

1. Introduction

As the pace of globalization increases, English has emerged as the working language in both business and academic communities. Today, 1.5 billion (or one in four) of the world population use English as a first, second or foreign language. Apart from that, of 12,500 international organizations listed in the 1995-1996 Union of International Associations' Yearbook, approximately 85% use English as their official language (Crystal,2003,p.69- 87).

Whether you like it or not, as Spolsky writes in a chapter of a book, analyzing how English spreads, “English, it is generally agreed, is today in a stronger position in the world not just than any contemporary languages but also than any other historical languages” (2004, p.76). For the dominance of English in the world's communication today, McKay even jumps into the conclusion: “Various characteristics of English today, then, warrant it (English) being considered as an international language, particular in a global sense. Clearly it is a language being learned by more and more individuals as an additional language, it is central to a growing global economy, and it is the major language of a developing mass culture” (2002,p.15).

Under this situation, in non-English speaking countries, translation has gained analogues importance today as new ideas and knowledge written in English need to be translated into the target texts for the people who do not speak and read English. However, for long, the debate over accuracy and flexibility has never recessed in translation. By parity of reasoning, in translation teaching, this question has always puzzled translation teachers around the world: “Should teachers stress the principle of accuracy over flexibility, or vice versa?” Supporters of the former argue that the meaning of the original should be kept at any cost, while those in favor of the latter assert that for better understanding of the reader of the receptor language, translators are allowed not being abided by the restraints set by the

source language.

The purpose of translation is to convey the meaning of source language into target language and the target text is supposed to inform, to teach, to instruct, and to convince target language readers. It is pertinent to say that the process of translation is a process of communication done by translators for writers to their target text readers. There are various ways for human communication, and language plays as one of the most important channels. However, in a context involving the use of more than two languages, translation will be needed to ensure efficient and effective communication between people speaking different languages. Therefore, more and more, translation is regarded as a kind of language communication in the globalized society today.

This paper argues that professional translation should focus on providing good communication to the target text readers, in other words, to accomplish a communicative purpose in the target culture. Unlike translation of philosophy works or legal documents which focuses on the retention of the original form and content, professional translation aims to convey the correct message to target language readers, and it is used and applied in working places. Consequently, how to produce efficient and effective communication to the readers should be the top concern of the translator.

2. Review of Modern Theories of Translation

Translation is a process of turning the source language into the target language, ie., the transfer of a message written in one language into another, and basically, it is an application of comparative linguistics. Oxford English Dictionary gives its definition of translation as follows: “to express the sense of a word or text in another language.” In indicating the interpretative nature of translation, Hatim puts it, “translation proper involves the representation of what someone else has

thought or said. Furthermore, translations are intended to achieve relevance, not alone as communication in their own right, but by standing in for some original” (2001,p.40).

However, one of the most frequent criticisms of translation is that it does not sound completely equivalent to the original. For this, Tang(湯雄飛) claims:”What a translator tries to achieve is simply relative fidelity, because absolute fidelity is an ideal which can never be realized. Ordinarily, even the best translated texts only express eighty percent of what the original contained.” He thus pessimistically concludes: “It is impossible for a translator to be absolutely faithful” (1995,p.10).

It is meaningless to argue with Tang for how much of the original can be translated faithfully (translation is not pure science, and there is no standard for doing this), but most translators won’t disagree that absolute fidelity is impossible because of the numerous incompatibilities which inevitably exist between the source and target languages and cultures. Apart from that, the translator’s thoughts and wording for the translated text are strongly influenced by his/her mother tongue. All these factors have made complete fidelity with the original a mission impossible.

Unlike a composition in which a writer can freely express in his/her own language, a translator is somehow abided by the source language, and has to follow the style and ideas of the writer of the original, and he/she is expected to produce as nearly as possible the same effect as was produced on the readers of the original. In telling the uniqueness of translation, Colina writes, “ **【a】** translation is like any other text in that it is written for a particular audience and with a specific purpose in mind; it is different in that it must, by its own nature, correspond, to some extent, to a source text” (2003,p.9).

Translation theory is, therefore, in one view an attempt to create a model of

how messages are transferred from a source-language text into a target-language text by giving some insight into the relation between thought, meaning and language. Through human history, translation has played a crucial role in human communication. Yet, the study of it as an academic subject began in the second half of the 20th century; partly because of the pace of globalization sped up at the time, and people needed to rely on translation to understand others speaking different languages and growing up in different cultures.

2.1 Literal and Free Translation in Different Dichotomies: A Debate over Centuries

In western history, the practice of translation could be dated back to the time of Cicero and Horace (first century BC). However, up until the second half of the twentieth century, western translation theories seemed to be locked in the debate over “literal” and “free” translation (Steiner,1998,p.319), even though in different terms used by different translation theorists. In China, the same thing happened to the early translators as well, as the struggle over Yiyi (意譯, idiomatic translation) and Zhiyi (直譯, literal translation) had long been controversial (Liu 劉著研,2007,p.27). When translation gradually became an academic discipline in the 1950s, new translation theories also bourgeoned as the simple “literal vs. free” or “Yiyi vs. Zhiyi” could no longer satisfy the theoretical framework of the new subject. In the following, we will talk about some renowned translation theories widely discussed both before and after the second half of the 20th century.

