Document généré le 14/09/2026 20:11

Meta
Journal des traducteurs
Translators' Journal

META

Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach

Lucía Molina et Amparo Hurtado Albir

Volume 47, numéro 4, décembre 2002

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008033ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (imprimé)
1492-1421 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Molina, L. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*, *47*(4), 498–512. https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar

Résumé de l'article

Cet article a pour objectif de cerner la notion de technique de traduction entendue comme un des instruments d'analyse textuelle qui permet d'étudier le fonctionnement de l'équivalence par rapport à l'original. Nous rappelons tout d'abord les différentes définitions et classifications qui ont été proposées ainsi que les confusions terminologiques, conceptuelles et de classification qui en ont découlé. Nous donnons ensuite notre définition de la technique de traduction en la différenciant de la méthode et de la stratégie de traduction et proposons une approche dynamique et fonctionnelle de celle-ci. Pour terminer, nous définissons chacune des diverses techniques de traduction existantes et en présentons une nouvelle classification. Cette proposition a été appliquée dans le cadre d'une recherche sur la traduction des éléments culturels dans les traductions en arabe de *Cent ans de solitude* de García Márquez.

Tous droits réservés © Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2002

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach

LUCÍA MOLINA AND AMPARO HURTADO ALBIR
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article a pour objectif de cerner la notion de technique de traduction entendue comme un des instruments d'analyse textuelle qui permet d'étudier le fonctionnement de l'équivalence par rapport à l'original. Nous rappelons tout d'abord les différentes définitions et classifications qui ont été proposées ainsi que les confusions terminologiques, conceptuelles et de classification qui en ont découlé. Nous donnons ensuite notre définition de la technique de traduction en la différenciant de la méthode et de la stratégie de traduction et proposons une approche dynamique et fonctionnelle de celle-ci. Pour terminer, nous définissons chacune des diverses techniques de traduction existantes et en présentons une nouvelle classification. Cette proposition a été appliquée dans le cadre d'une recherche sur la traduction des éléments culturels dans les traductions en arabe de *Cent ans de solitude* de García Márquez.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to clarify the notion of translation technique, understood as an instrument of textual analysis that, in combination with other instruments, allows us to study how translation equivalence works in relation to the original text. First, existing definitions and classifications of translation techniques are reviewed and terminological, conceptual and classification confusions are pointed out. Secondly, translation techniques are redefined, distinguishing them from translation method and translation strategies. The definition is dynamic and functional. Finally, we present a classification of translation techniques that has been tested in a study of the translation of cultural elements in Arabic translations of *A Hundred Years of Solitude* by Garcia Marquez.

MOTS-CLÉS/KEYWORDS

translation technique, translation method, translation strategy, translation equivalence, functionalism

1. TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES AS TOOL FOR ANALYSIS: THE EXISTING CONFUSIONS

The categories used to analyze translations allow us to study the way translation works. These categories are related to text, context and process. Textual categories describe mechanisms of coherence, cohesion and thematic progression. Contextual categories introduce all the extra-textual elements related to the context of source text and translation production. Process categories are designed to answer two basic questions. Which option has the translator chosen to carry out the translation project, i.e., which *method* has been chosen? How has the translator solved the problems that have emerged during the translation process, i.e., which *strategies* have been chosen? However, research (or teaching) requirements may make it important to consider textual micro-units as well, that is to say, how the result of the translation

functions in relation to the corresponding unit in the source text. To do this we need *translation techniques.* We were made aware of this need in a study of the treatment of cultural elements in Arabic translations of *A Hundred Years of Solitude*$_1$. Textual and contextual categories were not sufficient to identify, classify and name the options chosen by the translators for each unit studied. We needed the category of *translation techniques* that allowed us to describe the actual steps taken by the translators in each textual micro-unit and obtain clear data about the general methodological option chosen.

However, there is some disagreement amongst translation scholars about translation techniques. This disagreement is not only terminological but also conceptual. There is even a lack of consensus as to what name to give to call the categories, different labels are used (procedures, techniques, strategies) and sometimes they are confused with other concepts. Furthermore, different classifications have been proposed and the terms often overlap. This article presents the definition and classification of translation techniques that we used in our study of the treatment of cultural elements in Arabic translations of *A Hundred Years of Solitude*. We also present a critical review of earlier definitions and classifications of translation techniques.

2. THE DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO CLASSIFYING TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

2.1. Translation Technical Procedures in the *Compared Stylistics.*

Vinay and Darbelnet's pioneer work *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais* (SCFA) (1958) was the first classification of translation techniques that had a clear methodological purpose. The term they used was 'procédés techniques de la traduction.' They defined seven basic procedures operating on three levels of style: lexis, *distribution* (morphology and syntax) and message. The procedures were classified as direct (or literal) or oblique, to coincide with their distinction between direct (or literal) and oblique translation.

