al-'atfalu yabī'ūna ḥājātīn raxīṣah fi l-utlah s-sayfiyyah*
def children sell commodities cheap in
def-vacation def-summer (children sell
cheap commodities during the Summer
vacation)
- 4b. *'atfalu l-madāris yaṣtagilūna fi s-sawāri fi s-sayf*
children def-schools work in def-streets in
def-summer (school children work in the
streets during the summer vacation)
- 4c. *'al-'atfalu yumārisūna 'a-mālan gayra muḥida fi l-utlah s-sayfiyyah*
def-children do jobs not useful in def-
vacation def-summer (children do useless
jobs during the summer vacation)
- 4d. *'atfalu l-'irāq yubā'ūna bi l-mazadi l-'alani hada s-sayf*
children def-Iraq sold in def-auction this
def summer (Iraqi children sold in auction
this summer)

Discussion of the data

The form and content of the translations provided in (1), (3), and (4) above seem to be an outcome of interaction among three major factors:

- the nature of the structure and format of the texts in question. Advertisements are, generally, characterized by brevity, highly condensed content, ellipsis, and lack of explicit cohesive devices (cf Leech 1972 and Pinchuck 1977).
- the decontextualization of the texts: advertisements usually occur in physical or linguistic background which provides context to such brief texts. Context in this case explains or at least provides clues as to what the advertisement is about.
- dominance of prototypical frames of reference consulted for potential meanings of the constituent components of the texts. In each text, it seems, there occurs one or more lexical items that proved opaque as regards their content, and therefore they seem to have generated sense components other than those intended by the SL text producer.

Turning to the translations in (1) above, we note that the examples (1a-e) reveal more than one aspect of digression from text typological focus. They manifest violation of the register of sales advertisements. Instead of inviting and persuading (as advertisements typically do), the translations provided warn and inform or instruct. This has been clear in the warning and instructional tone they assume. The Arabic syntactic structures:

1. *lā tuṣ'il in-nāra...*
do not lay a fire
2. *lā tuḡdih hāris*
do not make the guard angry...
3. *idā hamīyat sayyāratuka, fa'alayka*
if your car gets over heated, then you have to...

are used to warn (1 & 2) and to instruct (3). Thus we see that the student translators confused the advertisement with the signs they see in public places, e.g. parks, or with instructional texts as in how-to-do-it texts. Some lexical items in the text seem to have activated sign schemata, which are hierarchically superordinate to the advertisement schema (cf. Farghal and Shakir 1991). This is not hard to understand when we take into account the fact that the text is decontextualized. Thus, unable to capture the target schema (which is a sub-schema of the superordinate one), the translators opted for the superordinate one, viz., the sign schema. This, as surfaced in the linguistic expression of the rendered translations, has entailed employing rhetorical structure, lexical items, and syntactic constructions alien to the genre of advertising⁵.

Car parks in Jordan have attendants (often referred to as guards), but none is centrally heated. Hence the word HEATED in (1) arouses a number of associations which seem to have derived from the translators' culture-specific experiences. The word HEATED thus has lost its indexical / referential value to take on a representational power. The translators, failing to penetrate the opaqueness of the lexical item HEATED, and failing to envisage it in its relevant context, turn to an introspective process wherein a context deriving from own experiences is created. Introspecting own experiences is in other words a look into prototypical meanings long established in the translators' information repertoire which has a gravitational power when the content of ambiguous textual components proves unaccessible. This could explain why HEATED has taken on the senses of 'laying a fire', 'making angry', 'fire', 'heat', etc., as all seem to derive from prototypical experiences of HEATED in the translators' world knowledge.

Turning to the examples in (3) above, we notice similar attempts to handle the ambiguity of the expression SWAP A CHILD. Being unfamiliar with the situational meaning of the expression (as has been indicated in their protocols, Appendix B), they take it to mean 'to barter.' Yet their cultural frame of reference does not accommodate human experiences where children are 'swapped in a barter system' for 'something else.' Thus their schematic / prototypical knowledge of what values children represent, rejects such a notion, and an acceptable, even favorable, world comes to the fore in the absence of schematic knowledge of educational exchange programs.