2.1.1 Direct Vs. Indirect

Over centuries, the struggle over “direct” and “indirect” translation has never waned in translation community. Some translators argue that the meaning of the original should be kept at any cost, while others assert that for better understanding of the reader, changes to the original are accepted. As a matter of fact, in the practice of translation, direct and indirect could be seen as different approaches,

which have been used by the translator, sometimes alternatively.

Gutt invokes the distinction between “direct” and “indirect” translation as follows: “Direct translation is a translation in which the translator has to somehow stick to the explicit contents of the original. A translation is considered to be direct if and only if it purports to interpretively resemble the original completely in the context envisaged for the original. In contrast, indirect translation is a translation in which the translator is free to elaborate or summarize. This heeds the urge to communicate as clearly as possible rather than the need to give the receptor language audience access to the authentic meaning of the original” (1991,p.122).

The main argument between direct and indirect translation lies on whether the translator should strictly follow the original or be given flexibility in doing translation works. Direct translation calls for the translated texts to “resemble the original completely” and it does pose a big problem for the translator as barriers set by different languages and cultures are difficult to surmount. On the other hand, indirect translation gives the translator much freedom to freely elaborate or summarize in order to achieve good communication with the receptor language reader, and that often lead to under-translation or over-translation.

The debate over direct and indirect has been on the rise for centuries in translation, and we don’t know when it started and we also anticipate that the struggle will never end given to the fact that both camps have their respective adamant supporters. Based on the old debate of direct vs. indirect, more different dichotomies emerge when translation as an academic discipline becomes more maturing.

2.1.2 Word-for-Word vs. Sense-for-Sense

Apart from the argument over “direct” and “indirect”, translation theories also evolved from simple word-for-word (i.e. literal) versus sense-for-sense (i.e. free)

approaches into something considerably more complex. For centuries, until the second half of the twentieth century, the word-for-word approach, which refers to the replacement of one word in the source-language text with another in the target-language text, was pitched against the sense-for-sense approach, more concerned with preserving the meaning of the source-language text rather than its precise wording (Munday, 2008,p.19-20) .

In fact, the struggle over word-for-word and sense-for-sense (or literal and free) is just like the enduring debate over Yiyi (意譯) and Zhiyi (直譯) that has puzzled Chinese translators for centuries. Supporters of Yiyi claim that given the different syntax and grammar of the source language and target language, it is impossible to achieve complete resemblance in a translation work. They believe that a translator while in keeping the meaning the same with the original should be allowed to do some changes in order to make the translation draft more readable. On the other hand, supports of Zhiyi believe that the main aim of the translator is to produce as nearly as possible the same effect on his readers as was produced on the readers of the original. In order to meet the standard, it leaves little room for the translator to change the manner or style of the original in the process of translation.

In essence, Yiyi and Zhiyi are the Chinese equivalent terms for word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. For this, Chan Leo Tak-hung claims that Yiyi, in reality most closely matches sense-for-sense translation. Zhiyi, which has been translated as “straightforward” or “direct” translation, on the other hand, is the Chinese term for word-for-word translation (2001,p.199-204). It is pertinent to say that word-for-word (Zhiyi) and sense-for-sense (Yiyi) are different approaches taken by translators either for being loyal to the original or for being convenient to the readers.

2.1.3 Formal versus Dynamic

The period between 1950s and the 1960s saw the dominance of linguistic

theories that focused on the description and analysis of translation procedures. The same period also saw the return of the dichotomy of oppositions similar to that of word-for-word versus sense-for-sense such as “formal versus dynamic” as proposed by Eugene Nida, and he defines the two as follows:

1. Formal equivalence: Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content...One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language (Nida, 1964,p.159).
2. Dynamic equivalence: The relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message. The message has to be tailored to the receptor’s linguistic needs and cultural expectation and aims at complete naturalness of expression (Nida,1964,166, Nida and Taber,1969,p.12).

However, Nida’s dichotomy does not deviate much from the long-held debate over literal vs. free, with the Formal leans toward the source-language text structure while the Dynamic adapts the translation more closely to the target language in order to achieve naturalness. Unlike most translation theorists who still call for equivalence of the translated text on form and content, Nida is the first one who draws reader-friendly translation (translation which meets the cultural and language demand of the receptor language) into our attention.

As perceived, Nida’s dynamic equivalence is challenged by Catford—a British linguist and translation theorist who argues that one of the central tasks of Translation Theory is defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence. Equivalence is taken to be the basis on which source language textual material is replaced by target language textual material. Catford believes that translators do not “transfer” meaning between languages, they merely “replace” a source

language meaning by a target language meaning that can function in the same way in the situation at hand (Hatim,2001,p.14). When most translation theorists at that time still called for adhering closely to the linguistic form of the source text, Nida's "dynamic equivalence" was really a far cry from them.

In order to avoid being misunderstood, Nida changed the "dynamic equivalence" into "functional equivalence", which serves as the core of his theory. Nida asserts that a translator should seek the functional correspondence but not semantic correspondence between the source and target languages in doing his/her translation works and in such a translation, the focus of attention is directed not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response.

