Translation and Linguistics

PAN Hanting   ZHANG Meifang

Beijing Normal University   University of Macau

1.   Introduction

Ever since Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) published his seminal paper 'On linguistic aspects of translation' in 1959, linguistics has played a pivotal role in translation studies. Jakobson (1959) classified translation into three types according to the relationships between the source text and the target text: intralingual translation, interlingual translation and intersemiotic translation. Intralingual translation is akin to paraphrasing insofar as the language of the two texts is the same. Interlingual translation refers to translation between two different written language systems, which has been the major interest of Translation Studies. The issues of linguistic meaning and equivalence still remain core in linguistic approaches to translation studies including contrastive linguistics, computational linguistics, functional linguistics and discourse analytic approaches, whereas the more recent multimodal approach has aroused interests in intersemiotic translation.

2.   Translation and Early Modern Linguistics

In the mid-twentieth century, the development of modern linguistics entered a stage of 'expansion and diversification' (Howatt 2013: xxviii). In addition to the three mainstream approaches in linguistics, i.e., structuralism, functionalism and generativism, research on other subfields such as contrastive linguistics, computational linguistics, semantics, and pragmatics also became popular.

Given the complexity and breadth of linguistics and its long tradition of interplay with Translation Studies (TS), this chapter will probe the relationship between translation and linguistics, discuss the development of linguistic approaches to

translation since around 1960 and examine the relationship between linguistics and translation, as well as presenting suggestions about how the relationship might develop in the future. Our foci are: 1) The linguistic theories and concepts that have been applied to TS. 2) The way in which these linguistic theories and concepts have informed the development of translation studies. And 3) What the relationship between translation studies and linguistics might be in the future. To address these topics, we will make reference to a bibliometric survey by Zhang et al. (2015) on discourse analysis and translation and include more recent developments within linguistics that have been applied to translation research, in particular multimodal discourse analysis. In what follows, the interplay between translation and linguistics will be addressed in terms of the three stages, namely the engagement of early modern linguistics, the engagement of discourse analysis, and the engagement of multimodality theory in translation.

It is commonplace to trace the formation of modern European linguistics back to the structuralist account of language provided by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), although the work through which Saussure's linguistics is mainly known (Saussure 1916) was written by his colleagues at the University of Geneva, Charles Bally and Albert Séchehaye on the basis of Saussure's lectures and his students' notes on these. Saussure transformed 'philology' into 'linguistics', stressing the importance of the scientific study of language. Gradually, both linguists and translation scholars came to identify translation and translation studies as potential areas for the application of linguistic methodology. Key linguistic concepts and issues were borrowed to define translation, interpret translation activities and construct translation theories with the aim of establishing translation studies as a science. At this stage, two concepts played vital roles in the theory of translation. One was 'equivalence' and the other was 'meaning'.

2.1 Equivalence

Jakobson (1959) examines the key issues of linguistic meaning and equivalence in interlingual translation,. Jakobson follows Saussure's theory of language that distinguishes between the linguistic system (*langue*) and the instances of language in

use (*parole*). Central to the theory of *langue* is the relation between the 'signifier' (the spoken and written signal) and the 'signified' (the concept) which together creates the linguistic 'sign' that is arbitrary or unmotivated (Saussure 1916/1983: 67-69). Jakobson stresses that it is possible to understand what is signified by a word without actually seeing or experiencing the thing. In other words, it is possible for one to interpret the linguistic sign that belongs to a different linguistic system. Jakobson then moves on to discuss the issue of equivalence in meaning between words in different languages. In his view (Jakobson 1959: 233), 'on the level of interlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of alien code-units or messages'. Thus, translation 'from one language into another substitutes messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language' and therefore 'involves two equivalent messages in two different codes' (op. cit. 234). Jakobson further argues that 'equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics' and translating activities 'must be kept under constant scrutiny by linguistic science' (1959: 233). This strongly linguistic concept of equivalence was, as Hatim and Munday (2019: 123) comment 'to occupy translation theorists for several decades afterwards'. One of the prominent works on the question of equivalence in meaning that of Eugene Nida (1914-2011) who addressed the issue with a new 'scientific' approach.

Unlike Jakobson, whose background is in structuralism, Nida 'takes as his starting point Chomsky's more cognitivist, generative view of language' (Malmkjær 2005b: 9), in particular, he believes that Chomsky's work on syntactic structure, provides the translator with a technique for decoding the source text (ST) and a procedure for encoding the target text (TT) (Nida 1964: 60). His concern is to set out translation procedures and principles, particularly his 'principles of correspondence', and he posits 'two different types of equivalence', namely 'formal equivalence' and 'dynamic equivalence' (Nida 1964a; 159). According to Nida (1964: 165), a formal-equivalence translation is oriented towards the source text and 'designed to reveal as much as

possible of the form and content of the original message'.,The formal elements include: 1) grammatical units, 2) consistency in word usage, and 3) meanings in terms of the source context (ibid.). A dynamic-equivalence translation, on the other hand, is intended to provide the 'closest natural equivalent to the source-language message' (Nida 1964: 166). He further explains that the term, 'natural', points towards the receptor language, and a dynamic-equivalence translation 'is directed primarily towards equivalence of response rather than equivalence of form' (ibid.). However, both formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence present difficulties in practice. This is because formal equivalence is ideal but often not appropriate or not even achievable in actual situations of communication. On the other hand, the receptor response, which is the corner stone of 'dynamic equivalence', is subjective and hard to measure. In Nida's later work, he changed the controversial term 'dynamic equivalence' to 'functional equivalence' (Nida and Waard 1986), but the definition of the terms remains basically the same and the new term does not change his theory of translation equivalence.