Literal translation occurs when there is an exact structural, lexical, even morphological equivalence between two languages. According to the authors, this is only possible when the two languages are very close to each other. The literal translation procedures are:

- Borrowing. A word taken directly from another language, e.g., the English word *bulldozer* has been incorporated directly into other languages.
- Calque. A foreign word or phrase translated and incorporated into another language, e.g., *fin de semaine* from the English *weekend.*
- Literal translation. Word for word translation, e.g*., The ink is on the table* and *L'encre est sur la table.*

Oblique translation occurs when word for word translation is impossible. The oblique translation procedures are:

- Transposition. A shift of word class, i.e., verb for noun, noun for preposition e.g., *Expéditeur* and *From.* When there is a shift between two signifiers, it is called crossed transposition, e.g., *He limped across the street* and *Il a traversé la rue en boitant.*
- Modulation. A shift in point of view. Whereas transposition is a shift between grammatical categories, modulation is a shift in cognitive categories. Vinay and Darbelnet

postulate eleven types of modulation: abstract for concrete, cause for effect, means for result, a part for the whole, geographical change, etc., e.g., the geographical modulation between *encre de Chine* and *Indian ink*. Intravaia and Scavée (1979) studied this procedure in depth and reached the conclusion that it is qualitatively different from the others and that the others can be included within it.

- Equivalence. This accounts for the same situation using a completely different phrase, e.g., the translation of proverbs or idiomatic expressions like, *Comme un chien dans un jeu de quilles* and *Like a bull in a china shop*.
- Adaptation. A shift in cultural environment, i.e., to express the message using a different situation, e.g. *cycling* for the French, *cricket* for the English and *baseball* for the Americans.

These seven basic procedures are complemented by other procedures. Except for the procedures of compensation and inversion, they are all classified as opposing pairs.

- Compensation. An item of information, or a stylistic effect from the ST that cannot be reproduced in the same place in the TT is introduced elsewhere in the TT, e.g., the French translation of *I was seeking thee, Flathead*. from the *Jungle Book* Kipling used the archaic *thee*, instead of *you*, to express respect, but none of the equivalent French pronoun forms (*tu, te, toi*) have an archaic equivalent, so the translator expressed the same feeling by using the vocative, *O*, in another part of the sentence: *En verité, c'est bien toi que je cherche, O Tête-Plate.*
- Concentration vs. Dissolution. Concentration expresses a signified from the SL with fewer signifiers in the TL. Dissolution expresses a signified from the SL with more signifiers in the TL, e.g., *archery* is a dissolution of the French *tir a l'arc.*
- Amplification vs. Economy. These procedures are similar to concentration and dissolution. Amplification occurs when the TL uses more signifiers to cover syntactic or lexical gaps. According to Vinay and Darbelnet, dissolution is a question of *langue* and adaptation of *parole*, e.g., *He talked himself out of a job* and *Il a perdu sa chance pour avoir trop parlé*. The opposite procedure is economy, e.g., *We'll price ourselves out of the market* and *Nous ne pourrons plus vendre si nous sommes trop exigeants.*
- Reinforcement vs. Condensation. These are variations of amplification and economy that are characteristic of French and English, e.g., English prepositions or conjunctions that need to be reinforced in French by a noun or a verb: *To the station* and *Entrée de la gare*; *Shall I phone for a cab?* and *Voulez-vous que je téléphone pour faire venir une voiture?* Mallblanc (1968) changed Vinay and Darbelnet's reinforcement for over-characterization, because he found it was more appropriate for the traits of French and German. He pointed out that German prepositions, such as, *in* can be translated into French as *dans le creux de, dans le fond de*, or, *dans le sein de.*
- Explicitation vs. Implicitation. Explicitation is to introduce information from the ST that is implicit from the context or the situation, e.g., to make explicit the patient's sex when translating *his patient* into French. Implicitation is to allow the situation to indicate information that is explicit in the ST, e.g., the meaning of *sortez* as *go out* or *come out* depends on the situation.
- Generalization vs. Particularization. Generalization is to translate a term for a more general one, whereas, particularization is the opposite, e.g., the English translation of *guichet, fenêtre* or *devanture* by *window* is a generalization.
- Inversion. This is to move a word or a phrase to another place in a sentence or a paragraph so that it reads naturally in the target language, e.g., *Pack separately … for convenient inspection* and *Pour faciliter la visite de la douane mettre à part ….*