Despite the subsequent questioning of the feasibility of that goal, Nida's great achievement is to have drawn translation theory away from the stagnant "literal vs. free" debate and into the modern era. As Munday puts it, "【t】he key role played by Nida is to point the road away from strict word-for-word equivalence. His introduction of the concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence was crucial in introducing a receptor-based (or reader-based) orientation to translation theory (2008,p.43).

2.1.4 Overt versus Covert

In the late 1970s, another similar dichotomy was introduced by Juliane House in the form of "overt versus covert". House gives her definition of the two as follows: "an overt translation is one in which the addressees of the translation text are quite overtly not being directly addressed" (1997,p.66), and she believes that with such translations, equivalence has to be sought at the level of language/text, register and genre (p.112).

In House's eyes, a covert translation "is a translation which enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture." (p.69) and the function of a covert translation is "to recreate, reproduce, or represent in the translated text the function

the original has in its lingua-cultural framework and discourse world” (p.114).

From House’s rather confusing definition, we can roughly conclude that in overt translation, the target-language text is a translation from another language. On the other hand, covert translation does not show that the target text originates in another language.

2.1.5 Semantic versus Communicative

In the 1980s, Peter Newmark, a well known British scholar, proposed a new dichotomy in translation theory “Semantic versus Communicative”, which he defined as follows, “Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.” He went on to elaborate the difference between the two as follows, “**[c]**ommunicative translation addresses itself solely to the second reader, who does not anticipate difficulties or obscurities, and would expect a generous transfer of foreign elements into his own culture as well as his language where necessary. Semantic translation remains within the original culture and assists the reader only in its connotations if they constitute the essential human (non-ethnic) message of the text” (1988,p.39).

Even though Newmark’s definition of the communicative and semantic translation is clear, he still admits that “all translation must be in some degree both communicative and semantic,” and the approach taken in a translation work is just “a matter of difference of emphasis” (ibid.,62).

The “equivalent effect” proposed by Newmark serves as the core of his theory. In his viewpoint, a translation must completely reflect the true intention of the writer of the original and the translation will be seen incomplete even if part of the original is not accepted or understood by the receptor. Newmark emphasizes the

importance of faithfulness to the writer; at the same time, he also calls for receptor-centered translation texts. Given the different structure and style of the source language and target language, the equivalent effect is sometimes hard to achieve. For this, in his later publications, Newmark openly admits that complete equivalence is impossible even in the communicative translation (Jin 金隄 1998: 16-7).

The dichotomy proposed by Newmark is not a big departure from the long-held debate over faithfulness to the original in translation. However, his assertion of reader-based translation, which allows the reader “no difficulties and obscurities” in reading the translation text is quite similar to Nida’s.

2.1.6 Documentary vs. Instrumental

Nord distinguishes two type of translation theories, the first type is what she calls “documentary translation, and the second “instrumental translation” This dichotomy, like the previous ones mentioned above, is another controversy of “literal” vs. “free” translation, as “the result of a documentary translation process is a text about the source text that allows target-culture audiences to look at its linguistic and textual structure; however, the result of an instrumental translation process is a text that may have the same functions as the source and that is the vehicle through which the source text author will be able to accomplish a certain communicative purpose in the target culture (Colina,2003,p.10).

If we take a closer look at the above dichotomies, we can soon find that they all center on the question: whether translators should be strictly loyal to the original works in order to keep “fidelity” (to retain the style of the original author), or are allowed not to be abided by the source texts so as to achieve “naturalness” in the target ones. Venuti openly asserts that “all these dichotomies are in a way reminiscent of the word-for-word versus sense-for-sense debate, documented earlier in the history of translation theory; however, they are not identical since

these new dichotomies were often influenced by linguistics” (2000,p.122) .

2.1.7 Skopos Theory: From Linguistic-based to Communicative-based Translation

In 1980s, translation was increasingly conceptualized as cultural transfer rather than a linguistic operation. German scholar Hans Vermeer’s Skopos Theory is a far cry from traditional theories. Skopos is the Greek word for “purpose” or “aim”, and according to Vermeer, it “is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation”. Regarding translation as one type of social action, he claims that translation is produced for particular recipients with specific purposes in a given situation (Skopos). He goes further to explain Skopos rule as follows: "Translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function" (ibid.,p.227-37).

Comparing to linguistic or equivalence-based theories, Vermeer considered equivalence between a source text and a target text no longer as the normal case, but rather regarded a source text only as “an offer of information”, which – depending on the Skopos – can be wholly or partly simulated into an offer of information in a target language and culture. In other words, the target text is "functional" to fulfill the expectations and needs of target audience. “Vermeer’s is not the first functionalist approach in translation theory, however, it is one of the most known, because for the first time extra-linguistic and textual factors like the ‘client’, the ‘recipient’s culture’ and especially the ‘purpose’ of a text became the focus of attention” (Sunwoo, 2007, p.2).

