Book Review

Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as text.* Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press.

Reviewed by

Mehrnoosh Pirhayati *

MA in English Language Translation, Department of English Language, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

This review focuses on the book entitled, "Translation as Text" written by Neubert and Shreve (1992). A book that clearly defines and elaborates the term, "translation" and its related areas and fields. This book is produced and published for translators and translator trainers, and also those who know nothing except the old theory of translation, "faithfulness". This book is introduced as the common frame of reference for translation scholars, translation teachers and the students of translation studies. The authors of this book with having textual view point towards the process of translating, try to define it as a text-centered action and provoke their audiences to strive for understanding the concept of translation as text. This book contains four chapters: 1- Translation, Text, Translation Studies, 2- Translation: Knowledge and Process, 3- Textuality, and 4- Translation as Result. Each chapter is made by different and interrelated concepts and subjects.

The authors in the primary pages challenge their readers with the paradoxical aspect of translation; it is natural, since we always do it, and it is unnatural; when we read bad translations. Then, the concept of "translation and text" is discussed by the authors, in relation to cultural gaps and the effects of the actual behaviors of translator on the textual form of source language/discourse; they stress on the non-static nature of the process of translating. In between the discussions over the subject of how a translator must translate a text, and also which aspect of translation must be regarded first and important for translator, they coherently point to the concept of translation studies as the ground of various approaches and empirical perspectives, and with calling it as an empirical discipline, show it as the attempt of bringing unity out of disunity. After that, they define the term, "model" and its significance in translation studies.

According to them, a model is the conceptual and hypothetical construct. "It is logically a connected set of conseptualizations of an object of study" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 13). It can also claim hypothesis(es). They distinguish model from theory with bringing and

describing its hypothetical feature (Neubert & Shreve, 1992). Then, they describe different models, including critical model, practical model, linguistic model, text-linguistic model, socio-cultural model, computational model, and psycho-linguistic model as the tools of study for analyzing and evaluating translations. In critical model, they stress on the comparative aspect of translation criticism on the basis of comparing the two texts with each other (the source text and its corresponding target text), and with mentioning that this model has static nature, and it is proper for result-oriented studies.

Contrarily, in practical model, they emphasize on the dynamic and process-oriented aspect of research for assessing and evaluating target text; through translational strategies and translator's behaviors, the researcher(s) can understand and conclude that a particular product (translation) is good or bad, or is an acceptable or unacceptable translation, and also how a particular source text can be translated into target language. They explain that critical model is retrospective and practical model is prospective, and they also stress on the point that, the nature of a practical model is created on the basis of observation, comparison, and empirical study, and it is used for finding and revealing (a) pattern(s). Then, linguistic model is elaborated as the study of the linguistic mechanisms related to replacing the signs of the source language by the target language signs.

They further explain that, the aim of using linguistic model in translation studies is a try to establish a set of connected linguistic rules between source language and target language at different linguistic levels from word to grammatical structure, and with distinguishing it from other models of translation, define it as an inapplicable/un-functional model, which is highly abstract, since as said before "it deals with the systematic relations between languages" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 20). In the next part, the authors elaborate text-linguistic model with distinguishing it from linguistic model on the basis of the supra-sentential linguistic factors. They state that, this model "locates and distributes the meaning equivalence throughout the text" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 22), and it is not limited at word and sentence levels. In other words, the pragmatic function and semantic value of a particular source text can be discussed and assessed by the researcher(s) in the process of analyzing the target text; the term, "equivalence" is located at textual/discursive/communicative level.

Then, the next model, socio-cultural model is elaborated and defined as assessing the extent of translatability or non-translatability of a particular text with regarding the existence of social, cultural, and historical differences between the context of source text and the context of target language. They emphasize on a particular text that because of its unique context is not repeatable or translatable. In addition, they state that from the perspective of socioculturalists, the assumption of keeping equivalence in translation, in terms of corresponding source text, is regarded as an illusion. They stress on the point that, what the target readers can get from the translation of a particular text is not the "real thing". Based on the socioculturalists, "translators prevent the target readers from appreciating the source culture" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 26), and they emphasize on the oblique rendering of source text.

After introducing and elaborating these five models, that regard translation as a completely human process, they introduce computational model that is divided into two different models: machine translation, and computer-assisted translation. They describe machine translation as a robot that controls the process of translating and performs a formal translation; without regarding pragmatic meaning. In fact, it is not a psychologically valid translation, but it is structurally valid translation, that shows an acceptable translation. Thus, such this translation definitely needs pre-editing and post-editing. On the other hand, computer-assisted translation is defined as a tool/software that helps translator in the process of translating. This tool works like an amplifier for translator; it is a knowledge support system. They state that decisions which are related to translator's choices, like words choices, in the case of computer-assisted model of translation, are taken by translator/human. Moreover, the quests for better translation can improve the quality of the translations of computational models; "this model is focus on the text and its textuality" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 29).