TABLE 1

Vinay and Darbelnet's translation procedures

Borrowing	Bulldozer (E) ⇒ Bulldozer (F)
Calque	Fin de semaine (F) ⇒ Week-end (E)
Literal translation	L'encre est sur la table (F) ⇒ The ink is on the table (E)
Transposition	Défense de fumer (F) ⇒ No smoking (E)
Crossed transposition	He limped across the street (E) ⇒ Il a traversé la rue en boitant (F)
Modulation	Encre de Chien (F) ⇒ Indian Ink (E)
Equivalence	Comme un chien dans un jeu de quilles (F) ⇒ Like a bull in a china shop (E)
Adaptation	Cyclisme (F) ⇒ Cricket (E) ⇒ Baseball (U.S)
Compensation	I was seeking thee, Flathead (E) ⇒ En vérité, c'est bien toi que je cherche, O Tête-Plate (F)
Dissolution	Tir à l'arc (F) ⇒ Archery (E)
Concentration	Archery (E) ⇒ Tir à l'arc (F)
Amplification	He talked himself out of a job (E) ⇒ Il a perdu sa chance pour avoir trop parlé (F)
Economy	Nous ne pourrons plus vendre si nous sommes trop exigeants (F) ⇒ We'll price ourselves out of the market (E)
Reinforcement	Shall I phone for a cab? (E) ⇒Voulez-vous que je téléphone pour faire venir une voiture? (F)
Condensation	Entrée de la garde (F) ⇒ To the station (E)
Explicitation	His patient (E) ⇒ Son patient / Son patiente (F)
Implicitation	Go out/ Come out (E) ⇒ Sortez (F)
Generalization	Guichet, fenêtre, devanture (F) ⇒ Window (E)
Particularization	Window (E) ⇒ Guichet, fenêtre, devanture (F)
Articularization	In all this immense variety of conditions,… (E) ⇒ Et cependant, malgré la diversité des conditions,… (F)
Juxtaposition	Et cependant, malgré la diversité des conditions,… (F) ⇒ In all this immense variety of conditions,… (E)
Grammaticalization	A man in a blue suit (E) ⇒ Un homme vêtu de blue (F)
Lexicalization	Un homme vêtu de blue (F) ⇒ A man in a blue suit (E)
Inversion	Pack separately […] for convenient inspection (E) ⇒ Pour faciliter la visite de la douane mettre à part […] (F)

2.2. The Bible translators

From their study of biblical translation, Nida, Taber and Margot concentrate on questions related to cultural transfer. They propose several categories to be used

when no equivalence exists in the target language: *adjustment techniques, essential distinction, explicative paraphrasing, redundancy and naturalization*.

2.2.1. Techniques of adjustment

Nida (1964) proposes three types: *additions, subtractions and alterations*. They are used: 1) to adjust the form of the message to the characteristics of the structure of the target language; 2) to produce semantically equivalent structures; 3) to generate appropriate stylistic equivalences; 4) to produce an equivalent communicative effect.

- Additions. Several of the SCFA procedures are included in this category. Nida lists different circumstances that might oblige a translator to make an addition: to clarify an elliptic expression, to avoid ambiguity in the target language, to change a grammatical category (this corresponds to SCFA's transposition), to amplify implicit elements (this corresponds to SCFA's explicitation), to add connectors (this corresponds to SCFA's articulation required by characteristics of the TL, etc.). Examples are as follows. When translating from St Paul's Epistles, it is appropriate to add the verb *write* in several places, even though it is not in the source text; a literal translation of *they tell him of her* (Mark I:30) into Mazatec would have to be amplified to *the people there told Jesus about the woman*, otherwise, as this language makes no distinctions of number and gender of pronominal affixes it could have thirty-six different interpretations; *He went up to Jerusalem. There he taught the people* some languages require the equivalent of *He went up to Jerusalem. Having arrived there, he taught the people.*
- Subtractions. Nida lists four situations where the translator should use this procedure, in addition to when it is required by the TL: unnecessary repetition, specified references, conjunctions and adverbs. For example, the name of God appears thirty-two times in the thirty-one verses of Genesis. Nida suggests using pronouns or omitting *God*.
- Alterations. These changes have to be made because of incompatibilities between the two languages. There are three main types.
  1) Changes due to problems caused by transliteration when a new word is introduced from the source language, e.g., the transliteration of *Messiah* in the Loma language, means *death's hand*, so it was altered to *Mezaya*.
  2) Changes due to structural differences between the two languages, e.g., changes in word order, grammatical categories, etc. (similar to SCFA's transposition).
  3) Changes due to semantic misfits, especially with idiomatic expressions. One of the suggestions to solve this kind of problem is the use of a *descriptive equivalent* i.e., a satisfactory equivalent for objects, events or attributes that do not have a standard term in the TL. It is used for objects that are unknown in the target culture (e.g., in Maya *the house where the law* was read for *Synagogue*) and for actions that do not have a lexical equivalent (e.g., in Maya *desire what another man* has for covetousness, etc.)

Nida includes footnotes as another adjustment technique and points out that they have two main functions: 1) To correct linguistic and cultural differences, e.g., to explain contradictory customs, to identify unknown geographical or physical items, to give equivalents for weights and measures, to explain word play, to add information about proper names, etc.; 2) To add additional information about the historical and cultural context of the text in question.

2.2.2. The *essential differences*

Margot (1979) presents three criteria used to justify cultural adaptation. He refers to them as the essential differences.