The new emphasis on function turned the attention of translation theorists to the pragmatic aspects of text, causing many of them to turn their backs on linguistic theories of translation. In fact, the Skopos theory has modernized translation theory by offering an alternative to traditional translation. The theory indicates that the “function” of the target text should be the top concern of the translator and

the translator should be given much flexibility to create a new text on the basis of the communicative factors of reception in each situation.

Under this situation, “The source text merely serves as one of various information sources utilized by the translator, not the first and foremost criterion in translator's decision-making” (Aveling 2002). Doing away from the traditional approach, Spokos supporters seem to hold the view that translation work, in keeping the original meaning, can be “rewritten” in the receptor language for better communicative purpose.

Vermeer’s Skopos also encounters challenges from different disciplines. Firstly, it has been said that it does not apply to literary texts, because it could be considered that they serve no purpose (Munday 2001,p.81). Apart from that, legal scholars and specialists also publicly speak against the theory being used in the translation of legal documents. Traditionally, legal translators need to adhere to the principle of fidelity so that the exact meaning of the source text can be preserved. “Thus literal translation (the stricter the better) was the golden rule for legal texts and is still advocated by some lawyers today”(Sarcevia, 2008,p3).

Obviously, Vermeer’s Skopos theory has brought back the heated debate of “literal” and “free” translation. After all, translation is not creation. If a translator is allowed to “re-write” based upon the source text, the receptor text, strictly speaking, is not translation. However, as supporters of functionalism emphasize a good translation work is used by readers, and it should cater for the needs and expectation of its readers. If a translation work cannot achieve the purpose of communication and is not easily understood by its readers, it is nothing. This especially applies to professional translation, which aims to provide its readers quick access to the required information.

2.2 *Criteria of Translation: When the East Meets the West*

2.2.1 Western Views on Translation Standard

In western world, the first renowned translators might be Cicero (1st Century BC) and St. Jerome (late 4th century AD). Introducing his approach for a translation work, Cicero stated that he declined to be an “interpreter” but an “orator” by keeping the same ideas and forms of the original, and prefers to use the language which conforms to the usage of the target text. Wedged between the debate of “literal” and “free” translation, St. Jeromy also showed disparagement to “word-to word” translation, and he believes “by following so closely the form of the source text, it produced an absurd translation, cloaking the sense of the original” (Munday, 2008,p.19-20).

In English, perhaps the first systematic study of translation is Alexander Fraser Tytler’s “Essay on the Principles of Translation” in which he gives three general laws and rules for the translator:

1. The translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.
2. The style and manner or writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
3. The translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

The three laws listed above by Tytler look simple, but they are actually very difficult to fulfill. His first law refers to the translator having a perfect knowledge of the original, and the second law requires the translator to recreate the style of the original in the target language. The third law, on the other hand, is the most difficult to achieve, given the sharp difference between the source language and the target language in form, style and content. For experienced translators, scrupulous imitation of the original is a goal hard to reach, let alone keeping the

ease of the original.

In talking about the usefulness of translation, Duff briefly and concisely points out three qualities for a translator: “Translation develops three qualities essential to all language learning: accuracy, clarity, and flexibility. It trains the learner to search (flexibility) for the most appropriate words (accuracy) to convey what is meant (clarity). This combination of freedom and constraint allows the students to contribute their own thoughts to a discussion which has a clear focus—the text” (1994,p.7). If we compare Tytler’s three laws with Duff’s three qualities, we might find that for centuries, loyalty to the original and fluency of the translated text are what western translation theorists concern most, and their views are also shared by eminent Chinese translators.

2.2.2 Chinese Views on Translation Standard

In China, the translation of Buddhist sutras in the late Han Dynasty (1st century AD) might be the earliest systematic translation works known to the public. At that time, the interaction between China and Central Asia became more intense after the completion of the Silk Road. The ever-increasing popularity of Buddhism also demanded a large quantity of Buddhist scriptures to be translated.

According to Hung and Pollard’s research, the translation of Buddhist sutras could roughly be divided into three phases (1997,p.368), and translators used different approaches and criteria . in different time. Phase I started from Han Dynasty to the Three Kingdoms Period (148-265 AD), and translations produced in this period were word-for-word renderings adhering closely to the originals. Phase II began at Jin Dynasty and the Northern and Southern Dynasties (265-589 AD), and in this period, most translators used the approach of Yi-yi (free translation) and drafts were polished in order to give them a high literary quality. Phase III covered the Sui Dynasty, Tang Dynasty and Northern Song Dynasty (589-1100), and translation approach at the time was dominated by Xuan-Zang (玄奘, 602-664),

who advocated that the translator ought to attach much importance to the style of the source text rather than literary polishing on the target text.

Xuan-Zang , in talking about his criterion for translation, also asserted that a good translation work should not only” be loyal to the original, but also be easily understood by the reader” (既須求真，又須喻俗) (Ma 馬祖毅,1984,p.58). This might be the earliest criterion for Chinese translators, and from his above-mentioned criterion for translation, we can find that he singled out “accuracy” as the first priority in a translation work; however, he also advocated that attention should be paid to the style of the original text: literary polishing was not to be applied to simple and plain source texts. Because of his insistence on accuracy and fluency of his translation works, the great master was widely seen “striking a balance between literal and free translation and being the greatest translator of the time” (Yeh 葉子南 2000,p.155).