The expression loses its referential / indexical value to assume a representational one based on favorable experiences which are in alignment with prototypical values of what children represent to us. Taking into account that the student translators are

school teachers, we can detect aspects of long-established educational values: the home is the central place for educating children. Therefore, 'do not argue or quarrel with your child, as the home or family is the central place for educating him.' This may explain why the lexical item SWAP has been either skipped, because of pejorative implications, or injected with favorable content.

The transformation process the expression SWAP A CHILD has undergone has led to a transformation of the generic, registeral, and therefore, the rhetorical orientation of the text. So, instead of maintaining its inviting function, the text acquires a prescriptive and informative role, a common place statement: take care of your child; the home is the central place for educating him.

The examples provided in (4) above (4a-d) reveal cognitive operations similar to those discussed in (1) and (3). Failing to grasp contextual or co-textual clues to the content of text (4), some of the student translators turned to introspective operations whereby culture-specific experiences are called upon. The student translators, being aware of and concerned about a well known phenomenon in Jordan, viz., school children getting involved in 'useless' and educationally 'unprofitable' types of jobs, such as selling newspapers or cleaning cars at traffic lights, establish association between CHILD SUMMER SALE and what some school children do during their summer vacation. (See Appendix B for further explanations in the students' protocols.)

The text thus takes on a different function. Instead of translating it as a sales advertisement posted on shop windows, the students rendered it as a statement of protest that can fit very well as a headline of an editorial criticizing the phenomenon and calling for solutions. Viewed from a rhetorical perspective, the translations provided have brought about drastic changes to the SL text. Translation (4c), for instance, is a case in point. The form and content of the translation is closer to a cry of protest calling attention to the 'phenomenon' than to a sales advertisement.

This protesting and attention-calling tone is configured in the lexical and syntactic structure of the Arabic rendering of the text. First, the subject of the sentence 'al-'atfalu' (children) is used in its generic and exaggerated form: not some, but all children; it is not adults, but children. The use of the Arabic definite article 'al' is an indicator of the intentionally exaggerated form. Second, the timeless verb tense 'yumarisuna' (practice / do) is employed here to add a touch of factness to the phenomenon. Third, coupled with the modifying phrase 'gayru mufidah' (useless), the verb picks up a negative sense: practicing jobs which, educationally, are harmful. The translation thus gets much farther from the intended function and content of the SL text.

The translation takes even unexpected routes as we consider (4d). Preoccupied with the results of the Gulf War and its devastating effects especially on

Iraqi children, some of the student translators who have failed to grasp contextual or co-textual clues to the meaning of CHILD SUMMER SALE, create their own experiential context. The translation assumes the form and content of a cry calling attention to the sufferings of the Iraqi children.

Text (2), however, seems to have caused no serious problems to the student translators, as about 76% of them translated it appropriately. Looking at the students' protocols, one can explain why the meaning of the text was readily accessible to them. Checking the meaning of the word RESUME, which seems to have been unfamiliar to some of them, the students were able to associate its meaning with the word SPEED. Associating the two items seems to have activated road sign schemata which are familiar to most of them. It seems that the universality and uniformity of the shape, form, content, and location of road signs, together with instructional content encapsulated in brief road sign texts — all have contributed to providing an easy access to the intended meaning and function of the text. Hence the high frequency of appropriate translations:

'ist'anif is sur'ah
resume def-speed

The data provided in session 2

A look at the statistics in table 2 below and the students' protocols (Appendix C) reveals a significant shift (except in Text 1) from representational to referential strategies in handling the once-opaque texts. The data show that once the texts were contextualized, accessibility to the intended meanings was easier. The contexts provided frames of reference whereby the sense components of the lexical items in each text associated with the relevant aspects of the context. These sense components derive their relevance from the fact that both the SL and TL recipients share knowledge of. This shared reference is indicated in translations that retain equivalent discursive features of the SL texts. Most of the translations in session 2 retain the rhetorical and registeral characteristics of the SL texts. Text 3, for instance, is rendered as in the examples in (5) below:

