

CHAPTER 4

LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO TRANSLATION

KIRSTEN MALMKJÆR

4.1 INTRODUCTION

To speak of an approach to translation implies that the work under discussion expresses and displays a comprehensive understanding of an area of study, and considers translational phenomena in the light of this comprehensive understanding. A linguistic approach to translation is informed by linguistics, and since the origins of linguistics (as opposed to philology and rhetoric) are usually considered to reside in the work of Ferdinand de Saussure in the early twentieth century, this chapter will not deal with any work on translation preceding that time.

Among theorists who have taken a linguistic approach to translation, some are linguists who see translation as a branch of (applied) linguistics (see e.g. Catford 1965); others are translation scholars who consider language to be the raw material of translation (e.g. Baker 1992) and believe that it behoves translators to have 'sound knowledge of the raw material with which they work: to understand what language is and how it comes to function for its users' (Baker 1992: 4). Obviously, a person may be both a linguist and a translation scholar, and may at different times write in either role, or indeed both. For example, Roger Bell writes as a linguist in his book on sociolinguistics (1976) but as a translation scholar in parts of his book on translation (1991). Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995—all page references to the

1995 English language edition), for their part, undertake the dual task of comparing French and English by way of translational examples in order to achieve a clearer understanding of 'the characteristics and behaviour of each [language]' (p. 8) as well as providing 'a theory of translation... which is based both on linguistic structures and the psychology of language users' (p. 10). There are also linguists and philosophers who have used translational data and the phenomenon of translation as examples in the furtherance of arguments and theory construction within their own disciplines (see e.g. Sapir 1921, Quine 1959, 1960, Davidson 1973), but this chapter will not discuss their work (see, instead, Chapter 8).

Obviously, just as there are numerous accounts of what language is and how it functions for its users, each of which has the potential to alter, develop, or fade away over time, there are different linguistic approaches to translation, and these too are subject to variance in popularity. Vinay and Darbelnet provide a comprehensive account of translational examples using concepts and notions drawn from Saussurean structural linguistics, Catford's and Baker's approaches are heavily influenced by Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics, and Nida's (1964b) approach is influenced by early Chomskyan generative grammar. Fillmore's scenes-and-frame semantics (1977) inspired the linguistic side of Snell-Hornby's integrated approach to translation (1988/1995). Cognitive linguistics has captured the imagination of Wilss (1988) and Halverson (2003, 2007), and relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995) underlies Gutt's (1991) attempt to do away with translation theory in favour of relevance theory itself. Some scholars make only occasional or selective use of individual insights from linguistics in developing their work. For instance, Reiss and Vermeer (1984/1991) are sometimes said to be inspired by text linguistics because of their reliance on linguistic functions in developing a text typology (see Švejc 2004: 237). This chapter will cover only work in which a comprehensive range of translational phenomena are described and explained in terms of linguistic concepts and categories.

4.2 VINAY AND DARBELNET'S SAUSSUREAN APPROACH

As the title of Vinay and Darbelnet's work suggests, their interest is in style, and style, as they point out, is about choice (1958/1995: 16). They identify three levels of language: lexis, syntax, and message, pointing out that whereas syntax is a matter of rules, choices are freely available at the other two levels (pp. 16–17), in terms of tonality (basically the vernacular versus poetic, literary language) and functionality

(the jargons of different specialized language uses: administrative, legal, scientific, etc.) (p. 18).

The basic linguistic concepts Vinay and Darbelnet employ in their contrastive work on English and French are drawn essentially from Saussurean linguistics. They include *langue* and *parole* (1958/1995: 15), and the linguistic sign in its dual nature of concept ('*signifié*', 'signified') and acoustic or visual image ('*signifiant*', 'signifier') (p. 12), which is used to construct contextually situated messages. Vinay and Darbelnet point out that in some cases one and the same signified corresponds to a word in each of two (or more) languages (as in the case of *couteau de table* and 'table knife'), whereas often, slightly different concepts are invoked by words in two languages which are to an extent interchangeable (as in the case of *pain* and 'bread'); partly for this reason, 'it is dangerous to translate without paying attention to the context' (pp. 11–12). They also adopt Saussure's concept of *valeur*, 'value' to account for the fact that corresponding terms in different languages can have different extensions (pp. 50ff.); for example, *mouton* in French can be used to refer to both sheep and the meat of sheep, whereas in English, 'mutton' is only used for the meat.