Then, they define and elaborate psycho-linguistic model as the model that deals with the cognitive aspect of the process of translating; what goes on in the mind of translator in the process of translating a particular text?, or why he/she used for example, addition strategy, equivalent, or the other translational strategies?, and the answer of such these questions can be achieved by the study of the language processing strategies and some observable studies such as, think-aloud-protocol (TAP), video cameras that is used for capturing and recording the eyes movements of translator during his/her engagement in translation, and interview. The top subjects for designing research questions are: 1- Investigating the influence of language system on translation, 2- Time constraints, 3- The extent of translator's familiarity with target culture, and 4- The information structure of source text.

After that, they stress on the purpose of introducing these translational models that are used for resolving differences. They state that these different models can contribute to establishing and producing an integrated theory of translation. At the end of the chapter one, they define the term, "theory" as a common-sense construct and as an opinion-like construct that can be accepted by others through persuasion, or faith, or the use of compelling arguments, and later can be codified into a formal system with adding rigor and proof. In other words, some verification methods and verifying statements can be added to theory/explanation. Finally, they express that translation is the result of linguistic miracle, and an integrated theory cannot be possible. On the other hand, they say that, if someone believes in the non-randomness nature of translation, an empirical integrated theory can be possible, but with considering *textuality,* and the empirical feature of the method(s) of an integrated theory.

In chapter two, they start with the explanation of the nature of translation as a communicative action, since it deals with language. They state that written texts, and spoken discourses are not considered as the neutral vessels filled by writers and speakers with language content. Alternately, texts and discourses are produced for (a) particular aim(s) and purpose(s). Thus, their linguistic expressions reflect and follow (a) particular aim(s) and purpose(s). In fact, the production of a particular text or speech is considered

as a cognitive and communicative process, and translation is regarded as a cognitive and communicative action, since as said before, it deals with language which is regarded as the tool of social and communicative interaction. A translator must use his/her own linguistic knowledge, communicative knowledge, and subject knowledge in the process of translating a particular text or discourse. Then, they elaborate the interactive structure of the act of translating. They say that source language users and target language users ask translator to accomplish a particular communication. Then, translator as a mediator must take the source text and recreate it as the member of the *text world* of the target language. "A text world is the repertoire of textual interaction structures used in a particular communicative community" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 41).

Then, they declare that, the process of translating and its result (target text) are integrally related, and the process of translation can be considered as translator's competence which is used by himself/herself in a translation situation. They further explain that, text linguistics contains some theories that are referred to as the explanation of the process of text production and comprehending a particular text, and translation process can be studied by this branch of linguistics. They define the term, "process" as the result of applying and executing procedures, and the procedural knowledge can be obtained by experience. After that, they emphasize on having mutual knowledge; translator must act as a mediator and as a bridge between the two different language users (source language users and target language users), that have different cultural, historical, and social backgrounds. In fact, a translator must act as a knowledge broker between the members of two different communities. Then, they define the term, *copresence* "as the logical grounds for presuming mutual knowledge of objects, events, things, people, and places" (Clark & Marshal, 1981, 3839, as cited by Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 56). After, the authors describe the term, "frame" in translation, as knowledge structures, along with noting that the process of matching two different cultural frames is regarded as a significant and difficult task. Frame includes knowledge of language, knowledge of text, knowledge of first-level translation procedures, and world knowledge. They give this example to their readers that the frame of "restaurant" can be understood by the word, "tip".

"The word, tip includes the knowledge of conventional sequences of events, actions, states, and processes that can be used with the sequences of words and constructions…" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 66). This frame is connected to the *global structure* or *scenario* that is originated from experience. It is named by the senders and receivers "as an activity conditioned by community co-membership" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 66). They further explain that, scenario can be also named as plan, or script. Plan is called as the goal-oriented scenario, and script is the high conventional scenario. They also elaborate the term, "schema", as the subdivision of scenario which is "the part of a scenario that can be isolated as a more or less discrete pattern of objects, events, states, and processes linked by time, place, or casual relations. Several schemas may compose a scenario" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 68).

In chapter three, they define the term, "textuality" as a complex linguistic object that reflects "certain social and communicative constraints" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 70).

They state that, "textness" or "textuality" includes these seven broad characteristics: 1-Intentionality, 2-Acceptability, 3-Situationality, 4-Informativity, 5-Coherence, 6-Cohesion, and 7-Intertextuality.

Intentionality. The linguistic behaviors are not random; they are directed by writer, speaker, and translator.