Yan Fu (嚴復), widely seen as the greatest translator in modern China, illustrated three criteria for a good translation work in his short preface to his translation of Aldous Huxley’s *Evolution and Ethics* (1895)—Fidelity (信), Fluency (達) and Elegance (雅), and this three- word principle has been widely observed by Chinese translators since then on. (Ker 柯平 1994,p.49, Song 宋天錫,2006,p.4, Yeh 葉乃嘉,2007,p.23) In some way, Yan’s three-word principle, resemble Tytler’s three general laws for translation, as Munday writes that “Tytler’s laws are said by some to have influenced the work of the renowned Chinese thinker and translator Yan Fu at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries” (2008,p.27-8).

The three-word principle, even though is easy to understand; however, we can’t deny that it is too simple and too abstract for the beginners of translation study. The success of the slogan- like principle lies on its briefness and simplicity, and almost every literate will soon understand what it implies when he/she takes a look on it. However, it is also because of its briefness and simplicity, it does not

elaborate more on what a translator should follow in making a good translation work.

Lin Yutang (林語堂), a great Chinese translator in modern times, further defines Yan's principle on translation criteria as follows. Fidelity means loyalty to the original and the translator should be responsible to the original text. Fluency means smoothness (clarity) of the translated text, and the translator should be responsible to the reader. Elegance means beautiful wording and the translator should be responsible to artistry. In his view point, good translation depended on the following factors: (1) The translator thoroughly understands the content and has a good command of the source language (2) The translator has a good level of target language and can write smooth articles in the language. (3) The translator has a certain level of competence on translation work (Chang 張達聰,1996,p.8).

Lin's assertion has received a great deal of response from local translators as they are more realistic and easily understood compared with the three-word tenet: Fidelity, Fluency and Elegance. Lin Iliang (林以亮) adapted Lin Yutang's three requirements for a good translator and he believed that a good translator needs to have the following abilities: (1) Full comprehension of the work to be translated (2) Good command of both source and target languages (3) Good experience and imagination (Huang,1978,p.5) .

Apart from those requirements mentioned above, based upon my observation and experience in doing translation, I would like to offer another requirement for a good translator— abundant knowledge of technological know-how in the pertinent field. For example, the translation work of a computer textbook is doomed to be a failure if the translator does not have good knowledge of computer science. Likely, the translation of an economic report would not be expected to be precise if the translator has not received any education in economics and finance before.

In this rapidly developing world, the requirement of quick processing of

information has pushed translators nowadays to learn more about professional knowledge in various fields than to devote all their time to linguistics or literature. In other words, unlike translators in the past, translators today are more likely to do non-literary translation works. Without enough technological know-how, it is totally impossible for a translator to do a good translation work in a specific field, because he/she would not thoroughly understand the highly technical text.

3.Communicative Translation: Paving the Way for Better Understanding

Communicative and also fundamentalism theory as discussed above seem to encourage modern translators to do away with the traditional linguistic-oriented translation approach, and take a more reader-friendly approach. In order to demonstrate the basic difference between communicative and semantic translation Newmark translates a German text into English in two different approaches below, the first one, being “semantic”, the second one, being “communicative” (1988,p.54-5).

Semantic Translation:

“Hans Castorp’s story, which we propose to tell—not on his own account (for in him the reader will make the acquaintance of a simple thought attractive young man) but for the sake of the story, which seems to us to be highly worth telling (it should however be remembered to Hans Castorp’s credit that it is his story, and that not every story happens to everybody): this story took place a very long time ago, it is already so to speak covered with the patina of history, and it must in any event be presented in a tense corresponding to the remotest past.”

Communicative Translation:

“We propose to tell Hans Castorp’s story not for his sake, but for the story’s. The reader will discover that in fact he is rather a simple but attractive young man.

But the story seems to us to be well worth telling, even though it took place a long time ago, and is already covered in the dust of history. It is essential to show that it took place in the remote past. Further we must bear in mind in Hans Castorp's favor that this is his own story, and a story like this one does not happen to everyone."

In order to be loyal to semantic and syntactic structures of the German original, the version of semantic translation, as we can see, achieves no naturalness in English. For example, in the semantic translation, in order to accurately correspond to the source language, the translator has no choice but to loyally translate those supplementary words in the brackets (for in him the reader will make the acquaintance of a simple thought attractive young man), which sound incompatible to the common style and usage of the receptor language (English). Also in the last sentence, the semantic translation "it is already so to speak covered with the patina of history" is not as natural as the communicative translation "it is already covered in the dust of history" to the receptor reader.

For those who do not read the source language (German), they might be puzzled or even confused after reading the semantic translation, which in Newmark's view is required "to show the thought processes of the utterance." On the contrary, the reader-friendly communicative version is more comprehensible and attractive to readers of the receptor language. In order to further find the effectiveness of the two translations, I try to give both translations to three English native speakers who do not speak German, and get their comment and response about the two translations.

Table One: Comments Given by Three Receptor Language Readers

Reader	Semantic	Communicative
Jerry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think this translation is an awkward translation as it is unclear and confusing. 2. The whole paragraph contains only one 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To me, this translation is obvious and is clear to understand. 2. The translation text has been divided into short sentences,

	<p>sentence and it makes reading difficult.</p> <p>3. Many grammar and syntax mistakes could be found in the translation.</p> <p>4. I need to think at least twice or for many times in order to catch up the meaning.</p> <p>5. Words in brackets seem redundant and some are even unnecessary.</p>	<p>and is much easier for the reader to understand.</p>
John	<p>1. The sentence structure in Translation One is horrible, which makes reading unpleasant.</p> <p>2. Some words are not standard English and those make it difficult to comprehend the meaning of the translation.</p>	<p>1. Translation Two is much easier to read because of short sentences.</p> <p>2. I have no problem in realizing the meaning of the translation.</p> <p>3. The translation is much smoother and sound more natural in English usage.</p>
Robert	<p>1. Bad punctuation makes Translation One looks convoluted.</p> <p>2. The bracket parts are not coherent to the context.</p> <p>3. The long sentence is not easy to comprehend and I have to go over and over to realize the meaning.</p> <p>4. All in all, the translation seems strange to me.</p>	<p>1. Good punctuation makes reading much easier.</p> <p>2. Translation Two is well-organized and is more corresponding to the standard usage of English.</p>

Similarly, 48 students taking translation course from a junior class are given the two translations to test their comprehension of the translated texts, and the result is as follow.

Table Two: Students' Evaluation on the Two Translation Works

Translation	Fully Understand	Almost Understand	Barely Understand	Don't Understand
Semantic	0	7	12	29
Communicative	14	25	7	2

Actually, the finding is predicable and not surprising at all because the reader-based communicative translation calls for good communication with the receptor-language readers. For readers who don't understand the source language, what they concern most is whether the translated text transmits meaningful and correct messages to them, and few ever care about whether the style and structure of the translated text are corresponding to the source text.

There are many ways of human communication, and language communication is the most important of all. As translation is seen as a special way of language communication, it should be provided with all the characteristics of communication. Language communication is a process of achieving consensus by two parties using a common language. Therefore, "two parties", "language" and also "consensus" could be seen as the most important elements in human communication. The "two parties" in this case can be seen as the speaker and the listener, "language" is the tool of communication, and consensus is the result of communication. Consequently, the tool will achieve better effectiveness if it is used properly. Therefore, all translation texts need to take communication with the reader as the first priority.

Many linguistics and language specialists hold the view that in the process of communication, it's impossible to catch up all the words a speaker utters. Likely, in translation, it is meaningless to require the translator to reproduce a scrupulous copy in the receptor language; rather, we should ask whether the translator has successfully conveyed the meaning of the source texts in the receptor language. Like language communication, a successful translation calls for mutual

understanding between the writer and the reader given that total equivalence is impossible in the translation texts. Therefore, the responsibility of the translator is trying to seek a functional consensus for the two parties, and that is especially so in professional translations. For examples; translation of an operating manual aims at teaching people how to use a machine or an appliance; therefore, what the translator should concern first is to help the receptor language reader to understand how to use it. Under this situation, every operating procedure should not be omitted and the translation must correspond to the original as closely as possible. However, in the translation of a TV commercial, in order to achieve its naturalness in the target language and adapt to the receptor cultural background, the translator might be forced to drastically change the form and structure of the original so as to achieve a sound effect.

In this fast changing world when the phenomenon of globalization takes shape, the movement of people, technology and even ideas has become ever closer between states. Closer interchange and interaction between people in the emerging global village require the translator today to provide efficient and effective translation service for better communication. If translation (especially professional translation) is given a new role as a channel of communication in this information exploration era when piles of data waiting to be translated each day, what the translator should concern is whether good communication is achieved between the writer and the reader. In communicative translation, what we need to concern is that whether the translator has completely reflected the true intention of the writer of the original and good communication could only be met after the reader has no “difficulties and obscurities” in understanding the translated texts.

4. Case Study: Change or Not to Change--A Dilemma in Communicative Translation

In the practice of translation, the translator might face the problem of bad original writing, which makes good translation extremely difficult or even impossible. If the translator sticks to the original and makes no changes, the translated texts might prove to be unreadable and even makes no sense to the reader of the receptor language. Of course, loyalty to the writer of the original has long been held as the first priority in the process of translation; however, the translator might be disloyal to the bad original writing and be forced to elaborate in his/her own way as he/she is assumed to be an orator or an interpreter for the reader. For this, Newmark puts it, “ **[a]** translator must respect good writing scrupulously by accounting for its language, structures and content, whether the piece is scientific or poetic, philosophical or fictional. If the writing is poor, it is normally his duty to improve it, whether it is technical or a routine, commercialized best seller.” (1988,p.6) In the following, I try to select a good writing and a bad writing to see their influence on the quality of communicative translation.

4.1 Case One: Communicative Translation for Good Writing

Normally, a good writing won't trouble the translator much in the translation process. What needs to be concerned is whether the translation done is fluent in the receptor language and culture. In the following, I take a paragraph abridged from Mac. Arthur's notable speech to Congress “American Policy in the Pacific”, soon after he was relieved as the supreme commander in the Asian Pacific in WWII, as an example and a translation downloaded from the internet (See Translation One) is reviewed in contrast to the work of a professional translator. (See Translation Two)

Original text

I am closing my fifty-two years of military service. When I joined the army even before the turn of the century, it was the fulfillment of all of my boyish hopes and dreams. The world has turned over many times since I took the oath on the plain at West Point, and the hopes and dreams have long since vanished. But I still remember the refrain of one of the most popular barrack ballads of that day which proclaimed most proudly that “Old soldiers never die; they just fade away. And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodbye.

Translation One

我即將結束五十年的軍旅生涯。我從軍是在本世紀開始之前，而這是我童年的希望與夢想的實現。自從我在西點軍校的教練場上宣誓以來，這個世界已經過多次變化，而我的希望與夢想早已消逝，但我仍記著當時最流行的一首軍歌詞，極為自豪地宣示「老兵不死，只是凋謝」。就像這首歌中的老兵，一位想盡一己之責的老兵，而上帝也賜予光輝使他能看清這一項責任，而我現在結束了軍旅生涯，而逐漸凋謝。再見。

Translation Two

我將結束五十二年的軍旅生涯，在本世紀之初，我即從軍，而這也是我孩提時代希望與夢想的實現。當我在西點操場上宣誓參加行伍後，世界已歷經滄桑，孩提時代的希望與夢想亦逐漸消散。但我依稀記得當年的一首軍歌，歌詞中驕傲的宣誓著「老兵不死，他們只是逐漸凋謝。」一如歌詞中上帝囑其盡責的老兵，現今我也將結束我的軍旅生涯並逐漸凋謝。再見。

As Mc Arthur's Congress Speech is collected in *Great American Speeches* (Suriano ed. 1993); doubtlessly it could be seen as an excellent writing, and various translation works of the original text only differ in degree of fluency in the receptor language (Chinese). The two translation works above are no exception. Basically speaking, by accounting to language, structures and content, these two

translation works “respect scrupulously” the original text, and in most parts of the two translation texts, we see no big difference except in the last sentence, in which the complement “—an old soldier who tries to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty” makes the translation extremely difficult to achieve naturalness in the receptor language.

Most Chinese readers might have difficulties and obscurities in understanding the first translation 「就像這首歌中的老兵，一位想盡一己之責的老兵，而上帝也賜予光輝使他能看清這一項責任，而我現在結束了軍旅生涯，而逐漸凋謝。」

By adhering to the sentence structure of the original, the translator has shown loyalty to the writer. However, he seems to fail to provide good communication to the reader. On the contrary, the second translation 「一如歌詞中上帝囑其盡責的老兵，現今我也將結束我的軍旅生涯並逐漸凋謝。」 sounds more natural and is more corresponding to the usage of the receptor language. Most important of all, it has achieved the purpose of communication even though it doesn't completely stick to the original text like the first translation does. Doing the translation of good writing doesn't require the translator to elaborate much on the original, but it is a totally different story in doing the translation of a bad writing, which might call for the translator to “deviate” from the original in order to achieve a good effect in the translated text.

4.2 Case Two: Communicative Translation for Bad Writing

In our daily life, we might come across many bad writings, containing either weak grammar and syntax or bad content, and all of those have made the translator difficult to comprehend the meaning of the original, let alone to translate the clumsy writing. The following is an excerpt from an example of bad writing given in the book “Improve Your Writing Skills.”

Original Text

The program is of vital importance, and would assist in creating a significant improvement in the quality of life of disabled people of all ages, not least as access to transport is a key requirement in education and employment, as well as for social, leisure, health, shopping and other activities.

Three students from my translation class are chosen to do the translation work, and their TOEIC scores are 890, 755 and 550 respectively. According to CEF classification, the three students' English proficiency can be rated as "effective operational proficiency" (880), "vantage" (760), and "threshold" (550), and their translation works are listed as below.

Translation One (threshold)

本計畫致力於在不同年紀的殘障人士生活中創造一項非常重要的變革。這不僅僅是在公共運輸的一種管道，更也是對於教育、就業，甚至於在社交、休閒、健康、購物以及其他的活動。

Translation Two (vantage)

此計畫對於各個年齡層的殘障人士的生活有大幅提昇。因為對他們來說在教育及就業能方便使用交通工具是相當重要的，甚至在於社交、休閒、健康和購物或是其他活動。

Translation Three (effective operational proficiency)

本計畫十分重要，預將大幅改善各年齡層殘障者的生活品質；交通運輸不僅在就學及就業方面，另在社交、休閒、保健、購物和其他各種活動上均不可或缺。

As we can see the second part of the original is confusing, for which Johnson gives his comment: “[t]he weaknesses of this original are caused by its length, and also by its poor grammar and confusing repetitions. It starts with the active verb ‘is’ then switches to the conditional “would”; the three ‘of’s in quick succession are

clumsy; and ‘not least as’(which should be ‘because’) is not properly paralleled in ‘as well as’. (1995,p.120) Therefore, if the translator adamantly sticks to the original and makes no changes to the confusing sentence, he/she might run a risk of mistranslation in this case.

The three translations of the first part of the sentence almost convey the meaning of the original, varying only in degree of fluency. However, in the part “not least as access to transport is a key requirement in education and employment”, we see sharp difference in the three translation versions. The first translation, being trapped in the style and form of the original, gives the translation “access to transport” as “公共運輸的一種管道,” which completely twists the meaning of the original. As for the second translation, basically it almost reflects the true intention of the writer; however, it doesn’t correspond to standard Chinese usage and we still can feel that the translated text is strongly influenced by the source text. The success of Translation Three lies in ignoring the confusing “not least as” and translating “a key requirement” as 不可或缺, which is more adapted to the Chinese language.

Being an orator and interpreter for the original work, it is normally the translator’s duty to improve errors and mistakes of the original in the process of translation. As we know, bad writings are usually unclear to the reader, and some are even unreadable. For the purpose of better communication, the translator is inclined to make changes on the original so that the translated text could be more accessible to the receptor reader.

5. Conclusion

There is no record showing when translation started in human communication. However, it must take place when people who speak different languages began to interact with each other. The need for international communication further

facilitate the demand of translation in different areas, and that is especially so in the era of globalization when international exchanges become more intense than before. To cope with the ever-increasing work-load of translation, the translator today needs to know that he/she is playing a role of communicator for people who speak different languages and live in different cultures.

The revolution of translation theory happening in the second part of last century also brought in a new thinking. It started with Nida's dynamic equivalence, followed by Vermeer's functionalism and Newmark's communicative translation, all of which are eager to be liberated from the traditional linguistic-based approach. Since then on, translation is not seen as a process of "replacing" but "transferring" the meaning from the source text to the target one. Consequently, effective and efficient communication with the reader of the receptor language began to draw the attention of the translator who is less concerned with "scrupulous imitation" of the source text in the target language.

Communicative translation is a subjective procedure as it is intended primarily to achieve a certain effect on its readers' minds, and normally the translated version is gradually skewed to the reader's point of view, for which some critics worry that the original meaning might not be totally kept in the process of translation. As most professional translations today like non-literary writing, news, textbooks, scientific and technological reports and even propaganda commercials, all call for achieving quick communication with the receptor reader, the translator ought to be given much flexibility in doing translation works rather than focusing on the form and content of the original. After all, only the translated text which can achieve good communication with the reader can be rated as good and effective translation.

References

- Aveling, H. (2006) "Mistakes" in Translation A Functionalist Approach.
<http://www.soas.ac.uk/Literatures/satranslations/Aveling.pdf> [2005, April 10]
- Chan, L. (2001) "What is Modern in Chinese Translation Theory? Lu Xun and the Debates on Literalism and Foreignization in the May Fourth Period", *TTR* 14.2:195-223.
- Colina, S. (2003) *Translation Teaching: From Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language*.(2nd.edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, A. (1994) *Translation* (4th edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gutt, E. (1991) *Translation and Relevance: Gognition and Context* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hatim, B. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Translation*. London: Pearson Education.
- House, J. (1997) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tublingen: Gunter Narr.
- Hung, E and. Pollard (1998) "The Chinese Tradition" in M. Baker (ed.) *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- McKay, S. (2002) *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Munday, J.(2009) *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988) *Approaches to Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Nida, E. A. (1994) *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. and C. R. Taber (1999) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (2007) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sarcevia, Susan (2008) "Legal Translation and Translation Theory: a Receiver-oriented Approach." <http://www.tradulex.org/Actes2000/sarcevic.pdf>
- Spolsky, B. (2008) *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steiner, George (1998) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sunwoo, M. "Operationalizing the translation purpose (Skopos)" http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2007_Proceedings/2007_Sunwoo_Min.pdf
- Venuti, L.(ed.) (2009) *The Translation Studies Reader*. (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.

中文參考書目

- 馬祖毅 (1984) 《中國翻譯簡史》 北京:中國對外翻譯出版公司。
- 金隄 (1998) 《等效翻譯探索》 台北: 書林出版有限公司。
- 葉子南 (2000)年 《英漢翻譯理論與實踐》 台北:書林出版有限公司。
- 劉著妍 (2007) 《大學英語英漢互譯教程》 天津:天津大學出版社。
- 胡功澤 (1994) 《翻譯理論之演變與發展—建立溝通的翻譯觀》 台北:書林出版有限公司。
- 張達聰 (1996) 《翻譯之理論與技巧》 台北:國家出版社。

- 湯雄飛 (1995)《中文英譯的理論與實例》台北:書林出版有限公司。
- 劉宓慶 (2002)《文體與翻譯》台北:書林出版有限公司。
- 蔣筱珍 (2006)《英文翻譯》台北:華視教學事業處。
- 柯平 (1994)《英漢與漢英翻譯》台北:書林出版有限公司。
- 宋天錫 (2006)《翻譯新概念:英漢互譯實用教程》北京:國防工業出版社。
- 葉乃嘉 (2007)《中英雙向翻譯新視野》台北:五南圖書出版公司。