1) Items that are unknown by the target culture. He suggests adding a classifier next to the word (as Nida does), e.g., *the city of Jerusalem* or, by using a cultural equivalent (similar to the SCFA procedure of adaptation), e.g., in Jesus' parable (Matthew 7:16) to change *grapes / thorn bushes* and *figs / thistles* for other plants that are more common in the target culture. However, he warns the reader that this procedure is not always possible. Taber y Nida (1974) list five factors that have to be taken into account when it is used: a) the symbolic and theological importance of the item in question, b) its fequency of use in the Bible, c) its semantic relationship with other words, d) similarities of function and form between the two items, e) the reader's emotional response.
2) The historical framework. Here Margot proposes a linguistic rather than a cultural translation, on the grounds that historical events cannot be modified.
3) Adaptation to the specific situation of the target audience. Margot maintains that the translator's task is to translate and that it is up to preachers, commentarists and Bible study groups to adapt the biblical text to the specific situation of the target audience. He includes footnotes as an aid to cultural adaptation.

2.2.3. The explicative paraphrase

Nida, Taber and Margot coincide in distinguishing between legitimate and illegitimate paraphrasing. The legitimate paraphrase is a lexical change that makes the TT longer than the ST but does not change the meaning (similar to the SCFA amplification / dissolution. The illegitimate paraphrase makes ST items explicit in the TT. Nida, Taber and Margot agree this is not the translator's job as it may introduce subjectivity.

2.2.4. The concept of redundancy

According to Margot (1979), redundancy tries to achieve symmetry between ST readers and TT readers. This is done either by adding information (grammatical, syntactic and stylistic elements, etc.) when differences between the two languages and cultures make a similar reception impossible for the TT readers, or by suppressing information when ST elements are redundant for the TT readers, e.g., the Hebrew expression, *answering, said* that is redundant in some other languages. This procedure is very close to SCFA's implicitation / explicitation.

2.2.5. The concept of naturalization

This concept was introduced by Nida (1964) after using the term *natural* to define dynamic equivalence (*the closest natural equivalent to the source language message*). Nida claims that naturalization can be achieved by taking into account: 1) the source language and culture understood as a whole; 2) the cultural context of the message; 3) the target audience. This procedure is very close to SCFA's adaptation.

Table 2

The Bible translators' proposals

Classifier	The city of Jerusalem
Alteration	Messiah (E) ⇒ Mezaya (Loma)
Cultural equivalent	grapes / thorn bushes and figs / thistles ⇒ other plants that are more common in the target culture
Equivalent description	Synagogue ⇒ The house where the law was read (Maya)
Footnotes	

2.3. Vázquez Ayora's *technical procedures*

Vázquez Ayora (1977) uses the term *operative technical procedures*, although he sometimes refers to them as the translation method. He combines the SCFA prescriptive approach with the Bible translators, descriptive approach and introduces some new procedures:

- Omission. This is to omit redundancy and repetition that is characteristic of the SL, e.g., to translate *The committee has failed to act* by *La comisión no actuó*, omitting the verb *to fail* and avoiding over-translation: *La comisión dejó de actuar*.
- Desplacement and Inversion. Displacement corresponds to SCFA's inversion, where two elements change position, e.g., *The phone rang* and *Sonó el teléfono*.

Table 3

Vázquez Ayora's contribution

Omission	The committee has failed to act (E) ⇒ La comisión no actuó (Sp)
Inversion	The phone rang (E) fi Sonó el teléfono (Sp)

2.4. Delisle's contribution

Delisle (1993) introduces some variations to the SCFA procedures and maintains the term procedure for Vinay and Darbelnet's proposals. However, for some other categories of his own, he introduces a different terminology, e.g., translation strategies, translation errors, operations in the cognitive process of translating… He lists several of these categories as contrasting pairs.

In his review of Vinay and Darbelnet, he proposes simplifying the SCFA dichotomies of reinforcement/condensation and amplification/economy and he reduces them to a single pair, reinforcement/economy. Reinforcement is to use more words in the TT than the ST to express the same idea. He distinguishes three types of reinforcement: 1) dissolution; 2) explicitation (these two correspond to their SCFA homonyms); and 3) periphrasis (this corresponds to SCFA's amplification). Economy is to use fewer words in the TT than the ST to express the same idea. He distinguishes three types of economy: 1) concentration; 2) implicitation (these two correspond to their SCFA homonyms and are in contrast to dissolution and explicitation); and concision (this corresponds to SCFA's economy and is in contrast to periphrasis).