Although Nida aligns himself with linguistics, his 'fundamental measure of translation equivalence is reader response' (Malmkjær 2005b: 9), whereas 'the most systematic attempt in English at the wholesale interpretation of translation theory in terms of a linguistic theory is probably that of John Catford (1917-2009) (ibid). Catford (1965) devotes a chapter to discussing translation equivalence, which he regards as an empirical phenomenon that can be discovered by a comparison between source language (SL) texts and target language (TL) texts with the assistance of a native speaker of the language of the translation (who also knows the language of the source text, of course). Catford (1965) proposes two types of equivalence between items of language, namely textual equivalence and formal correspondence. A textual equivalent is defined as 'any TL text or portion of text which is observed […] to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text' (Catford 1965: 27). A formal correspondent, on the other hand, 'is any TL category … which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the "same" place in the "economy" of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL' (ibid.). These definitions show that Catford attaches great importance to the 'form' and his theory of translation equivalence is rule-based. Following the discussion of two

types of equivalence, Catford (1965: 31) defines a 'translation rule' as 'an extrapolation of the probability values of textual translation equivalence' and suggests that translation rules may be operational instructions to be applied in machine translation, which he calls 'translation-algorithms'. Catford's theory of translation equivalence, particularly 'formal correspondence' is therefore of great interest to example and statistics-based machine translation and translation memory systems. However, the examples used by Catford to illustrate the two kinds of equivalence are decontextualized, which makes it difficult to apply his approach to communicative events that are context-dependent.

Unlike Catford whose focus is on the clause and sentence, the German linguist Otto Kade (1927-1980) seeks to establish types of equivalence relations at the lexical level, particularly in the area of terminology. Kade (1968) contends that total equivalence, i.e. 'where one SL unit exactly corresponds to one TL unit, and these units being interchangeable in any context' (Schäffner and Wiesemann 2001: 7) is only applicable to numbers, proper names and terminology. Other types of equivalence at the lexical level include diversification (one-to-many equivalence), neutralisation (many-to-one equivalence), approximative equivalence (one-to-part-of-one equivalence) and zero (or nil) equivalence. Kade notes the influence of context, stressing that different receivers of a text may respond differently to it and that the intention of the originator of the text is unlikely to match its effect completely (1968: 202).

Although the linguistic perspective on equivalence has made an important contribution to the scientification of translation studies, it has been criticized by adherents to 'the cultural school' of translation studies for presenting an 'illusion of symmetry' between languages (Snell-Hornby 1988: 22). In addition, Koller argues (1979/1992: 98, 233), from the perspective of the nature of translation, that translation activity is parole, language in use, and cannot be analyzed from the angle of langue, language as system (Saussure, 1916).

2.2 Meaning
Meaning is one of the key concepts in linguistics. The study and theory of meaning is

referred to as 'semantics', in the same way that the study and theory of language structure can be referred to as 'grammar' or 'syntax'. The original use of 'semantics' can be traced back to the French linguist Michel Bréal (1832-1915) who launched the word in an article in 1883 in an annual of a society for Greek studies and published the full book *Essai de Sémantique* in 1897 which was regarded as a landmark in language study, especially in the study of meaning (Read 1948: 79). In another influential work on the study of meaning, C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards (1923) prefer the term 'science of symbolism' over 'semantics' and regard the 'net result of Bréal's work as 'disappointing' owing to 'the constant resort to loose metaphor' and 'the hypostatization of leading terms' (2-3). Despite the disagreement, both Bréal (1897) and Ogden and Richards (1923) agree on the importance of meaning to the study of language and have influenced later works by e.g. Leech (1974) and Lyons (1977) to use the term 'Semantics' as their book title.

The issue of meaning is equally significant to translation studies. Like linguists (see Leech 1974: 9-12), translation scholars are interested in identifying various categories of meaning. Nida (1964: 57; 70), divides meaning into linguistic meaning (i.e., meanings of grammatical constructions), referential meaning (i.e., dictionary meanings), and emotive meaning (i.e., connotative meanings). Newmark (1981: 26-27), categorizes meaning as grammatical meaning which attaches to grammatical units such as a sentence, a clause or a word-group, and lexical meaning which 'starts where grammatical meaning finishes: it is referential and precise, and has to be considered both outside and within the context' . According to Nida (1982: 10-11), to translate is to translate meaning and a similar observation is made by Newmark, who says that 'the translation theorist is concerned from start to finish with meaning' (1981: 26).

