Approaching Translation from the Perspective of Text Analysis

Hongping Chen[1], Wenbin Zhang [2]
[1]School of Foreign Languages, North China Electric Power University, NO 689 Road, North District Baoding 071003, Hebei, China
[2]School of Foreign Languages, North China Electric Power University, NO. 689 Road, North District, Baoding 071003, Hebei, China

Original Research Article

*Corresponding author
Hongping Chen

Email:
504131582@qq.com

Abstract: Guided by theories of systemic functional linguistics and pragmatics, this paper is focused on approaching translation from the perspective of text analysis. It aims at analyzing, interpreting and ironing out some issues conceding textual translation by means of transplanting linguistic theories and trying to provide a text-oriented perspective in translation studies. The paper consists of four chapters. The first chapter presents a brief introduction to text analysis at home and abroad. Starting from the unit of translation, the second chapter deals with the necessity of text analysis in translation and makes a brief difference between discourse and text. The third chapter discusses the role of intentionality in translation and gives some examples. The fourth chapter is a retrospect and prospect, which tells the strong points and limitations of the paper, its developing tendency and further research in the future.
Keywords: Translation, Text analysis, Linguistics, Pragmatics, Intentionality

Chapter 1 A brief introduction to text analysis at home and abroad

Text analysis is a new discipline developed by the concerted efforts of many scholars abroad. For example, Hymes, a sociologist, published an article called "Towards Ethnographies of Communication" in 1964, in which he studied the use of speech in the context of society from the angle of sociology. Linguistic philosophers such as Austin [1], Searle [2], and Grice [3] made researches on language use from the perspective of Speech Acts Theory and conversational implicature Halliday laid special emphasis on the social functions and metafunctions of language [4]. labov [5] made an initiative research on language variance. Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson [6] and Goffman [7, 8] brought to light the structural law of conversations by analyzing such verbal communications as Conversation Norm and Turn.

Gumperz & Hymen [10] made researches on verbal behaviors in different social and cultural environments from the angle of social linguistics, hence probing into a new field of text analysis. Sinclair & Coulthard [11] made researches on the conversation norms between teachers and students in class. Their researches delineated the internal relationship between conversations and discourse. In a word, text analysis takes in the new findings and theories of semiotics, psychology, anthropology, sociology and literature and gradually becomes a discipline which is focused on the study of the use of language in communication, involving a number of disciplines.

Over the past ten years western linguists have been trying to use functional linguistic theories to discuss translation problems. For example, J.C.Catford [12] proposed the theory of "translation equivalence" on the basis of systemic functional linguistics. Similarly, some Chinese scholars, such as Li Yunxing [13], Ju Zuehun [14], Yao Jirong [15], have also tried to discuss translation from the perspective of text. They extended their research unit from sentence to text. Other scholars, such as Chen Hongwei [16] and Zhang Meifang [17], have applied Halliday's linguistic theories to discussing translation. But so far, most people are discussing textual translation only from their own understanding of textual theories discussions on textual translation vary from people to people.

Chapter 2 the Necessity of Text Analysis in Translation

Before we discuss the issue, it is necessary to make a difference between text and discourse. It is self-evident that language does not exist in isolation from its users nor they from the society in which they live and it is equally self-evident that language, whether as knowledge or as communication, does not consist of

individual, isolated sentences. Tie text, like the sentence, is "a structured sequence of linguistic expressions forms a unitary whole", in contrast with discourse which is a far broader event manifest in linguistic (and other) behavior". The definition is, however, not entirely adequate for a number of reasons- for example "text" and "discourse" are used interchangeably by some linguists, while others reserve the first for written documents and the second for speech-so we would suggest definitions of the following kind (recognizing that many of the terms within them will themselves require later definition). Text: the formal product of selections of options from the theme systems of the grammar; a unit which carries the semantic sense of the proposition (the prepositional content and locutionary force of the speech act)'through sentences which are linked by means of cohesion. Discourse: a communicative event which draws on the meaning potential of the language (and other systems of communication) to carry commnunicative value (the illocutionary force) of speech acts through utterances which are linked by coherence [18].