Acceptability. This features indicates to the standard grammatical and lexical patterning of a particular text. For example, "the writer of a highway code has less freedom than the participants in an informal roadside conversation" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 73). They further explain that, if a translator wants to create an acceptable target text, "he/she must first understand the acceptability standard of the L2 community for this particular category of text" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 73).

Situationality. It is "the location of the text in a discrete sociocultural context in a real time and place" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 85). The authors further explain that, this term, "situationality" determines the translatability of a particular source text, since a particular text that is created in a particular situation cannot be translated for the target readers of a particular, different, or an opposite situation.

Informativity. It is the extent of new information that exist in a particular source text, and the act of translation must be on the basis of this feature. They state that situationality and informativity are related to each other in which, if the two situations (the situation which a particular source text is created within it, and the situation which its target text is produced for it) be very similar to each other, the source text probably has not very new information, and translation may not be needed.

Coherence. It is considered as the property of text that is logically structured. The authors give a caution to their readers that sentence-for-sentence translation cannot re-stablish the coherence of source text.

Cohesion. It is "the linguistic potential for the expression of semantic relations" (Halliday & Hassan, 1976, as cited by Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 102). "Cohesion make coherence linguistically evident" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 102). They state that cohesion and coherence are related to each other. They further explain that, cohesive ties within a particular text/discourse can make a *texture*. Text/discourse can be created and structured by a single sentence or the sequences of sentences. Cohesion can be divided into two subcategories: 1- Lexical cohesion (textonymy, and word systems), and 2- Grammatical cohesion (grammatical structures)

Intertextuality. It is interpreted as "the property of being like other of its kind which readers attribute by using parallel texts as guides" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, pp. 117-118). They state that, "every translation can be seen as having double intertextuality" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, pp. 118).

In chapter four, the authors explain the term, "translation evaluation" and express that, a good translation is not recognized as translation. According to them, literally translations need to being re-translated. Contrarily, those texts that are pragmatically translated rarely need re-translation. In other words, "the more effective a translation is, the more

difficult it is to detect the presence of the translator" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 124). Then, the concept of "text types" is bolded by them. They declare that, a particular type of text can be recognized through its grammatical features and its particular purpose(s). They further explain that, the consideration of text type by translator is very important and significant, since it can give him/her "a more realistic view of the sophisticated contextualization of the textual markers that occurs in social activity" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 128). After that, the authors define *prototype* and its significant role in translation. They state that, translator must first focus on studying and assessing prototype by collecting and analyzing the related and parallel target texts (with regard to the particular source text that is under the process of translation) that their clients and audiences (their target readers/audiences) use. They further explain that, translator must focus on the linguistic particulars of the prototype of second language. On the other hand, they emphasize that prototype analysis cannot be happened unless after understanding the *textual meaning* of source language/discourse/text.

According to them, textual meaning is referred to as the semantic pattern of the whole text. Textual meaning of a particular text is connected to the past, present, and future textual meaning of its related texts. They declare that, "textual meaning provides the global semantic structure that is given linguistic expression through the application of a prototype" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 136). Then, they explain that, when textual meaning or global meaning of a particular source text is reflected through the global linguistic pattern (superstructure) of its target prototype, the result is *textualized meaning*. In addition, they state that the global meaning or global proposition (which is textualized by the superstructure or global linguistic pattern of target prototype and named as textualized meaning) can be decomposed into an ordered set of semantic macropropositions (macropropositions which are textualized and named as macrostructures). Macropropositions are referred to as the "intermediate semantic structures that are just underneath the main themes of the text" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 136).

Macropropositions can be also decomposed into micropropositions which are textualized and named as microstructures. They further explain that, "macrorules derive macrostructures from microstructures" (Van Dijk, 1980, p. 46 as cited by Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 138). In other words, this term, "macrorules" is generally interpreted as the attempt of explaining that "how a reader can synthesize larger meanings from the smaller meaning units…" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, p. 138). So, the comprehension procedures are basically regarded as the attempt of understanding the larger meanings from the smaller meaning units. They say that, text production is a top-down process, while text comprehension is a bottom-up process. Moreover, they express that a translation must have an important feature which is called "communicative value". It is conditioned by the extent of understanding the linguistic cues and their references. Furthermore, the authors state that communicative value can be considered as the true comprehension of the concept, "equivalence", since the real and true equivalence is the *communicative equivalence*. If a text can be accepted by the target readers/users, it has the communicative value, and subsequently, both text (source text and target text) are

equal. Finally, they ended their words with concluding that "the theory of translation has to account for the *textuality* of translations. Because a translation is always a text, and because translation is always a textual process, a theory of translation is part of a theory of texts" (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, pp. 147-148).