The other categories Delisle introduces are:

- Addition vs. Omission. He defines them as unjustified periphrasis and concision and considers them to be translation errors. Addition is to introduce unjustified stylistic elements and information that are not in the ST, omission is the unjustifiable suppression of elements in the ST.
- Paraphrase. This is defined as excessive use of paraphrase that complicates the TT without stylistic or rhetorical justification. It is also classified as a translation error. Delisle's paraphrase and addition coincide with Margot's illegitimate paraphrase.
- Discursive creation. This is an operation in the cognitive process of translating by which a non-lexical equivalence is established that only works in context, e.g., *In the world of literature, ideas become cross-fertilized, the experience of others can be usefully employed to mutual benefit* is translated into French as, *Dans le domaine des lettres, le choc des idées se révèle fécond; il devient possible de profiter de l'expérience d'autrui*. This concept is close to Nida's alterations caused by semantic incompatibilities and transliteration.

TABLE 4

Delisle's contributions

	Dissolution		
Reinforcement	Explicitation		
	Periphrasis (+)	Addition (–)	Paraphrase (–)

	Concentration	
Economy	Implicitation	
	Concession (+)	Omission (–)

Discursive creation	Ideas become cross-fertilized (E) ⇒ Le choc des idées se révèle fécond (F)

2.5. Newmark's procedures

Newmark (1988) also uses the term *procedures* to classify the proposals made by the comparative linguists and by the Bible translators, as well as some of his own. These are:

- Recognized translation. This is the the translation of a term that is already official or widely accepted, even though it may not be the most adequate, e.g., Gay-Lussac's *Volumengesetz der Gase* and *Law of combining volumes*.
- Functional equivalent. This is to use a culturally neutral word and to add a specifying term, e.g., *baccalauréat = French secondary school leaving exam*; *Sejm = Polish parliament.* It is very similar to Margot's cultural equivalent, and in the SCFA terminology it would be an adaptation (*secondary school leaving exam / parliament*) with an explicitation (*French/ Polish*).
- Naturalization. Newmark's definition is not the same as Nida's. For Nida, it comes from transfer (SCFA's borrowing) and consists of adapting a SL word to the phonetic and morphological norms of the TL, e.g., the German word *Performanz* and the English *performance*.

- Translation label. This is a provisional translation, usually of a new term, and a literal translation could be acceptable, e.g., *Erbschaftssprache* or *langue d'heritage* from the English *heritage language*.

Newmark includes the option of solving a problem by combining two or more procedures (he called these solutions doubles, triples or quadruples). Newmark also adds synonymy as another category.

TABLE 5

Newmark's procedures

Recognized translation	Volumengesetz der Gase (G) ⇒ Law of combining volumes (E)
Functional equivalent	Baccalauréat (F) ⇒ *Baccalauréat*, *secondary school leaving exam* (E)
Naturalization	Performance (E) ⇒ Performanz (G)
Translation label	Heritage language (E) ⇒ Langue d'heritage (F)

3. CRITICAL REVIEW OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

As we have seen, there is no general agreement about this instrument of analysis and there is confusion about terminology, concepts and classification. The most serious confusions are the following.

3.1. Terminological confusion and over-lapping terms

Terminological diversity and the overlapping of terms make it difficult to use these terms and to be understood. The same concept is expressed with different names and the classifications vary, covering different areas of problems. In one classification one term may over-lap another in a different system of classification. The category itself is given different names, for example, Delisle uses procedure, translation strategy, etc.

3.2. The confusion between translation process and translation result

This confusion was established by Vinay y Darbelnet's pioneer proposal, when they presented the procedures as a description of the ways open to the translator in the translation process. Nevertheless, the procedures, as they are presented in the SCFA do not refer to the process followed by the translator, but to the final result. The confusion has persisted and translation techniques have been confused with other translation categories: method and strategies.

In some of the proposals there is a conceptual confusion between techniques and translation method. Vinay y Darbelnet introduced the confusion by dividing the procedures following the traditional methodological dichotomy between literal and free translation. As they worked with isolated units they did not distinguish between categories that affect the whole text and categories that refer to small units. Furthermore, the subtitle of their book, *Méthode de traduction*, caused even more confusion. In our opinion (see 4.1.), a distinction should bemade between translation method, that is part of the process, a global choice that affects the whole translation, and translation techniques that describe the result and affect smaller sections of the translation.

The SCFA use of the term procedures created confusion wirh another category related to the process: translation strategies. Procedures are related to the distinction between declarative knowledge (*what you know*) and procedural or operative knowledge (*know-how*) (Anderson 1983). Procedures are an important part of procedural knowledge, they are related to knowing how to do something, the ability to organise actions to reach a specific goal (Pozo, Gonzalo and Postigo 1993). Procedures include the use of simple techniques and skills, as well as expert use of strategies (Pozo y Postigo 1993). Strategies are an essential element in problem solving. Therefore, in relation to solving translation problems, we think a distinction should be made between techniques and strategies. Techniques describe the result obtained and can be used to classify different types of translation solutions. Strategies are related to the mechanisms used by translators throughout the the whole translation process to find a solution to the problems they find. The *technical procedures* (the name itself is ambiguous) affect the results and not the process, so they should be distinguished from strategies. We propose they should be called translation techniques.