Nida's theory of meaning is influenced by general linguistics, semantics and pragmatics. According to Nida (1964: 70), referential meaning refers 'primarily the cultural context identified in the utterance', while emotive meaning refers to 'the responses of the participants in the communicative act'. Referential meaning is also known as the dictionary meaning, i.e., the referents identified in terms of field or

context. Emotive meaning can be understood as native speakers' ''feeling' for the appropriateness of words in certain types of linguistic and cultural contexts' (ibid.). Nida's discussion of meaning, in particular referential meaning and emotive meaning provides the theoretical foundation for his distinction between 'dynamic equivalence' and 'formal equivalence', and makes 'response equivalence' one of the important indicators for measuring translation quality. In Nida's later work, he further specifies the scope of 'translating meaning': 'Translating meaning implies translating the total significance of a message in terms of both its lexical or propositional content and its rhetorical significance' (1982: 11). As a result, evaluating the adequacy of a translation requires a complete analysis of meaning, from the lexical level to the discourse level, of both the source text and the target text.

Catford (1965) also considers meaning an essential concept in a theory of translation. Following Firth (1957), Catford defines meaning as 'a property of a language', and 'the total network of relations entered into by any linguistic form' (1965: 35). The relations include formal relations and contextual relations. Formal relations are 'relations between one formal item and others in the same language', a variety of which constitute a form's formal meaning. Contextual relations are the relationships of grammatical or lexical items to linguistically relevant situational elements which constitute the contextual meaning of the relevant linguistic form (Catford 1965: 35-36). Based on this view, meanings of 'SL items and TL items can rarely be the same, and meaning transference from SL to TL is impossible' (op. cit. 36).

Larson (1984) agrees with Nida that translation is meaning-based. According to her (Larson 1984: 3), translation consists of transferring the meaning of the source language into the receptor language. In the process of translation, only the form changes while the meaning remains constant. In short, meaning has priority over form in translation.

2.3 Summary

From the above discussion we can see that early modern linguistics played an important part in the scientification of translation studies as a discipline. Key concepts such as

'equivalence' and 'meaning' are used to define translation and form the theoretical foundation of translation studies. In the linguistic approach to translation, keywords in linguistics including 'message', 'code' and 'form' are repeatedly mentioned. However, at the early stage of the encounter between linguistics and translation, the main research focus remained below the clausal level and was limited to words and sentences. The situation changed as linguistics developed into a new stage, in particular, with the emergence and popularization of discourse analysis.

3.   Translation and Discourse Analysis

Around the 1970s, a new focus of linguistic research emerged, which has come to be known as discourse analysis (DA). There are two main conceptions of this new object of study. One takes a more linguistic view and sees discourse as 'the layer of meaning which is tied to situations of language use and located beyond the structural and semantic affordances of a language system' (Slembrouck 2013: 135). Representative proponents of this view include Michael Halliday (1925-2018), Ruqaiya Hasan (1931-2015) and Michael Hoey. Another views language use, 'often in combination with other forms of semiotic behaviour', from the perspective of 'social practice' in context (ibid.). A prime example of this direction is Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g., Fairclough 1992a; Wodak 1996) which aims to relate situated language use, power and ideology (ibid.). Despite the different emphasis, the two directions arrive at the same focus on 'language use' and 'social context'.

In 1990, Hatim and Mason published their book *Discourse and The Translator*, which has been considered the first influential endeavor to articulate the discourse perspective in translation. Since then, discourse analysis has been gaining increasing attention in translation studies. Key concepts in discourse analysis such as 'context', 'function' and 'communication' have been introduced to translation studies and integrated into the TS theoretical system.

3.1 Context

The influence on meaning of context was highlighted by the anthropologist Bronislaw

Malinowski (1884-1942) who referred to the context of text production and reception as 'context of situation' and the socio-cultural background of the speaker as 'context of culture'(1923). According to Malinowski (ibid.), context is key to the interpretation of a message. Against this background, J. R. Firth (1890-1960), the first professor of linguistics in Britain and the originator of the so-called London School of Linguistics, developed the concept of meaning as 'function in context' (1957), which became a central influence on the systemic functional linguistics (SFL) developed by Michael Halliday, which relates language form and language function to context from a socio-cultural perspective.

In the linguistic turn of TS, 'context' also plays an essential role in broadening the research territory of the linguistic approach to TS. For example, on the basis of SFL, Hatim and Mason (1990) map the 'three dimensions of context', namely communicative transaction, pragmatic action and semiotic interaction, and suggest potential areas for investigation along with the three dimensions (1990: 58). Communicative transaction concerns the context of situation, which is mainly presented by user and use analysis, including the analysis of idiolect, dialect and register. Register covers the three aspects of discourse: field, tenor and mode. Pragmatic action includes speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, and text acts. Semiotic interaction treats linguistic recourses such as word, text, discourse and genre as signs. Hatim and Mason also take into account the context of culture that is beyond textual analysis and leads to the discussion of culture, ideology and power.