- (5) a. *barūmij tabādul il-'atfāl: marākiz 'usariyyah xāssah*
programs exchange def children: centres family special (child exchange programs: special educational family centres)
- b. *barūmij / 'andmat tabādul tullāh il-madāris: marākiz 'usariyyah ta'limiyyah*
programs / systems exchange students def. schools: centres family educational (School student exchange programs / systems: special educational family centres).
- c. *tubādul tiffika ma'a 'atfal axarin hada s-sayf: 'ittasil bi l-markaz il-'usari, markaz ta'limi Xass*

exchange child-your with children other this summer: contact prep. def. centre def. family, centre educational special
(exchange your child with other children: contact the family center, a special educational center).

Text	% appropriate	% inappropriate
1	4.3	95.6
2	74.6	25.4
3	26.0	73.9
4	45.5	54.5

Table 2
Percentage of appropriate and inappropriate translations of the texts in session 2

Text 1, however, remained opaque for the majority of the students. The lexical items HEATED and ATTENDANT have assumed meanings other than those discussed above. The students' interpretations of the words remained confined to an uninformed guessing process whereby associations deriving from attempts based on certain features in the context, e.g. the sign being fixed at the top of the building, cars in front of the building, etc. Note, for examples the translations in (5) below:

- (5) a. *yurja mina z-zaba'in al-huduri 'ila l-mawaqif halan*
requested from def customers def reporting to def parking area now (customers are requested to report soon to the parking area).
- b. *muntazah wa haris lisayyaratik wa wajbat sāxinah*
park and guard for-car-your and meals hot (a park, a guard to your car, and hot meals).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study has shown that student translators need to be aware of the contextual aspects that motivate or co-occur with the linguistic input of the SL text. Awareness of such aspects enables the student translator / interpreter to map the linguistic configurations onto his / her knowledge of form, function and content of the text in question. When the dimensions of the context of a certain text are integrated into the translator's / interpreter's world knowledge, they constitute frames of reference he / she consults when dealing with ambiguous linguistic input. Being aware of schematic constraints, the translator / interpreter attempts to render translations that maintain the rhetorical and registeral characteristics of the SL text.

Exposing student translators to contextless texts can be a useful training technique. Trainees can discover for themselves that translating is a multi-dimensional process in which the choice of linguistic expression is an outcome of the interaction between linguistic competence and knowledge of the world of

the text they are dealing with. To highlight the importance of such multi-dimensional knowledge, teachers of translation can discuss with their students the ways in which their translation has digressed, and the effect of such digression may have on both the content and the rhetorical function of the text they are dealing with.

When handling ambiguous texts, and receiving feedback as to the appropriateness of the translations they provide, student translators will recognize that the target equivalence they must seek has to be of multidimensional nature. Maximal equivalence may not be attainable; yet retaining the registeral, rhetorical, and cultural dimensions need to be the end target the student translators aim at.

APPENDIX A The texts contextualized

Text 1



Text 2



Text 3

Swap a child this summer: Family Centre Special Education Centre

When 'O' or 'A' levels loom, there aren't many subjects in which parents can give direct help: except languages. The only satisfactory way to learn a language is to be immersed in it for a while. And since just on the other side of the water, a European teenager is in the same position with his English as yours with his French or German, a swap seems obvious. Three weeks or so in each other's family and the candidates surely will have that part of the G.C.E. or bac safely buttoned up. It's a simple idea and often it works very well but many mistakes are made by attempting it too soon. However, a well-adjusted child of 14+ should be able to cope.

(*Good Housekeeping Magazine*, 14 April 1976)

Text 4 — Child summer sale



APPENDIX B Some examples of the protocols in Session 1

Text 1:

1. I have never seen or read this text. The words *attendant* and *heated* are difficult to understand. I think *attendant* means *guard* and *heated* means *angry*.
2. This is a strange text. It consists of three words only. I cannot put them together. The dictionary gives many meanings to each. I believe *Heated* means *hot* and *attendant* means *guard*.
3. This is the first time I read such a short text. I do not think it is a text because it is made of three words only. I do not know how they come together. *Heated* to me means *angry*, and *attendant* is the guard the children annoy.
5. Car parks are not clean in my city. The guard must be careful and watchful. I think *heated* means *watchful*.