3.3. The confusion between issues related to language pairs and text pairs

Vinay y Darbelnet's original proposal also led to a confusion between language problems and text problems. Their work was based on comparative linguistics and all the examples used to illustrate their procedures were decontextualized. In addition, because they gave a single translation for each linguistic item, the result was pairs of fixed equivalences. This led to a confusion between comparative linguistic phenomena (and the categories needed to analyse their similarities and differences) and phenomena related to translating texts (that need other categories).

The use of translation techniques following the SCFA approach is limited to the classification of differences between language systems, not the textual solutions needed for translation. For example, SCFA's borrowing, transposition and inversion, or, Vázquez Ayora's omission, should not be considered as translation techniques. They are not a textual option open to the translator, but an obligation imposed by the characteristics of the language pair.

4. A DEFINITION OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

Our proposal is based on two premises: 1) the need to distinguish between method, strategy and technique; 2) the need for an dynamic and functional concept of translation techniques.

4.1. The need to distinguish between method, strategy and technique

We think that translation method, strategies and techniques are essentially different categories. (Hurtado 1996).

4.1.1. Translation method and translation techniques

Translation method refers to the way a particular translation process is carried out in terms of the translator's objective, i.e., a global option that affects the whole text. There are several translation methods that may be chosen, depending on the aim of

the translation: interpretative-communicative (translation of the sense), literal (linguistic transcodification), free (modification of semiotic and communicative categories) and philological (academic or critical translation) (see Hurtado Albir 1999: 32).

Each solution the translator chooses when translating a text responds to the global option that affects the whole text (the translation method) and depends on the aim of the translation. The translation method affects the way micro-units of the text are translated: the translation techniques. Thus, we should distinguish between the method chosen by the translator, e.g., literal or adaptation, that affects the whole text, and the translation techniques, e.g., literal translation or adaptation, that affect micro-units of the text.

Logically, method and functions should function harmoniously in the text. For example, if the aim of a translation method is to produce a foreignising version, then borrowing will be one of the most frequently used translation techniques. (Cf. This has been shown in Molina (1998), where she analyses the three translations into Arabic of García Marquez's *A Hundred Years of Solitude*. Each translation had adopted a different translation method, and the techniques were studied in relation to the method chosen).

4.1.2. Translation strategy and translation techniques

Whatever method is chosen, the translator may encounter problems in the translation process, either because of a particularly difficult unit, or because there may be a gap in the translator's knowledge or skills. This is when translation strategies are activated. Strategies are the procedures (conscious or unconscious, verbal or non-verbal) used by the translator to solve problems that emerge when carrying out the translation process with a particular objective in mind (Hurtado Albir 1996, 1999). Translators use strategies for comprehension (e.g., distinguish main and secondary ideas, establish conceptual relationships, search for information) and for reformulation (e.g., paraphrase, retranslate, say out loud, avoid words that are close to the original). Because strategies play an essential role in problem solving, they are a central part of the subcompetencies that make up translation competence.

Strategies open the way to finding a suitable solution for a translation unit. The solution will be materialized by using a particular technique. Therefore, strategies and techniques occupy different places in problem solving: strategies are part of the process, techniques affect the result. However, some mechanisms may function both as strategies and as techniques. For example, paraphrasing can be used to solve problems in the process (this can be a reformulation strategy) and it can be an amplification technique used in a translated text (a cultural item paraphrased to make it intelligible to TT readers). This does not mean that paraphrasing as a strategy will necessarily lead to using an amplification technique. The result may be a discursive creation, an equivalent established expression, an adaptation, etc.

4.2. A dynamic and functional approach to translation techniques

In our opinion, most studies of translation techniques do not seem to fit in with the dynamic nature of translation equivalence. If we are to preserve the dynamic dimension of translation, a clear distinction should be made between the definition of a

technique and its evaluation in context. A technique is the result of a choice made by a translator, its validity will depend on various questions related to the context, the purpose of the translation, audience expectations, etc.

If a technique is evaluated out of context as justified, unjustified or erroneous, this denies the functional and dynamic nature of translation. A technique can only be judged meaningfully when it is evaluated within a particular context. Therefore, we do not consider it makes sense to evaluate a technique by using different terminology, two opposing pairs (one correct and the other incorrect), e.g., Delisle's explicitation/implicitation and addition/omission.

Translation techniques are not good or bad in themselves, they are used functionally and dynamically in terms of:

1) The genre of the text (letter of complaint, contract, tourist brochure, etc.)
2) The type of translation (technical, literary, etc.)
3) The mode of translation (written translation, sight translation, consecutive interpreting, etc.)
4) The purpose of the translation and the characteristics of the translation audience
5) The method chosen (interpretative-communicative, etc.)