House's influential work on Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) (1997, 2015) falls into the dimension of communicative transaction as the model adopts register analysis as its core analytical part. In this model, the scholar analyzes and compares the register of the source text and the target text and arrives at a translation quality report based on the results of the comparison. The design of House's TQA model is influenced by the Hallidayan model of language which 'sees meaning in the writer's linguistic choices and, through a detailed grammar, systematically relates these choices to the text's function in a wider sociocultural framework' (Munday 2016: 143). In Halliday's model, the linguistic choices (i.e., lexicogrammar), the aims of the

communication (i.e., genre) and the sociocultural framework (i.e., context) interact, and the direction of influence is illustrated by Munday with an inverted pyramid (see Figure 6.1 in Munday 2016: 143): On the top of the pyramid is the sociocultural environment (or context), which partially conditions the genre 'understood in SFL as the conventional text type that is associated with a specific communicative function' and through the conditioning of genre determines register which we have explained in the previous paragraph. The variables of register (i.e., field, tenor and mode) are associated with the three strands of meaning (or 'discourse semantics', i.e., ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning) which are formed by the choices of lexicogrammar (at the bottom of the inverted pyramid) in the text. House's model largely follows the hierarchy of the Hallidayan model and incorporates register analysis as the main body of the framework. With the purpose of assessing translation quality, the analytical procedure is as follows: (1) Producing the source text (ST) Register profiling; (2) Adding ST genre description; (3) Making a 'statement of function' for the ST; (4) Undertaking the same descriptive process on the target text (TT); (5) Comparing the TT profile with the ST profile; (6) Making 'a statement of quality'; and (7) Categorizing the translation into 'overt translation' or 'covert translation' (House 2015). In addition, House uses the term 'individual textual function', indicating the production of a 'statement of function' for ST and TT respectively. This 'textual function' in fact falls within the scope of 'context', which conditions or influences the production of ST and TT and can partly explain the differences between them, which is an important consideration for translation quality assessment.

The dimension of pragmatic action is rooted in pragmatics, 'the study of the relations between language and its context of utterance' (Hatim and Mason 1990: 59). The introduction of pragmatics to TS offers a selection of analytical tools for conducting textual analysis on translated works and helps the translator to remain aware of the intended purposes of a communication act and to foresee possible responses by the target audience. Scholars who work with this dimension usually focus on the process of contextualization and recontextualization in translation (see Baker 2006; House 2006). For instance, House (2006) reexamines the relationship between text and context

and argues that a theory of translation as recontextualization can be defined as 'taking a text out of its original frame and context and placing it within a new set of relationships and culturally-conditioned expectations' (2006: 356).

The dimension of semiotic interaction is based on semiotic theory. Hatim and Mason argue that the primary task of translation is to deal with signs and to preserve semiotic, as well as other pragmatic and communicative properties which signs display (Hatim and Mason 1990: 69). Word, text, discourse and genre are all signs. The exchanges between signs are constrained by 'the interplay between values yielded by a given field of discourse and the pragmatic action intended'. Hatim and Mason describe the process of inter-semiotic transfer with an illustration of the hierarchical relationship between text, discourse and genre, in which social occasions at the top of the hierarchy are reflected in genre that is expressed in discourse realized in text (1990: 69-74). This hierarchical relationship is also articulated in the Hallidayan model we introduced in the previous paragraph. The Hallidayan model is known for taking the socio-semiotic approach to language study and adopted by a number of translation scholars as a discourse analytical tool in their studies with a focus on a variety of topic areas such as textual scale and translation units, cohesion in translation, thematic and information structure in translation, transitivity in translation, modality in translation, intertextuality, as well as appraisal and translator attitudes. (Zhang, et. al 2015) Textual scale includes a hierarchy of grammatical units including word, clause, sentence, and text, which can be discussed in relation to the appropriate selection of translation units (e.g., Zhu 2004). Cohesion is created by the linguistic devices by which the speaker can signal the experiential and interpersonal coherence of the text. (Thompson 2004: 179) It is important to the text organization and therefore discussed by translation scholars. For instance, Baker (1992: 180-215) devotes a chapter to explaining how cohesion works in translation through a set of cohesive devices which include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Thematic and information structure in translation also concerns text organization. Thematic structure includes two segments of a clause, i.e., Theme and Rheme, while information structure includes two segments of a message, i.e., given and new. Both thematic structure and information structure are

features of the context. They are different in that thematic structure is speaker-oriented while information structure is hearer-oriented. (Baker 1992: 119-159) In thematic structure, Theme is the 'point of departure of the message' or 'that which locates and orients the clause within its context' (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 64). In information structure, the given segment conveys information which the speaker regards as already known to the hearer and the new segment conveys information that the speaker wishes to convey to the hearer (Baker 1992: 144-145). Transitivity theory is often applied to the investigation of translational shifts. For instance, Calzada Pérez (2001) studies transitivity shifts in translation and their connection to ideological issues. Intertextuality is 'the way we relate textual occurrences to each other and recognize them as signs which evoke whole areas of our previous textual experience', through which 'texts are recognized in terms of their dependence on other relevant texts' (Hatim and Mason 1990: 120). It can be applied to explaining the relationship between the source text and the target text (e.g., Farahzad 2009). The topic of appraisal and the translator's attitudes then concerns the interpersonal relationship in translation. Appraisal theory was developed by Martin and White (2005), based on the interpersonal function of the Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics, for the analysis of evaluation in predominantly educational and journalistic texts in English and has been used in translation research for identifying 'critical points' of translator intervention and shift of values in the target text (Munday 2018: 305).