Text 3:

1. I hate this text. I do not know what *swap* means here. I do not believe that a child can be swapped. He is not for sale or trading. I will forget it now. I will focus on *education*. It is my career. We always say to our students that the home and family are the first places for educating them.
2. The words *child*, *family*, *center*, *education* are the keys to the meanings. The word *swap* has one meaning in the dictionary. I do not think it suits this difficult text. As a school teacher I agree that the family is the most important place for educating young children.
3. The only meaning I accept for the word *swap* is *taking care of*. The dictionary does not give this meaning, but how can a child be swapped? So, families must take care of their children and educate them. This is acceptable by all teachers.
4. I am sure that bigger dictionaries have other meanings for this difficult word (*swap*). My dictionary's meaning does not mean anything to me. But I know very clearly the meanings of the other words. I know *education*, *center*, *family*, etc. The school and the family are the most important centers for education. Forget about *Swap*.
5. There are no punctuation marks in the text. I do not know how to connect the words. Also the word *Swap* is very hard. But perhaps this text is very similar to what we say to our students: The house is the basis of education. Children are the dearest; they cannot be swapped!

Text 4:

1. We notice in the summer holidays many young students sell vegetables or newspapers or wash cars at traffic lights.
2. Some parents want their children to know life very well. They send them to do small jobs in the summer vacation. But these jobs are not educational and the kids learn useless and bad language and habits.

3. These three words do not remind me of anything except what some of our young students always do during the summer vacation. As an educator, I believe that allowing the children to work and do trivial jobs causes harm to them.

4. The words *child* and *Summer* and *sale* are very difficult to translate because I thought that we can translate them as a place for *selling children during Summer*. But this is not possible. What is possible and acceptable is to translate it as *school children selling things in Summer*. We see many children selling ice cream and sweets in the streets of Irbid.

5. I know the meaning of every word in the text. But what do they mean together? They can mean two things:

(1) children selling sweets and vegetables and fruits in the streets in Summer;

(2) Iraqi children being sold to families that can look after them and provide them with food and medicine.

APPENDIX C Examples of the Students' protocols in Session 2

Text 1:

a. The sign on the top of the building is similar to the signs we see on the top or in front of restaurants and hotels where we find hot meals and persons to guard our cars.

b. The sign and the cars in front of the building show that it may be a big conference building. *Heated* then means heated discussions; *Attendant* means the persons attending the conference.

c. I think it is a sign of a restaurant. Heated = hot food, attendant = waiter, *parking* = a place where we park our cars.

d. This sign is fixed on the gate of a garage which is located under a building. The garage causes annoyance to the residents. The sign says do not disturb or annoy the residents because they will be angry.

Text 3:

a. Now I can see what *Swap* means. It means send your child to a family that speaks another language, and have their child to live among your children. This is a good way to learn languages.

b. Although we do not have this system, but I can now find a good translation of *Swap a child*; it means send your child to a family in France to learn French, and get their child to live with your family.

c. The words *parents*, *language*, *learn*, *English*, *French*, *Family in France* --- all these words helped me in deciding what *Swap a child this summer* means.

d. This must be an advertisement for programs of exchanging school children. It is clear that it is published in a magazine; so it is an advertisement. The words *Summer*, *family*, *learn*, *languages*, etc. show that summer is the most suitable time for this exchange because schools are closed.

e. This is a text in a magazine. This magazine tries to encourage parents to send their children to another

country in order to learn another language and get children from the other country to learn a foreign language. The words *language*, *learning*, *English*, *French*, *three weeks in each other's family* clarify the meaning of *Swap a child this Summer*.

Text 4:

Almost all the students referred to the pictures of children's wear accompanying the text.