4.3. Definition of translation techniques

In the light of the above, we define translation techniques as procedures to analyse and classify how translation equivalence works. They have five basic characteristics:

1) They affect the result of the translation
2) They are classified by comparison with the original
3) They affect micro-units of text
4) They are by nature discursive and contextual
5) They are functional

Obviously, translation techniques are not the only categories available to analyse a translated text. Coherence, cohesion, thematic progression and contextual dimensions also intervene in the analysis.

5. A PROPOSAL TO CLASSIFY TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

Our classification of translation techniques is based on the following criteria:

1) To isolate the concept of technique from other related notions (translation strategy, method and error).
2) To include only procedures that are characteristic of the translation of texts and not those related to the comparison of languages.
3) To maintain the notion that translation techniques are functional. Our definitions do not evaluate whether a technique is appropriate or correct, as this always depends on its situation in text and context and the translation method that has been chosen.
4) In relation to the terminology, to maintain the most commonly used terms.
5) To formulate new techniques to explain mechanisms that have not yet been described.

The following techniques are included in this proposal[2]:

- Adaptation. To replace a ST cultural element with one from the target culture, e.g., to change *baseball*, for *fútbol* in a translation into Spanish. This corresponds to SCFA's adaptation and Margot's cultural equivalent.

- Amplification. To introduce details that are not formulated in the ST: information, explicative paraphrasing, e.g., when translating from Arabic (to Spanish) to add *the Muslim month of fasting* to the noun *Ramadan*. This includes SCFA's explicitation, Delisle's addition, Margot's legitimate and illigitimate paraphrase, Newmark's explicative paraphrase and Delisle's periphrasis and paraphrase. Footnotes are a type of amplification. Amplification is in opposition to reduction.
- Borrowing. To take a word or expression straight from another language. It can be pure (without any change), e.g., to use the English word *lobby* in a Spanish text, or it can be naturalized (to fit the spelling rules in the TL), e.g., *gol, fútbol, líder, mitin*. Pure borrowing corresponds to SCFA's borrowing. Naturalized borrowing corresponds to Newmark's naturalization technique.
- Calque. Literal translation of a foreign word or phrase; it can be lexical or structural, e.g., the English translation *Normal School* for the French *École normale*. This corresponds to SCFA's acceptation.
- Compensation. To introduce a ST element of information or stylistic effect in another place in the TT because it cannot be reflected in the same place as in the ST. This corresponds to SCFA's conception.
- Description. To replace a term or expression with a description of its form or/and function, e.g., to translate the Italian *panettone* as *traditional Italian cake eaten on New Year's Eve*.
- Discursive creation. To establish a temporary equivalence that is totally unpredictable out of context, e.g., the Spanish translation of the film *Rumble fish* as *La ley de la calle*. This coincides with Delisle's proposal.
- Established equivalent. To use a term or expression recognized (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TL, e.g., to translate the English expression *They are as like as two peas* as *Se parecen como dos gotas de agua* in Spanish. This corresponds to SCFA's equivalence and literal translation.
- Generalization. To use a more general or neutral term, e.g., to translate the French *guichet*, *fenêtre* or *devanture*, as *window* in English. This coincides with SCFA's acceptation. It is in opposition to particularization.
- Linguistic amplification. To add linguistic elements. This is often used in consecutive interpreting and dubbing, e.g., to translate the English expression *No way* into Spanish as *De ninguna de las maneras* instead of using an expression with the same number of words, *En absoluto*. It is in opposition to linguistic compression.
- Linguistic compression. To synthesize linguistic elements in the TT. This is often used in simultaneous interpreting and in sub-titling, e.g., to translate the English question *Yes, so what*? With *¿Y?*, in Spanish, instead of using a phrase with the same number of words, *¿Sí, y qué?*. It is in opposition to linguistic amplification.
- Literal translation. To translate a word or an expression word for word, e.g., *They are as like as two peas* as *Se parecen como dos guisante*, or, *She is reading* as *Ella está leyendo*. In contrast to the SCFA definition, it does not mean translating one word for another. The translation of the English word *ink* as *encre* in French is not a literal translation but an established equivalent. Our literal translation corresponds to Nida's formal equivalent; when form coincides with function and meaning, as in the second example. It is the same as SCFA's literal translation.
- Modulation. To change the point of view, focus or cognitive category in relation to the ST; it can be lexical or structural, e.g., to translate ستصير أبا as *you are going to have a child*, instead of, *you are going to be a father*. This coincides with SCFA's acceptation.
- Particularization. To use a more precise or concrete term, e.g., to translate *window* in English as *guichet* in French. This coincides with SCFA's acceptation. It is in opposition to generalization.
- Reduction. To suppress a ST information item in the TT, e.g., *the month of fasting* in opposition to *Ramadan* when translating into Arabic. This includes SCFA's and

Delisle's implicitation Delisle's concision, and Vázquez Ayora's omission. It is in opposition to amplification.