Having identified the basic concepts of the linguistic theory underlying their analysis, Vinay and Darbelnet turn their attention to the notion of the translation unit, pointing out that 'the word on its own is unsuitable for consideration as the basis for a unit of translation' (p. 20). Instead, they opt for 'the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually' (p. 21). This being established, the way is open for them to concentrate on 'the methods translators use' at each of the three linguistic levels previously mentioned (p. 30).

They first draw a distinction between direct and oblique translation. In direct translation the SL message can be transposed element by element into TL because of parallelisms between the two languages. But often there are gaps in TL which have to be filled, and here translators can choose between borrowing a term from SL (*Le coroner prit la parole*, 'The coroner spoke', where 'coroner' is borrowed from English), and calque (*l'homme dans la rue* from English 'the man in the street'). When gaps are not an issue, literal translation can sometimes be used, especially between related languages. However, it is often necessary to employ transposition, 'replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message', or modulation, 'variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view [...] justified when, although a literal, or even transposed, translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, it is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic, or awkward in the TL' (1958/1995: 36). For example, 'The time when...' has to be translated into French as *Le moment où...* ('the moment when...'). Both transposition and modulation may be obligatory or optional. To deal with idioms and fixed expressions, Vinay and Darbelnet introduce a special use of the term 'equivalence' to describe the relationship between e.g. 'like a bull in

a china shop', and *comme un chien dans un jeu de quilles* ('like a dog in a game of bowls') (p. 38). Finally, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (p. 39), adaptation is:

the extreme limit of translation: it is used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by the SL message is unknown in the TL culture. In such cases translators have to create a new situation that can be considered as being equivalent.

In the remainder of the book, these methods are applied to and copiously illustrated at the three levels of language identified at the beginning: lexis, syntax, and message.

4.3 CATFORD'S SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

Catford begins his *Essay in Applied Linguistics* (subtitle) by explaining how he understands the relationship between translation theory and linguistic theory (Catford 1965: 1):

Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language—a general linguistic theory.

He selects the contemporary version of systemic functional grammar (Halliday 1961), and, like Vinay and Darbelnet, he stresses the importance of considering 'how language is related to the human situations in which it operates' (Catford 1965: 1). In 'language-events', certain abstract notions can be established at a series of formal levels: phonology and graphology, grammar, and lexis, which are related to situation via the notion of context (p. 3). At each of these levels, we find the fundamental categories of Hallidayan linguistics as formulated in 1961, namely unit, structure, class, and system. Units at each level form scales of classes of units at different ranks. At the level of grammar, the unit rank-scale goes, from largest to smallest, from sentence to clause to group to word to morpheme, where morphemes structure words, which structure groups, which structure clauses, which structure sentences. Below the morpheme, we find the level of phonology/graphology, and above the sentence, we find discourse, text, or message. Systems are enumerations of a limited number of members of a class, such as 'initial consonants' at the level of phonology, or the number system at the level of grammar (p. 7). In addition, lexis is dealt with in terms of collocation and lexical sets (pp. 10–11):

A collocation is the 'lexical company' that a particular lexical item keeps. [...] We refer to the item under discussion as the *node* [...] and the items with which it collocates as its *collocates*. [...] A *Lexical set* is a group of words which have similar collocational ranges.

These basic concepts having been identified, Catford moves on to their application to translation, beginning by establishing general types of translation, which he defines as (p. 20; italics in the original): '*the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)*'. So equivalence plays a central role in Catford's theory. The types of translation are defined 'in terms of the *extent, levels, and ranks of translation*' (p. 21).