Seen from within, all kinds of textual translation must make the target text have cohesion and coherence; otherwise, the result would not be a text but a non-text. This is the general analysis and interpretation. If we start from this and end at this, there will be no problem. But, if we are being specific and assert that the basic unit of translation is text because sentence as a unit of translation is not big enough, then problems will crop up. Firstly, when we view text as the basic unit of translation, it means that the translator is given the maximal freedom to handle all the elements within the text, including thematic structure, word order, sentence order or paragraph order, as well as the choice of words and the arrangement of the style, especially at the level of the textual translation of a whole poem, or a whole article, or a whole text, what is often termed as "adaptation", "rewriting", "imitation" is equal to translation, that is, the complete translation in the narrow sense, hence dimming the difference between adaptation, rewriting, imitation, and translation noumenon.

Chapter 3 the Role of Intentionality in Translation
In the text, cohesion at the superficial structure and coherence at the deep structure are two fundamental standards of the texture. But they are not enough for the understanding of the text. Out of various kinds of intentions, people will use the text that sees neither cohesive nor coherent. Therefore, the principles of constructing the target text should include the intention of the author. A9 the trans-language and cross-cultural propagator, the translator should, first of all, make sense of the intentionality of the source text and theft, based on the norms of the target language, try to create similar contexts to convey the intentions of the author.

According to Nida, judging the validity of a translation cannot stop with a comparison of corresponding lexical meanings, grammatical classes, and rhetorical devices. A successful translation, he concludes, should gala the effect of "functional equivalence" which in terms of a comparison of the relationship, between the original receiver and the source language. From this perspective, it is very essential for the translator to take into consideration the intentionality of the source text in the process of translating. Intentionality concerns the producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intent, e.g. to distribute knowledge or to attain a goal specified in a plan. Without the translator's understanding and conveying of the intention of the source text, the receptor of the translated text would not have the chance to understand and appreciate the translated text the same way as the original receptor.

Comparatively speaking, it is easier to convey the intention of a source text in nonliterary translation than in literary translation. However, the intention of literary is not so apparent. It is always hidden behind the words. Resides, the literary language is not only the code to bear and transfer the intention, some special use of syntactic structure and rhetorical devices are parts of intention themselves. So when doing literary translation, even if the translator has finished shining one language into another correctly, he may not convey the intention of the source text at all, or just port of it, even an opposite one.

Any text has an intention. Intentionality decides translation strategy. As the traps-language and cross-cultural propagator, the translator should make sense of the intentionality of the source text and then, based on the norms of the target language, try to create similar contexts to convey the intentions of the author.

It is well known that the real purpose of literary works is to make its intention known to the readers. Intention can be called the soul of a literary text. Nevertheless, when literary works is translated into another language without its soul, the translation must be an empty frame, dead and meaningless; when translated with part of its intention or even a contrary one, it is more or less misleading or distorting. Therefore, in literary translation, the most important and critical thing for a translator is to preserve the intention of the source text. Otherwise, it must be somewhat unfaithful to the original.

Intentionality decides translation strategy. Text is the combination of communicative signals in the context of situation. We can analyze the textual function from the angle of the textual producer. What's

important is to look at what intentions the author wants to achieve through the text. Intention has a direct bearing on the strategy of textual production. As far as translation is concerned, translation task decides translation target or intention. When chance demands it, the translator can make adjustment of the task. The more specific the task is, the clearer the intention will be. If he clearly outlines his task and ascertain his intention, the translator will be able to do the translation with facility- In other words, he wilt know for sure what changes have to be made on the source text in the process of translation.

Examples of applying intentionality to translation:

Example 1:
春怨（金昌绪）

打起黄莺儿，莫叫枝上啼。啼时惊妾梦，不得

到辽西。

A Lover's Dream (Translated by Flecther)
Oh, drive the golden orioles
From off our garden tree.
Their warbling broke the dream wherein
My love smiled to me.

In the original Chinese poem, by describing a picture that a young woman turned annoyed by the interrupting of orioles outdoors when she is dreaming her husband who was forced to fight in a battlefield far away, the author intended to expose the improper and cruel military service of Tang Dynasty and express his sympathy with the painful women in general for the separation caused by continuous wars. However, in Flecther's translation, though he represents a similar picture, yet it just imparts the readers such an impression that she is very happy and the theme of the poem is about love only. The superficial conceptual meaning of the source text has been preserved, but the real intention disappeared and was even distorted. Therefore, this translation is undoubtedly unacceptable.