- Substitution (linguistic, paralinguistic). To change linguistic elements for paralinguistic elements (intonation, gestures) or vice versa, e.g., to translate the Arab gesture of putting your hand on your heart as *Thank you*. It is used above all in interpreting.
- Transposition. To change a grammatical category, e.g., *He will soon be back* translated into Spanish as *No tardará en venir*, changing the adverb *soon* for the verb *tardar*, instead of keeping the adverb and writing: *Estará de vuelta pronto*.
- Variation. To change linguistic or paralinguistic elements (intonation, gestures) that affect aspects of linguistic variation: changes of textual tone, style, social dialect, geographical dialect, etc., e.g., to introduce or change dialectal indicators for characters when translating for the theater, changes in tone when adapting novels for children, etc.

TABLE 6

Classification of translation techniques

Adaptation	Baseball (E) ⇒ Fútbol (Sp)
Amplification	شهر رمضان (A) ⇒ Ramadan, the Muslim month of fasting (E)
Borrowing	Pure: Lobby (E) ⇒ Lobby (Sp) Naturalized: Meeting (E) ⇒ Mitin (Sp)
Calque	École normale (F) ⇒ Normal School (E)
Compensation	I was seeking thee, Flathead (E) ⇒ En vérité, c'est bien toi que je cherche, O Tête-Plate (F)
Description	Panettone (I) ⇒ The traditional Italian cake eaten on New Year's Eve (E)
Discursive creation	Rumble fish (E)⇒ La ley de la calle (Sp)
Established equivalent	They are as like as two peas (E) ⇒ Se parecen como dos gotas de agua (Sp)
Generalization	Guichet, fenêtre, devanture (F) fi Window (E)
Linguistic amplification	No way (E) ⇒ De ninguna de las maneras (Sp)
Linguistic compression	Yes, so what? (E) ⇒ ¿Y? (Sp)
Literal translation	She is reading (E) ⇒ Ella está leyendo (Sp)
Modulation	ستصير أبا (A) ⇒ You are going to have a child (Sp)
Particularization	Window (E) ⇒ Guichet, fenêtre, devanture (F)
Reduction	Ramadan, the Muslim month of fasting (Sp) ⇒ شهر رمضان (A)
Substitution (linguistic, paralinguistic)	Put your hand on your heart (A) ⇒ Thank you (E)
Transposition	He will soon be back (E) ⇒ No tardará en venir (Sp)
Variation	Introduction or change of dialectal indicators, changes of tone, etc.

NOTES

1. Cf. Molina (1998).
2. This classification of translation techniques has been tested in Molina 1998, where it was used as an instrument to analyse translations.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J.R. (1983): *The architecture of cognition*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Delisle, J. (1993*): La traduction raisonnée. Manuel d'initiation à la traduction professionnelle de l'anglais vers le français*, Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Hurtado Albir, A. (1994): 'Perspectivas de los Estudios sobre la traducción,' in A. Hurtado Albir (ed.) *Estudis sobre la Traducció*, Col. Estudis sobre la Traducció, vol. 1, Universitat Jaume I, 25-41.

—— (1996) 'La traductología: lingüística y traductología,' *Trans* 1, 151-160.

—— (1997) 'La cuestión del método traductor. Método, estrategia y técnica de traducción,' *Sendebar*, nº 7, 12-20.

—— (1999) *Enseñar a traducir*, Madrid: Edelsa

Malblanc, A. 1968): *Stylistique comparée du français et l'allemand*, Paris: Didier.

Margot, J. Cl. (1979): *Traduire sans trahir. La théorie de la traduction et son application aux textes bibliques*, Laussane: L'Age d'Homme.

Mason, I. (1994): 'Techniques of translation revised: a text linguistic review of *borring* and *modulation* ' in A. Hurtado Albir (ed.) *Estudis sobre la Traducció*, Col. Estudis sobre la Traducció, vol. 1, Universitat Jaume I, 61-72.

Molina, L. (1998): *El tratamiento de los elementos culturales en las traducciones al árabe de "Cien años de soledad"*, Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

—— (Research thesis in progress): *Análisis descriptivo de los culturemas árabe- español*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Newmark, P. (1988): *A textbook of translation*, London: Prentice Hall International.

Nida, E. A. (1964): *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden: E.J.Brill.

—— and Taber, Ch. (1969): *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Pozo, J. I., Gonzalo, I. and Y. Postigo (1993): 'Las estrategias de elaboración en el currículo: estudios sobre el aprendizaje de procedimientos en diferentes dominios' in C. Monereo (ed.) *Estrategias de aprendizaje*, Barcelona: Domenech, 106- 112.

Scavée, P. and Intravaia, P. (1979): *Traité de stylistique comparée. Analyse comparative de l'Italien et du Français*, Bruxelles: Didier.

Vázquez-Ayora, G. (1977): *Introducción a la traductología*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Vinay, J.-P. and J. Darbelnet (1977): *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*, París: Didier: Georgetown University Press.