Although different topic areas may focus on different linguistic aspects in translation, the discussion in the end cannot avoid including reference to the socio-cultural context. Studying translation in context then becomes an important research paradigm of the discourse analytical approach to translation studies.

3.2 Function and communication

The concepts of 'function' and 'communication' are indispensable to each other in discourse analysis in that DA views language use as communication and aims to study language in use in relation to language functions and contexts. The earliest systematic thinking about 'language function' can be traced back to Karl Bühler (1879-1963), who

belonged to the Prague Circle that inherited Saussurean structuralism. According to Bühler (1934), the function of language is threefold: The relation between the sign (i.e., language) and the world (i.e., context) points to the 'representational' or 'informative' function of language; the relation between the sign and the speaker points to the 'expressive' function of language; and the relation between the sign and the hearer points to the 'appellative' function of language. Bühler's tripartite division of language functions later influenced both Jakobson and Halliday and further influenced a group of TS scholars taking functional approaches to translation studies.

Capturing the essence of Bühler's categorization, Halliday (1973) proposes the three language metafunctions, the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual, which are realized by the lexicogrammar in the text. For example, the ideational function can be manifested by transitivity, the interpersonal function by mood and modality, and the textual function by thematic structure and cohesion. The lexicogrammar forms the basis of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), which sees meaning in the writer's linguistic choices and systematically relates these choices to a wider sociocultural framework. The three language metafunctions can be illustrated by the three basic questions that we can ask about language: 1) What is said? 2) What are the relationships between the speakers? And 3) How to form one's expression? The three questions can be instantiated in translation as follows: 1) What is translated? 2) What are the relationships between the author, the translator and the receiver? 3) How to translate? Each question can be answered through the analysis of the lexicogrammar in relation to the respective metafunction. Hallidayan functionalism in TS is represented by a number of scholars such as Mona Baker, Basil Hatim, Roger T. Bell, Juliane House and Jeremy Munday. For instance, House (1997) applies register analysis in her translation quality assessment model; Bell (1991) applies discourse semantics to analyze the elements in the communication process of translation; Baker (1992/2011) applies thematic structure and cohesion theory to guide the translator through the process of textual organization; Munday (2012) applies the interpersonal function, in particular in appraisal theory to uncover 'critical points' of the translator's decision-making.

More recent work taking the Hallidayan functional approach also pays attention to

ideology and power as advocated by scholars engaged in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The CDA model, in particular Fairclough's three-dimensional model (1992, 1995, 2001) is based on the power of description and explanation of SFL and shares its basic assumptions about textual functions with SFL. With reference to the CDA framework, Calzada Pérez (2001) proposes a threefold analytical methodology consisting of description, ideological explanation, and perlocutionary exploration of texts. She analyses European Parliament speech translations and focuses on transitivity shifts and their connection to ideological issues. Munday (2007) investigates the ideology of individual translators and examines what is meant by 'ideology' and how it is treated in translation studies, where it has primarily been linked to manipulation and power relations. Valdeón (2005, 2008) in particular applies Fairclough's three-dimensional model to investigate the ideology of the BBC Spanish service. The theoretical model is also borrowed and adapted in the study of institutional discourse translation (Zhang and Pan 2015) and gaming discourse translation (Pan and Zhang 2016).

Another influential application of Bühler's categorization of language functions to TS is the German Functionalism pioneered by Katharina Reiss (1923-2018), who proposed three major text types in relation to Bühler's three language functions, i.e., 'informative texts', 'expressive texts' and 'operative texts'. She tried to establish a correlation between text type and translation method for the purpose of working out a scientific and systematic translation assessment model based on the functional relationship between the source text and the target text (Reiss 1977/1989). Reiss's text typology was developed by Christiane Nord who further classified Reiss's 'operative text' (in Nord's term 'appellative text') into three sub-types, namely 'direct appellative', 'indirect appellative' and 'poetic appellative' texts (Nord 1997/2001: 42-43). Nord also proposed a translation-oriented text analysis model highlighting the text function and communicative purpose in the context of the target language (Nord 1997). Her text analysis model aims to provide translation students with a model of ST analysis that is applicable to all text types and translation situations. The model is based on a functional concept to 'enable translators to understand the function of elements or features

observed in the content and structure of the source text', and to 'choose the translation strategies suitable for the intended purpose of the particular translation they are working on' (Nord 2005:1).

Although the concept of 'function' of the German school of functionalism and that of Halliday's systemic functional linguistics may come from the same source, namely Bühler's tripartite division of language functions, there are some differences between them. One major difference is that in the functionalist approaches that have been developed with an orientation toward translator training, the application of the functional concepts 'set out from the hypothesis that the decisive factor in translation was the dominant communicative function of the source text' (Nord 1997/2001: 39). In contrast, the Hallidayan model of discourse analysis, is geared to the study of language in communication, and it 'sees meaning in the writer's linguistic choices and systematically relates these choices to a wider sociocultural framework' (Munday 2012: 137). Despite the differences, the Hallidayan functional framework and German Functionalism share some basic assumptions, including viewing language as a means of communication, emphasizing socio-cultural and physiological factors, and regarding semantic, pragmatic, and functional patterning as central, as well as analyzing texts in relation to their contexts. In a word, the introduction of 'function' and 'communication' to TS has revolutionized our understanding of translation and extensively enlarged the research scope of translation studies.

3.3 Summary

Unlike the stage of borrowing modern linguistic theories to build TS into a scientific and independent discipline, the encounter of translation studies with discourse analysis invites more diverse perspectives on translation research and is more concerned with the relationship between the translated text and the socio-cultural context that conditions its production and reception. Key concepts in DA such as 'context', 'function' and 'communication' have been introduced to TS and included in definitions

of translation. Both DA and TS are by nature interdisciplinary and therefore continue to absorb new insights from recent developments in other disciplines. With the advent of the digital era, discourse analytical approaches to translation studies have moved towards a multimodal stage.

4. Translation and Multimodality

Multimodality, as the name suggests, focuses on communication involving more than one mode. In Zhang et al. (2015), multimodality is placed in the dimension of semiotic interaction in Hatim and Mason's (1990) map of context. Within the framework of DA, multimodality or multimodal discourse analysis originates in the 1980s when Multimodal Social Semiotics (MSS) emerged as a branch of semiotics that sought 'to understand how people communicate in specific social settings.' (Boria and Tomalin 2020: 12) An influential theory of multimodality, MSS is rooted in the work of Michael Halliday, in particular in his monographs *Language as Social Semiotic* (1978) and *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1985). According to Halliday, language should be interpreted 'within a sociocultural context, in which the culture itself is interpreted in semiotic terms' (1978: 2). This observation echoes Jakobson's (1959) definition of intersemiotic translation in which verbal signs are interpreted by means of nonverbal signs, so the tripart categorization of translation by Jakobson can be considered an early attempt to conceptualize translation in multimodal terms.

Following Jakobson's 'intersemiotic translation', Toury (1986: 1128) expands the concept of translation to include the transfer between non-verbal signs that belong to different semiotic systems. He differentiates between two types of translation, namely intrasemiotic translation and intersemiotic translation. Intrasemiotic translation is further divided into 'intrasystemic translation' corresponding to Jakobson's 'intralingual translation' and 'intersystemic translation' corresponding to Jakobson's 'interlingual translation'. Given that Jakobson did not further elaborate on the transfer from nonverbal signs to verbal signs, Gorlée (2010: 58) suggests that the categorization of translation should take into consideration the concept of multimodality. Kaindl (2013: 261) therefore proposes a more detailed model of translation categorization based on

the concepts of mode, media and culture. In this model, Kaindl differentiates between 'intramodal translation' and 'intermodal translation' and between 'intramedia translation' and 'intermedia translation'. These sets of classification can be further differentiated as either 'intracultural' or 'transcultural'. In Kaindl's model, 'mode' and 'media' are different but overlapping categories. Mode can be realized by the medium, e.g., language becomes written words through the medium of writing, and becomes sound through the medium of speech. In translation, both 'mode' and 'media' should be taken into consideration. Kaindl's categorization of translation thus expands Jakobson's triparty categorization and contributes to a more accurate positioning of some translation phenomena that used to be difficult to define. In this view, translation is no longer only a textual activity. Instead, it is an act of communication involving mode, media and culture, or in Kress and van Leeuwen's terms 'transcultural multimodal communication' (2001). As Kress and van Leeuwen (2001: 21) argue, multimodal interaction has always been the 'normal state of human communication', and this is one of the underlying convictions that has guided MSS research from the very beginning (Boria and Tomalin 2020: 13). Reynolds (2020) further claims that language itself is, and has always been inherently multimodal, and that, 'therefore, even "language-centred" translation practices need to engage with, and account for, the multimodal dimension' (Boria and Tomalin 2020: 199). In other words, the concept of translation needs to be informed by a theory of multimodality.

Paralleling its engagement with the conceptualization and categorization of translation, multimodality was also introduced to translation studies as a methodological tool to analyze translations of particular text types, such as audiovisual translations, advertising translations, game translations, webpage translations, and picture book translations. Among the aforementioned text types, audiovisual translation has been discussed most extensively since the 1990s. It could be considered as the first subfield in translation studies to engage with multimodality and it emerged as the primary focus for multimodal studies of translation (Diaz Cintas 2009: 3). Currently, the research field of audiovisual translation has expanded to include all forms of translation that use any media (or format) to edit programmes, including subtitling,

dubbing, interpreting, revoicing, simultaneous interpreting, living subtitles, surtitling for opera and theatre, and so on (Orero 2004: vii-viii). The field also includes research topics such as subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing and audio description for the blind and partially sighted. The influence of audiovisual translation is so profound that it is easy to form the impression that multimodality only refers to audiovisual phenomena, whereas in fact, audiovisual translation constitutes merely a single manifestation of multimodality in translation (Boria and Tomalin 2020: 5). Apart from audiovisual translation, advertising translation also requires visual analysis and has been an important point of engagement with multimodal theories, e.g., when visual grammar is applied to analyze TV advertisement (Millán-Varela 2004). Interpreting, a traditional field in TS, also resorts to multimodal theories to deal with nonverbal elements such as facial expression and gestures that might affect the communication process (see Rennert 2008). New text types such as game translation (e.g., O'Hagan 2007) and experimental literary translation (e.g., Lee 2012) which emerged alongside the development of multimodality have also received theoretical support from insights derived from studies of multimodality. As fewer and fewer texts are monomodal in the digital era, multimodality related concerns can be expected to be of interest in an increasing number of translation studies subfields.

In sum, translation studies engages with multimodality in two major ways. One is in conceptualizing translation studies with insights from theories of multimodality, including using the concept of 'multimodality' in the definition and categorization of translation. Another is using theories of multimodality in the analysis of translations, including translations of multimodal text types. The introduction of the concept of multimodality to TS has influenced our understanding of translation and widened the scope of translation studies considerably.

5.   Future Developments

The above review of major developments in linguistic approaches to translation studies evidences the continuous expansion of the research field. It is conceivable that in years to come linguistics will continue to play an important role not only in descriptive

translation studies, but also in applied translation studies. Figure 1 suggests some potential future research themes and subthemes in translation studies.

Figure 1. Categorization of research in discourse analysis in translation studies

This categorization which is based on Hatim and Mason's 'three dimensions of context' (1990:58), not only suggests a three-level categorization of subthemes within the discourse analytical approach to translation studies, but also expands it to include the extralinguistic context of culture and specific themes or sub-themes, such as power and ideology, which were rarely included in the linguistic approaches. Also worthy of note are new themes, or an old concept if we recall Jakobson's (1959) categorization of 'intersemiotic translation', that have received increasing attention in translation studies: semiotics. According to Malmkjær (2010: 477), semiotics, which 'derived from Ferdinand de Saussure's coinage of sémiologie', 'is most often loosely defined as "the study of signs" or "the theory of signs"' and a sign 'is a meaningful unit which is interpreted by sign-users as "standing for" something other than itself'. Nowadays, the semiotic features in paratexts, digitial media and other types of texts, are likely to continue to interest researchers for many years to come because human communication is conducted through signs and sign systems.

Possible developments in translation studies in the coming decades are likely to include the following. First, with the increasing demand of corpus-based studies to make translation research more empirically grounded, the most traditional sector of linguistics, namely contrastive linguistics, is likely to continue to offer useful theoretical insights and methods for building corpora and for quantitative research. Second, textual analysis is likely to continue to capture the attention of translation researchers. As argued by Malmkjær (2003; 2004), without close attention to the language of texts and their translations, a translational stylistics cannot exist. Malmkjær also suggests that 'after decades devoted to examining translational phenomena from the points of view of a number of "studies" (e.g. cultural; post-colonial; gender) and "isms" (e.g. Marx-; femin-; colonial-; sex-) we should be able to carry out such close

textual analysis in enlightened ways' (2005b: 16). Third, multimodal theories and approaches are likely to continue to thrive with the new media continuing to transform translation practice and cause theory to revisit and embrace new concepts. Fourth, complementary interdisciplinary methodologies may be developed to deal with the analysis of 'big data', that is, large sets of quantitative data, which are rapidly accessible, but which present scholars with considerable challenges related to close critical analysis of the texts and paratexts in their sociocultural environment.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the role of linguistics in the development of translation studies. It has revisited three stages of linguistic influences on the rapidly growing area of translation studies, namely the influences of early modern linguistics, of discourse analysis, and of multimodality scholarship. With the benefit of the fruits of linguistic development and that of related fields, translation studies as an academic research area has expanded considerably since the middle of the twenty first century to become an interdiscipline, in which linguistics can be expected to continue to play an important part.

References

Baker, M. (1992/2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. (2006). Contextualization in translator and interpreter-mediated events. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 38(26), 321-337.

Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.

Boria, M., and Tomalin, M. (2020). Introduction. In M. Boria, Á. Carreres, M. Noriega-Sánchez and M. Tomalin, eds., *Translation and Multimodality: Beyond Words*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-23.

Bühler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: G. Fischer.

Calzada Pérez, M. (2001). A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies. *Target*, 13(2), 203-239.

Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Díaz-Cintas, J. (2009). *New Trends in Audiovisual Translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power (Second edition)*. London: Longman.

Farahzad, F. (2009). Translation as an Intertextual Practice. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 16(3-4), 125-131.

Firth, J. *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. (1957). London: Oxford University Press.

Genztler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Gorlée, D. (2010). Metacreations. *Applied Semiotics,* 24(9), 54-67.

Halliday, M. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as Social Ssemiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hatim, B., and Mason, I. (1990). Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman.

House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

House, J. (2006). Text and Context in Translation. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 38(26), 338-358.

House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London: Routledge.

Howatt, T. (2013). Introduction. In K. Malmkjær, ed., *The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia (Third Edition)*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. xxiii-xxxvii.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. Brower, ed., *On Translation*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239.

Kade, O. (1968). *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung*. Leipzig: VEB.

Kaindl, K. (2013). Multimodality in translation. In C. Millán and F. Bartrina, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 257-270

Koller, W. (1979/1992). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer.

Kress, G., and van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Hodder Education.

Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Oxford: University Press of America.

Lee, T. (2012). Performing multimodality: Literary translation, intersemioticity and technology. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 21(1), 245-256.

Leech, G. (1974). *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. Ogden and I. Richards, eds., *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language Upon Thought and the Science of Symbolism*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Malmkjær, K. (2003). What happened to God and the angels: An exercise in translational stylistics. *Target* 15, 39-62.

Malmkjær, K. (2004). Translational stylistics. *Language and Literature* 13, 13-24.

Malmkjær, K. (2005a). *Linguistics and the Language of Translation.* Edinburgh:

Edinburgh University Press.

Malmkjær, K. (2005b). Translation and Linguistics. *Perspectives*: *Studies in Translatology*, 13(1), 5-20.

Malmkjær, K. (2010). *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*, 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Millán-Varela, C. (2014). Exploring advertising in a global context: Food for thought. *The Translator* 10, 245-267.

Munday, J. (2007). Translation and ideology: A textual approach. *The Translator,* 13(2), 195-217.

Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points in Translator Decision-Making*. London: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2018). Translation analysis. In L. D'hulst & Y. Gambier, eds., *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, concepts, effects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 301-308.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nida, E. (1982). *Translating Meaning*. California: English Language Institute.

Nida, E. and Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. and Waard, J. (1986). *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*. New York: Thomas Nelson.

Nord, C. (1997/2001). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. [2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education press.]

Oettinger, A. (1960). *Automatic Language Translation: Lexical and Technical Aspects, with Particular Reference to Russian*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

O'Hagan, M. (2007). Video games as a new domain for translation research: From translating text to translating experience. *Revista Tradumatica*, 5.

Orero, P. (2004). Audiovisual translation: A new dynamic umbrella. In P. Orero, ed., *Topics in Audiovisual Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. vii-xiii.

Pan, H., & Zhang, M. (2016). Translating for a healthier gaming industry: Keywords and translation of the Macao gaming discourse. *Translation Spaces,* 5(2), 163-180.

Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Saussure, F. (1916/1983). *Course in General Linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). London: Fontana/Collins.

Schäffner, C. & Wiesemann, U. (2001). *Annotated Texts for Translation: English-German: Functionalist Approaches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Read, A. W. (1948). "An Account of the Word 'Semantics'". *Word* 4(2), 78-97.

Reiss, K. (1977/1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment (A. Chesterman, Trans.). In A. Chesterman, ed., *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab., pp. 105-115.

Reiss, K. (1971/2000). *Translation Criticism—The Potentials and Limitations*. (Erroll F. Rhodes Trans). London: Routledge.

Reiss, K., and Vermeer, H. (1984/2013). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained* (C. Nord, Trans. English reviewed by Marina Dudenhöfer). Manchester: St Jerome.

Rennert, S. (2008). Visual input in simultaneous interpreting. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 53*(1), 204-217.

Reynolds, M. (2020). Translating "I": Dante, literariness and the inherent multimodality of language. In M. Boria, Á. Carreres, M. Noriega-Sánchez, and M. Tomalin, eds., *Translation and Multimodality: Beyond Words*. London: Routledge, pp. 117-133.

Slembrouck, S. (2013). Discourse Analysis. In K. Malmkjær, ed., *The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia (Third Edition).* Abingdon: Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Iintegrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Toury, G. (1986). Translation. In T. Sebeok, ed., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics* (Vol. 2). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1107-1124.

Valdeón, R. (2005). The "translated" Spanish service to the BBC. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 6(2), 195-220.

Valdeón, R. (2008). Anomalous news translation: Selective appropriation of themes and texts in the Internet. *Babel,* 54(4), 299-326.

Vermeer, H. J. (1978). Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie. *Lebende Sprachen*, 23(3), 99-102.

Zhang, M. and Pan, H. (2015). Institutional power in and behind discourse: A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao. *Special Issue of Target: Discourse and Translation,* 23(2), 223-239.

Zhang, M., Pan, H., Chen, X., and Luo, T. (2015). Mapping discourse analysis in translation studies via bibliometrics: A survey of journal publications. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 23*(2), 223-239.

Zhu, C. (2004). Repetition and signification: A study of textual accountability and perlocutionary effect in literary translation. *Target*, 16(2), 227-252.