Another translator Xu Yuxnchong （许渊冲） translated the same poem, too, which reads:
Drive orioles of the tree
For their songs awaked me
From dreaming of my dear
Far off on the frontier

Though some minor information is lost, this translated version is widely and highly praised because to same extent the intention is preserved well enough to gain the effect of the "functional equivalence" which, stated by Nida, cannot be understood in its mathematical meaning of identity, but only in terms of proximity, i.e. on the basis of degrees of closeness of functional identity.

Example 2
Willy   Since the beginning you never know how to play cards.
Charley   (picks up the cards and goes to the door}
All right! Next time I'll bring a deck with five aces.
Willy   I don't play that kind of game!
Charley (Turning to him) You ought to be ashamed of yourself!
Willy   Yeah?
Charley   Yeah! (He goes out)
Willy (Slamming the door after him) Ignoramus!
     ---(*Death of a Salesman* by Arthur Millar)

威利:从打一开头，你就不会打牌。

查利:(收起牌，朝门口走)好吧!下次我带一付有

五张 A 的牌来。

威利:我不跟你这号人打牌。

查利:(转身面对他):你不怕害躁!

威利:你说谁？

查利:说你！(他走出门去)

威利:(朝着他的后影摔上门)：没知识！(英若诚

译《推销员之死》)

In the above example, Willy, an old down-and-out salesman was out of work. Partly due to overwhelming boredom and partly for the sake of killing time, he was reduced to playing cards with his neighbor Charley. He lost money and spoke insolently. Unwilling to suffer losses, Charley answered back sarcastically. The words-You ought to be ashamed of yourself!-deeply hurt where it was wound at the bottom of Willy's heart. In a rage, he burst out "Yeah?"-Its implied intention was obviously a challenge or a rebellion. The translator rendered it into"你说谁？"，thus appropriately conveying the illocutionary structure and achieved pragmatic equivalence.

Chapter 4 Conclusion

One of the purposes of translation is to translate the implied meaning of text. In a famous article "Logic and Conversation;"[3], Crice put forward the idea of conversational implicature: in order to make the conversation go smoothly, both sides have to observe "the cooperative principle". As to the discourse which disobeys the cooperative principle purposefully, translation is quite easy. But when the speakers do not violate the cooperative principle, the translator has to obey the maxim of relation and give a coherent interpretation of the incoherent discourse. If he fails to grasp the conversational implicature and consequently fails to convey it into the target text, then the target text

only conveys the superficial meaning of the source text, and this translation cannot achieve the pragmatic equivalence.

REFERENCES
1. Austin, J. L., & Urmson, J. O. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words. The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955.[Edited by James O. Urmson.]*. Clarendon Press.
2. Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.
3. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *1975*, 41-58.
4. Huang, G. (2001). Theory and Practice of Discourse Analysis–A Study of Advertising Discourse. *Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, Shanghai*.
5. Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns* (No. 4). University of Pennsylvania Press.
6. Saks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). The simplest systematics for the organization of turntaking for conversations. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.
7. Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in society*, *5*(3), 257-313.
8. Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, *25*(1-2), 1-30.
9. Wangari, M. A. (1972). Code switching in contempoary kiswahili rap song.
10. Baker, M. (1995). Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, *7*(2), 223-243.
11. Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford Univ Pr.
12. Catford, J. C. (1965). Language Varieties in Translation. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation; an Essay in Applied Linguistics*, 83-92.
13. Yunxing, L. (1998). Cultural factors in translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, *6*(2), 175-182.
14. von Wernberg, J. H. N. *Klaglibell an Ihre Chl. D.(1998). In Baiern in puncto fidei Commisi Rundingiani: contra die Erzbisch. Gläubiger... umb inbegriffene Erkandnus und Declaration*.
15. Jirong, Y. (2000). On the Essence of Text Translation [J]. *Chinese Translators Journal*, *5*, 005.
16. Chen Hongwei. New Practical Translation Tutorial. Wuhan: Hubei Education Press, 1996,
17. Eggins, S. (1994). An introduction to systemic functional grammar. *London: Pinter*.
18. Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and translating* (Vol. 56). London: Longman.