The extent of translation is full or partial. In a full translation 'the entire text is submitted to the translation process', whereas in partial translation 'some parts of the SL text are left untranslated' (Catford 1965: 21; cf. Vinay and Darbelnet's notion of borrowing, section 4.2 above).

The level of translation can be total or restricted. Translation is normally 'total': 'translation in which all levels of the SL text are replaced by TL material' (Catford 1965: 22), whereas in restricted translation, replacement of SL textual material by equivalent TL textual material is carried out at only one linguistic level. For example, Catford views speaking with a foreign accent as a form of translation at the level of phonology alone (p. 23).

The rank of translation is related to the linguistic ranks identified earlier. In long texts,

the ranks at which translation equivalence occurs are constantly changing: at one point, the equivalence is sentence-to-sentence at another, group-to-group, at another word-to-word, etc., not to mention formally 'shifted' or 'skewed' equivalences. (p. 24)

This 'unbounded translation', in which equivalences shift freely up and down the rank-scale, is opposed to rank-bound translation, in which equivalents are deliberately confined to one rank only, as when for example a word-for-word translation of an ST is used to show how the source language text is composed.

There are two main kinds of shifted equivalences. Level shifts occur between the levels of grammar and lexis, as when for example an English deictic term 'This' in e.g. 'This text is intended for...' is rendered by the French article + lexical adjective *Le présent* in *Le présent manuel s'adresse à...* (Catford 1965: 75). Category shifts occur when a unit at one rank in one language is rendered in the other language by a unit at another rank, or when there are differences of structure, class, or terms in systems between an ST and a TT item. The idea of shifts implies, as Catford points out, the notion of formal correspondence, since without it, there would be nothing to shift from; however, formal correspondence does not constitute translation equivalence, as we can see from the fact that it is necessary to depart from it to obtain translation equivalence—which, as we saw above, is definitional of translation in this theory, as it is in Toury's theory (1980b), which derived in part from Catford's.

Catford begins his discussion of translation equivalence by defining a textual translation equivalent as (1965: 27) 'any TL form (text or portion of text) which is

observed to be the equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of text)'. What makes it able to function thus is the relationship between it and the SL form on the one hand, and the contexts in which both can be used on the other (p. 49, italics original):

SL and TL texts or items are translation equivalents when they are *interchangeable in a given situation*. This is why translation equivalence can nearly always be established at sentence-rank—the sentence is the grammatical unit most directly related to speech-function within a situation.

The quality of a translation is therefore related to the number of situational features that the source text relates to, that the translation also relates to, and (p. 94) 'Translation fails—or untranslatability occurs—when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the TL text.' This may happen if a formal feature of the SL is functionally relevant in ST but no corresponding feature of the TL is able to fulfil the same function in the TT (linguistic untranslatability), as in the case of puns that rely on either structural or lexical ambiguity. Or it may happen 'when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely *absent* from the culture of which the TL is a part' (p. 99; italics original). This may seem to be a different kind of untranslatability, cultural untranslatability, but Catford insists that this is reducible to collocational difficulties, that is, to linguistic untranslatability. For example, English and American society does not have as a common, indigenous phenomenon the sauna, so common in Finland, and we are prone, therefore, to borrow the term *sauna* when translating, in preference to producing such unlikely collocations as exemplified in the following imaginary translation from Finnish into English (p. 102): 'They lay on the hot upper benches of the *bathroom* inhaling the aromatic scent of the birch twigs.' Catford suggests that we can describe the effect of such a sentence as collocational shock rather than as cultural shock, thus demonstrating his commitment to linguistic explanations for all types of translational phenomena.

4.4 NIDA'S GENERATIVE 'DYNAMIC' APPROACH

Although, as we saw above (section 4.2), Vinay and Darbelnet make reference to the psychology of language users and to translators' thought processes in their exposition of a theory of translation, it is in Nida's (1964b) work on Bible translation that language users and their concerns are placed at the theoretical centre. Nida pays homage not only to linguistics in his account of translational phenomena, but also to anthropology, psychology, psychiatry, philology, and biblical hermeneutics.

Nevertheless, what he terms the 'fundamental thrust' of his book is linguistic, as he says that (1964b: 8) 'it must be in any descriptive analysis of the relationship between corresponding messages in different languages'. Nida, then, shares a contrastive emphasis with Vinay and Darbelnet, even though the linguistic theory on which he draws, Chomsky's (1957) early generative grammar, is about as far removed from contrastive linguistics, and from the notion of description, as it is possible to be. The reason Nida selects this theory is that (Nida 1964b: 60):

A generative grammar is based upon certain fundamental kernel sentences, out of which the language builds up its elaborate structure by various techniques of permutation, replacement, addition, and deletion. For the translator especially, the view of language as a generative device is important, since it provides him first with a technique for analyzing the process of decoding the source text, and secondly with a procedure for describing the generation of the appropriate corresponding expressions in the receptor language.

The kernel constructions in different languages are 'not identical', but far more similar than 'the more elaborate transforms' (1964b: 66), and they function for Nida as the stable point behind cross-linguistic variance, rather like formal correspondents do for Catford (see section 4.3 above).

Chomsky's early work famously refrains from dealing with meaning at any length, so Nida is moved to avail himself, in addition, of Katz and Fodor's essentially componential work on semantics (1963a, 1963b), developed to supplement Chomsky's grammar. This is convenient for a translation theorist, since the components that make up the meanings of individual, language-specific terms are considered to be language-independent in Katz and Fodor's theory. Like kernel sentences at the syntactic level, therefore, components can be invoked as the common semantic coin shared between apparently disparate lexical items in different languages (see Nida 1964b: 82–7). However, Nida points out (1964b: 120):

Language consists of more than the meanings of the symbols and the combination of symbols; it is essentially a code [...] functioning for a specific purpose or purposes [cf. Chapter 1 on *functional approaches to translation*]. Thus we must analyze the transmission of a message in terms of a dynamic dimension. This analysis is especially important for translating, since the production of equivalent messages is a process [...] of reproducing the total dynamic character of the communication.

Any act of communication includes five 'phases', which Nida develops on the basis of Jakobson's (1960) list of the factors involved in verbal communication: (1) the subject matter, (2) the participants, (3) the linguistic act, (4) the code used, and (5) the message. The participants and the message are especially important, since the many different types of translation that exist 'can generally be accounted for by three basic factors in translating: (1) the nature of the message, (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and (3) the type of audience' (1964b: 156).

If the form and content of the message are especially important, a translator may produce a formal-equivalence translation, whereas if it is particularly important

that the audience for the translation react to it in the same way that the original audience reacted to the original text, then a translator may produce a dynamic-equivalence translation. In Bible translation, it is possible to live with the otherwise problematic nature of the so-called 'principle of equivalent effect', which Nida imports from Rieu and Phillips (1954) and which underlies the notion of dynamic equivalence, because of the idea that some kinds of message are 'universal' (Nida 1964b: 182–3):

In a F-E translation, the comprehension of intent must be judged essentially in terms of the context in which the communication was first uttered; in a D-E translation this intent must be understood in terms of the receptor culture. The extent to which intent can be interpreted in a cultural context other than the one in which the message was first given is directly proportional to the universality of the message.

4.5 BELL'S PSYCHOLINGUISTIC APPROACH

A number of scholars have set out to model the translation process by way of empirical investigations of those mental activities that translators are able to self-report either during or soon after translating, and many have formulated the results of their investigations using linguistic concepts and notions (see Chapter 9). What distinguishes Roger Bell's approach from the work discussed in Chapter 9 is that it attempts on the one hand to draw on psycholinguistic research to model those parts of the translating process that translators would be unable to introspect about, while also locating itself firmly 'within a Systemic model of language' (Bell 1991: xvi)—a slightly later version of the model that inspired Catford, in concert with whom Bell also positions the theory of translation within applied linguistics 'broadly defined'. In addition, the book constitutes an attempt to gain an understanding of translation competence, aiming 'to outline the kinds of knowledge and skill which we believe must underlie the practical abilities of the translator' (Bell 1991: xvi; see also pp. xviii and 35–6). These include a knowledge base consisting of (contrastive) knowledge of the languages involved and of text types and subject domains in each, an inference mechanism which permits decoding and encoding of texts (1991: 40), and general communicative competence in the languages and cultures involved.

Like Nida, Bell understands the translator's task to be to decode messages transmitted in one language and recode them in another (Bell 1991: 15), and the question he seeks to answer is: 'how does the translator move from one language to the other in the course of translation?' (p. 17). To answer this question, Bell believes he needs recourse both to psycholinguistics and to text- and sociolinguistics,

because, while psycholinguistics can help model the processes involved in decoding and encoding the messages, text- and sociolinguistics are needed to model the practices which inform users' selections among the many options for expression offered by the linguistic code (pp. 19–20).

Bell develops a model of the translation process based on work by Harris and Coltheart (1986), Nirenburg (1987), Sperber and Wilson (1986), and Steinberg (1982), which depicts the process whereby a source text is read. A visual word-recognition system converts a graphic stimulus into a string of discrete symbols, which can be recognized and coded as the distinctive features of letters, which form words, which form clauses (etc.), which are the input to a syntactic analyser, a semantic analyser, and a pragmatic analyser, which produce a semantic representation, which in its turn is encoded in the other language using the components of the model in reverse order to produce a TL text (I have simplified the description of the visual model considerably here. For full details see Bell 1991: ch. 2). As a model of translation this is rather disappointing, because however detailed the model is for the processes of reading and composing messages, its only indication of the actual translation process, of moving between the languages, is a box with 'Translate?' written in it. This is hardly illuminating as far as modelling goes. Several sections of the chapter are devoted to 'a record of the procedure used in moving from source to target language text, by one translator' (1991: 61) who is translating a poem from French into English; but this lengthy description of tidied-up and heavily linguistically theorized and formulated introspection provides none of the more finely discriminated detail that would be welcome within the 'Translate?' box. The remainder of the book gives thorough accounts of aspects of linguistics and human information-processing, but not of translation.

4.6 HALVERSON'S COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC APPROACH

In a number of papers (see e.g. Halverson 2003, 2007, 2010), Sandra Halverson outlines a cognitive linguistic approach to translation, and applies it to specific translational phenomena such as translation universals (2003) and translation shifts (2007). In Halverson (2010) the approach is referred to as 'Cognitive Translation Studies', implying a more encompassing approach; however, Halverson considers it obvious that 'a cognitive theory of translation must build on cognitive theories of language' (2010: 6), so there remains a foundation in linguistics in the later work, which is obviously not negated by the fact that Halverson insists that

'a cognitive theory of translation must integrate a cognitive theory of bilingualism' (2010: 7) as well.

The cognitive linguistic theory underlying Halverson's work is that developed primarily by Langacker (1987, 1991, 1999), which 'provides an account of how broad and general cognitive processes are reflected in human language' (Halverson 2003: 198). Like Halliday, and in sharp contrast to generativists, Langacker believes that grammar, as well as lexis, is meaningful, and that the same cognitive structures and processes underlie both of these aspects of language. Furthermore, he considers the cognitive structures and processes that underlie language to be integrated with other cognitive abilities such as perception, memory, and reasoning (see Dirven 2010: 61), in contrast to generative linguists such as Fodor (1983), who consider the language faculty to be isolated from other mental faculties. Therefore, the basic domains of human experience, and general human cognitive abilities to compare, categorize, abstract, schematize, focus attention, and distinguish figures from grounds (cf. Talmy 1978; 1988) can all be drawn on during the processing of linguistic events (see Halverson 1993: 200).

According to Langacker (1987: 100; Halverson 2003: 199), cognitive events, whether linguistic or not, leave neurochemical traces in the brain which decay if the event is not repeated, but which facilitate recurrence of events of that type. If events of the type in question recur regularly, they become entrenched, and 'An event type is said to have *unit status* when it is sufficiently well entrenched that it is easily evoked as an integrated whole, i.e. when it constitutes an established *routine* that can be carried out more or less automatically once it is initiated' (italics original). The execution of the event is called its activation. As Halverson points out (2003: 200), 'We might conjecture that this same process will pertain to translation events.'

The model shares its notion of activation with work on language representation in the bilingual brain (de Groot 1992), on which Halverson (1993: 210–13) also draws, assuming (p. 215) 'that bilinguals have one knowledge store, with various access routes, either via L1 or L2, although:

there may be particular conceptual configurations, or patterns of activation, in networks of meaning that are linked only to phonological representations in one of the two languages, though these may ultimately, in different configurations and through different, less direct routes, be linked to phonological representations in the other language. (p. 215)

Patterns of spreading activation form schematic networks that contain more or less salient nodes, and (Halverson 1993: 218):

in a translation task, a semantic network is activated by lexical and grammatical structures in the ST. Within this activated network, which also includes nodes for TL words and grammatical structures, highly salient structures will exert a gravitational pull, resulting in overrepresentation in translation of the specific TL lexical and grammatical structures that correspond to those salient nodes and configurations in the schematic network.

This notion is called 'the gravitational pull hypothesis' (see Halverson 2010: 4), and it is complemented by the notions of "non-overlap" or "distance" between concepts activated in the bilingual translator's semantic networks, which account for patterns of underrepresentation of structures in translated texts vis-à-vis non-translated texts. In the 2007 paper, Halverson relates types of translation shift other than Catford's (see section 4.3 above) to the construal operations identified by Croft and Cruse (2004), and illustrates her argument with examples drawn from the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC). Halverson (2010) employs the theory of bilingualism developed by Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), which operates with three levels of representation of language: lexeme (word form), lemma (lexical information), and concept (knowledge about the world) (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008: 82), in the hope that this three-level representational system will allow for 'the separation of the representational characteristics that may account for the various patterns of translational over- or underrepresentation attested in the translation studies literature' (Halverson 2010: 23). For more on these patterns, see Chapter 6.

4.7 GUTT'S RELEVANCE THEORETIC APPROACH

Gutt introduces his research to the translation studies community with the startling announcement that '*the phenomenon commonly referred to as "translation" can be accounted for naturally within the relevance theory of communication developed by Sperber and Wilson: there is no need for a distinct general theory of translation*' (Gutt 1990, abstract: 135, italics original). He is thus the most radical of our approachers: his approach obliterates the phenomenon approached as a phenomenon separate from the approach itself.

Relevance theory was developed against the background of Grice's important work on conversation (1975). Here (p. 45), Grice identifies a principle he calls the Cooperative Principle: 'Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged', and a number of maxims that facilitate adherence to that principle:

I: Maxims of quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

II: Maxims of quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

III: Maxim of relation: Be relevant.

IV: Maxims of manner: Be perspicuous.

1. Avoid obscurity.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
4. Be orderly.

And there may be others.

These maxims are to be understood as the unwritten background assumptions which shore up conversation. If they are perceived to be not adhered to at the same time as it is clear that the Cooperative Principle itself is in play, interactants supply whatever extra information is required to reinstate a given maxim. This system is intended to account for speakers' abilities to use and understand figurative language, understatement, overstatement, irony, sarcasm, discrepancies between speech function and grammatical mood (as when an interrogative such as 'can you pass the salt' is used to make a request)—in fact all manner of indirect language use. It is Sperber and Wilson's contention that a principle of relevance alone will serve this important purpose.

In their cognitively oriented account of communication, relevance is understood as an innate focusing mechanism of the human cognitive system. It is defined in terms of achievement of 'the greatest possible cognitive effect for the smallest possible processing effort' (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995: vii), and any attempt at communicating provides the intended hearer with a 'guarantee of relevance': that whatever the person who has engaged in the behaviour intends to get the other to know will be relevant to them (p. 50): 'It implies such a guarantee because humans automatically turn their attention to what seems most relevant to them.' This principle is sufficient grounds for the hearer to be able to work out what the intention behind the communicative behaviour is: it is the most relevant one to him/her.

What is relevant to a given person depends on their so-called 'cognitive environment', the set of assumptions that they are able to represent mentally (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995: 39). An assumption is composed of a set of concepts arranged in a semantic representation, and any linguistic stimulus a mind receives 'triggers an automatic process of decoding' (Sperber and Wilson 1987: 704), which is what produces the semantic representations in the shape of logical forms. The logical forms do not surface to consciousness, but act as assumption schemata which are made into propositional forms through inferential completion.

When an utterance does not share all of the logical properties of the thought it expresses, a hearer will have to work out its non-literal interpretation (in a literal utterance the thought and the utterance do share all their logical properties). The reason why some utterances do not share the logical properties of the thoughts expressed is that a speaker aiming for optimal relevance, as speakers should, will

always leave implicit everything a hearer can be trusted to supply with less effort than would be needed to process the information if it were made explicit (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995: 218).

Sperber and Wilson call literal (assertive) language use 'descriptive' and non-literal language use 'interpretive' (1986/1995: 228–9). But interpretive use also includes all instances of so-called 'non-assertive' language use, including speech and thought report and unattributed representation of assumptions; in fact, 'on a more fundamental level, *every* utterance is used to represent a thought of the speaker's' (1986/1995: 30; *italics original*) and is therefore interpretive. It is Gutt's (1990: 147) contention that 'since translations are also texts presented in virtue of their resemblance with an original, it seems they fall naturally under the category of interpretive use'.

However, translation involves communicating in two different languages, and since languages differ, the two texts involved cannot share all of their properties. But Gutt (1990: 150) insists that while languages differ 'in their concrete properties, they resemble each other with regard to the clues they are able to provide for the interpretation of an utterance'; he refers to these as 'communicative clues', and devotes some thirty pages to identifying and exemplifying types of communicative clues arising from semantic representations, syntactic properties, phonetic properties, semantic constraints on relevance, formulaic expressions, onomatopoeia, the stylistic value of words, and sound-based poetic properties (Gutt 1991: 129–59). The optimal or 'direct' translation would be the one that shared all of the source text's communicative clues. This raises the question of how we can know that interpretive clues in different languages are in fact identical. According to Gutt (1991: 162), we can know this 'by checking whether they give rise to the same interpretation when processed in the same context', and 'this, in turn means that the notion of direct translation is dependent on interpretive use: it relies, in effect, on a relationship of complete interpretive resemblance between the original and its translation.' And since 'both direct and indirect translation are instances of interlingual interpretive use [...] relevance theory offers a unified account of both' (Gutt 1991: 163). The question is whether important aspects of translation theory are not lost in the obliteration of it—a question which readers may determine the answer to for themselves by delving further into the present volume.

FURTHER READING AND RELEVANT SOURCES

The best way to learn more about the work of the authors described in this chapter is to read their work itself; Chesterman (1989) and Venuti (2000a) include extracts from Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995), Catford (1965), and Nida (1964b), but these

obviously provide only parts of the fuller picture of the authors' work. Readers wanting to make use of linguistic theories for themselves should explore the linguistic literature directly and there are numerous guides to the work of the linguists discussed in this chapter. See for example Chesterman (1998b) on contrastive analysis, Webster (2009) on the Hallidayan tradition, Radford (2004b) on the Chomskyan tradition, Croft and Cruse (2004) on cognitive linguistics, and Carston and Seiji (1998) on relevance theory. To explore the older theoretical standpoints, consider Halliday (1961) and Chomsky (1957). Contrastive analysis/stylistics is best approached by way of Vinay and Darbelnet's own work. Relevance theory is helpfully précised in the second chapter of Gutt (1991) and also by Sperber and Wilson themselves (1987).