Notes

1. E.g. Rumelhart 1981; Anderson *et al.* 1977; Steffensen *et al.* 1979; Hudson 1982; Carrell 1982, 1987; Thorndyke 1977; Casanave 1988; Randquist 1985; Shakir and Farghal 1991; Farghal and Shakir 1991; among others.
2. See Randquist 1985 for elaboration on space and form of presentation.
3. For a fuller information about such functions, see Reynolds *et al.* 1985; Steffensen *et al.* 1985; Schank and Abelson 1977.
4. E.g. Seleskovitch 1978.
5. For further information about genre and schemata, see Swales 1990.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, R., REYNOLDS, D., SCHALLERT, E. and E. GOETZ (1977): "Frameworks for Comprehending Discourse", *American Educational Research Journal*, 14(4), pp. 367-381.
- BROWN, G. and G. YULE (1985): *Discourse Analysis*, London, Cambridge University Press.
- CARRELL, P. (1982): "Evidence of Formal Schemata in Second Language Comprehension", *Language Learning*, 34(2), pp. 87-112.
- CARRELL, P. (1983): "Three Components of Background Knowledge in Reading Comprehension", *Language Learning*, 33(2), pp. 183-207.
- CARRELL, P. (1987): "Content and Formal Schemata in ESL Reading", *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(3), pp. 461-482.
- CASANAVE, C. (1988): "Comprehension Monitoring in ESL Reading: A Neglected Essential", *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(2), pp. 283-302.
- FARGHAL, M. and A. SHAKIR (1991): "The Interpretation of Advertisements by English Native and Non-Native Speakers as Viewed from a Schema-theoretic Perspective", to appear in *Abhath Al-Yarmouk*.
- HUDSON, T. (1982): "The Effects of Induced Schemata on the Short Circuit in L2 Reading: Non-decoding Factors in L2 Reading Performance", *Language Learning*, 32(1), pp. 1-31.
- LEECH, Geoffrey (1972): *English in Advertising: A Linguistic Study of Advertising in Great Britain*, London, Longman.
- MEYER, B. and G. RICE (1982): "The Interaction of Reader Strategies and the Organization of Text", *Text*, 2(1-3), pp. 155-192.

- PINCHUCK, Isadore (1977): *Scientific and Technical Translation*, London, Andre Deutsch.
- RANDQUIST, M. (1985): "The TT-Schemata as a Necessary Prerequisite of Skilled Writing", *Text*, 5(4), pp. 371-385.
- REYNOLDS, R., TAYLOR, M., STEFFENESEN, M., SHIRELY, L. and R. ANDERSON (1985): "Cultural Schemata and Reading Comprehension", *Reading Research Quarterly*, XVII (3), pp. 353-365.
- RUMELHART, D. (1981): "Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition", J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews*, London, IRP, pp. 3-25.
- SCHANK, R. and R. ABELSON (1977): *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- SELESKOVITCH, Danica (1978): "Language and Cognition", David Gerver and Wallace Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language Interpretation and Communication*, New York, Plenum Press, pp. 33-41.
- SHAKIR, A. and M. FARGHAL (1991): "The Activation of Schemata in Relation to Background Knowledge and Markedness", *Text*, 11(2), pp. 201-223.
- STEFFENSEN, M., JOAG-DEV, C. and R. ANDERSON (1985): "A Cross Cultural Perspective on Reading Comprehension", *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15(1), pp. 10-19.
- STEFFERSEN, M. and C. JOAG-DEV (1979): "Cultural Knowledge and Reading", J. Alderson and A. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a Foreign Language*, London, Longman, pp. 48-61.
- SWALES, John (1990): *Genre Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- THORNDYKE, P. (1977): "Cognitive Structures in Comprehension and Memory of Narrative Discourse", *Cognitive Psychology*, 9(1), pp. 77-110.
- WIDDOWSON, H. (1987): "Significance in Conventional and Literary Discourse", Larry Smith (Ed.), *Discourse Across cultures*, New York, Prentice Hall, pp. 9-22.

ABDULLAH SHAKIR

Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan