

Micro-, Macro-, and Supra-Macro Analyses and Their Impacts on Translation

■ Seyed-Ali Miremadi

□□ Associate Prof. Allame Tabatab'ei University

Abstract

How does one go about planning a university course in translation? Do we really train our college students so that they can become competent translators? What do we mean by translation anyway? What should be the content and scope of such a course? What do different models of translation focus on? What do we mean by a translation process? What about a competent translator? These questions and still many others need to be elaborated on, yet they are not intended here in this paper.

To give teachers and students of translation some insights into what models of translation have been in use so far and how they see translation as a discipline, this paper will outline the components of these models and later on it will focus on the supra-macro analysis of texts. Before texts can be thoroughly or relatively accurately translated, they should be analyzed syntactically, semantically, and hermeneutically. A review of some researches will hopefully provide us with information based on which some essential issues can be raised.

Keywords: *Macro-Analysis, Translation Impact, Syntactically*



1. Introduction

1.1 Significance of the Study

A fairly good question that has been raised and still is a matter of controversy is the how and what of a unit of translation. Do we have to accept that words are units of translation? Is it the case that neither words, sentences, paragraphs, sections, etc. nor linguistic texts are the real units of translation? Before beginning a translation, the students should be required to explain certain aspects of the text to ensure that they have clear understanding of it. Delisle (1980) labels this process.

“Explication de Text.”

In his words, “*explication*” should identify the following:

- a. les clés du texte, c'est-à-dire tout ce qui le situe et de précise le cadre;
- b. les connaissances non-linguistiques nécessaires à sa compréhension;
- c. le dépistage de sous-entendus et des allusions;
- d. l'interprétation sémantique et stylistique de certains mots, syntagmes ou idiotismes. (p. 141)

Students must realize that there are key ideas within a text that should be delved in and understood. Certain words have symbolic values which reflect what the author actually intends to say rather than what the words themselves denote. The students and trainees in translation should learn that some reflection and analyses are required before one can actually be involved in actual translation of a text.

The student of translation is expected to strive to wrench the prose from the grip of the source language and produce a literate, fluent, and supple product that reflects the content of the original in a new form. But how is this possible? Is a micro-linguistic analysis enough to know what the author has actually said? What role do the relevant and respective cultures play in enlightening the essence of the author's text? Do historical and background knowledge as well as diachronic etymological processes of words help the translator come to know the author's intentions? What role will supra-macro components play in better understanding of the text? Is there anything learned by any individual speaker of any language prior to experience that can be activated and utilized when one is about to learn how to

render a text from one language into another? These issues will be raised and tentatively responded to within this paper.

1.2 Questions

The following questions need to be elaborated on:

1. Do we, as human beings endowed with genetic knowledge of language, possess any prelinguistic capability of making interpretations?
2. If we do really enjoy a preknowledge of interpretation beyond the scope of wordly or macro-linguistic information, do we go through a hierarchy of interpretations, from the most unmarked to the most marked?
3. Should we activate the latent preknowledge in translation trainees?
4. What model is most convenient for translation purposes?

The following null-hypotheses are underway which will be worked out to see if they are supported:

1. Translation trainees make no preference as to the interpretations available and deductible from individual sentences.
2. There is no hierarchy of interpretations at least for Iranian translation trainees in Persian and English.
3. No hierarchy of interpretations exists.
4. There is no single model of translation.

2. Theoretical Issues

The procedures all translation curricula follow to train their students can be boiled down to three major models: 1) grammatical, 2) cultural, and 3) interpretive. Each area enjoys at least two methods: some with minor differences whereas others show great differences. A brief review of each is underway:

2.1 Grammatical Model

Generally speaking, this model bases its foundation on the assumption that translating is not but a language operation. Thus, a single and simple microanalysis will help overcome the problems of translation. In the process of translating, one



grammatical structure is transferred into another. Thus, translation training courses will have to focus on comparative grammar as the only means of translation teaching.

Grammar method of translation, as one of the basic methods in this model, has, in its base, a notion that all men have the same way of thinking about the universe. They all see it in one way but express it in different forms. Thus, there is only one correct equivalent that should be expressed lexically and semantically via grammar. The expressions "the correct language", "the correct concepts" and "the correct interpretation" are what one should aim for. The beginners have to learn how to form the correct concepts; saying the same thing in two different languages, taking into account the similarities and differences in the two languages involved.

This model is welcomed by students hoping that they will gain an adequate translation competence. However, it is much ado about nothing. It is a very static method.

The second method, to some extent, more descriptive than the grammatical method is basically prescriptive though the focus is on phonological, morphological, and syntactic analysis. This method focuses on *langue* rather than *parole*. Here, applied linguistics plays a significant role. Translation teaching is a branch of applied linguistics. Contrastive grammar rather than comparative grammar is considered to be the most fruitful way of teaching translation. Through contrast, distinctions are to be made by formal features of SL and TL. Tense, gender, etc. are cases which must be contrasted in the two languages. These two methods were quite dominant until 1970s and their practitioners were Catford (1965) and Nida (1969).

2.2 Cultural Model

The other model, namely the cultural method, is meaning-based. In this method, no word, phrase or sentence has any meaning in vacuum. Meaning is defined in terms of cultural fields and contexts. To come to know the meaning of a word, one must trace its meaning in history. People in one culture see the world in their own way. Thus, what translation does is to describe and to explain the world view of one people to another. Translating is a transfer of not only one language into another but a culture

into another. Casagrande's *The Ends of Translation* (1954) is just a typical example of this model.

The ethnographic-semantic method, the second method, faces translation from an anthropological point of view. Componential analysis, hierarichal analysis and cultural analysis form the foundations of this method. To understand a text, the civilization of the S-language must be analyzed and dealt with thoroughly. Nida in his *Semantic Componential Translating Theory* (1971) advocates the cultural contrasts in L1 and L2. "Kinship systems, color systems, etc. should be contrasted", advocates Nida (p. 87). Language determinism influenced by Sapir-Whorf hypotesis forms the basis of this method. Practitioners just become familiar with problems. What the solutions are is yet to be determined.

Taber (1969) develops the dynamic equivalence method. Whatever one can say in one language can be said in another as well. Messages are to be worked out in one language and be transformed into another. Target language readers will sense the same feeling and will react in the same way that the source language readers do, provided that the closest natural equivalent are sought.

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), de Beaugrande (1978), Newmark (1981), Neubert (1968), Reiss (1977), Toury (1980), and Wilss (1982) consider translation not as an interlingual or intercultural mechanism but rather text to text transference. The unit of translation is not a word but a text. Understanding the SL text is the primary goal. One should try to get a meaning but not the meaning of a text.

The text analysis method emphasizes the epistemic study of the co-text. Literary criticism plays a significant role and is to be used to serve the analysis of the source language text.

2.3 Hermeneutic Model

Heidegger's influential school of philosophy, mostly known as hermeneutics, does not leave translation teaching untouched. Achieving the essence of texts should be focused on resorting to the ontological rather than the epistemic. Readers and texts do not appear in fixed cliché forms. The reader and the text are always interacting with each other and no text remains always the same. Language is not a kind of



neutral receptacle, taking in and pouring out again the reality of the exterior world without modifying it (Chau, p. 216).

Objective understanding is not possible unless a meaning rather than the meaning hidden in the text is reconstructed. Thus, it is claimed that no objective understanding is workable. No one can see clearly what is seen in one moment but not seen in another. A text is an ocean with surroundings that form its shores but there is no fixed surface so that it could be seen in its core. The translator finds a text his/her co-subject, becomes an interpreter, falls into a dialog with it, and tries to create new meanings. No good artist paints the same scenery in the same way. No two artifacts match each other. A translator should be trained to learn how to fuse his/her own horizon of thought to that of the author's, the way s/he gets it from the text.

Steiner in his *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (1975) argues that the translation trainee's job is to recreate a text through criticizing the text. An utterance has multiple functions depending on where it occurs. The question one raises is whether it is a part of advertisement, diary, poem, a love letter, a novel, a password, a sick-minded person's soliloquy, whatever. The whole text is to be considered as a unit.

3. Hermeneutics

The word originally emanates from a verb "hermeneuein", referring to the interpretation of the holy scriptures. In the twentieth century, this view tilted towards German philosophy and was flavored with it. The presupposition is that reading a text or listening to it, no matter how relevant and vivid its lexical entries or expressions are, never reveals the essence of the text. Only a hermeneutic analysis will take the researcher to the depth of its meaning and may take him/her much beyond it.

The Arabic equivalent "táveel" roughly means "flashing back to some entity's origin". Some fourteen centuries ago, the word "táveel" appeared in the Holy Book, Koran, where the verse states:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ مِنْهُ آيَاتٌ مُحْكَمَاتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ وَأُخَرُ مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ فَأَمَّا

الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ ابْتِغَاءَ الْفِتْنَةِ وَابْتِغَاءَ تَأْوِيلِهِ وَمَا يَعْلَمُ تَأْوِيلَهُ
إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالرَّاسِخُونَ فِي الْعِلْمِ يَقُولُونَ آمَنَّا بِهِ كُلٌّ مِنْ عِنْدِ رَبِّنَا وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّا
أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ
(آل عمران. آية ٧).

He is who hath revealed unto thee (Muhammad) the Scripture wherein are clear revelations—They are the substance of the Book—and others (which are) allegorical. But those in whose hearts is doubt pursue, forsooth, that which is allegorical seeking (to cause) dissension by seeking to explain it. None knoweth its explanation save Allah. And those who are of sound instruction say: We believe therein; the whole is from our Lord; but only men of understanding really heed.

(The Glorious Koran, with English translation by Marmaduke, Pickthall, p. 62).

Two rival schools of thought developed, one influenced by Dilthey (1833-1911) and the other by Heidagger (1889-1976). The former classifies hermeneutics as a branch of history and humanities, which should be looked upon from that very perspective, whereas the latter considers hermeneutics as a phenomenon of existence.

Fredrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) extends the domain of hermeneutics and goes far beyond the realm of religion. To him, hermeneutics should be looked at from two perspectives:

- Grammatical: dealing with linguistic and cultural perspectives in which the author was born and s/he had no choice but to accept them.
- Psychological: the author's understanding of reality and how s/he could recreate it. The goal is to come to know the author better than s/he herself/himself did.

The grammatical analysis will lead the researcher to semantic values of expressions and their syntactic loci. On the other hand, knowing what the author had in mind, whether s/he is aware of it or not, is what psycholinguistic hermeneutics targets at. Hermeneutics is the way to explore the basic foundations of thought. Meaning, according to Schleiermacher, is what the author had in mind, expressed or unexpressed. He believes that, in the process of time, the meanings of words do change since world views change constantly. The gap between the author and his/her



time, on the one hand, and the reader and his/her time, on the other, is constantly changing and becoming deeper. The interpreter should adjust his/her understanding of the text to these natural developments. The interpreter, he believes, should avoid imposing his/her own counter views on the hermeneutic analysis that s/he makes.

Dilthey, following Schleiermacher, emphasized the psychological aspect of hermeneutics. He believed that to realize what the author actually intended to say, the author should be studied carefully from the psychological point of view.

In hermeneutics, "understanding" is the ultimate goal whereas, in natural studies, "explanation" is the target. A scientist in natural sciences searches what laws of nature are, what seems to be observable. Nevertheless, human beings rarely bring into surface their internalized views. Being humans, we can easily access what others have in their minds. Even coming to know oneself is a hermeneutic realization. Then the more we know one another, the better we can discover the hidden intentions molded into expressions. According to Dilthey, the meaning of a text is what the author had in mind. The interpreter must be reborn in the author's time.

Martin Heidegger emphasized the fact that understanding is prior to cognition. The essence of understanding is not to know the present but to predict the future. Interpretation, on the other hand, is what we have practically understood. It is the revitalization of possibilities in mind.

Understanding a text is to explore the meaning, not what the author put into words but what the text itself refers to. Dilthey believes that we should yield ourselves to the insurmountable secrets hidden in the text. We should submit to art and be at its service.

Gadamer, Dilthey's student, in his book titled *Truth and Method* (1960) argues that the researcher's preconceptions end in true understanding or misunderstanding of the text. He states that the meaning of a literary text is, by no means, restricted to the author's intentions. The text being transferred from one cultural and historical context into another fluctuates and evaporates in such a way that new meanings are to be understood, meanings which are possibly never recoverable in the author himself/herself. Any interpretation forms itself based on relative historical and cultural criteria confined to one specific culture. To understand the present, one

needs to understand the past. The past is always formed based on our present views.

Gadamer argues that tradition is what links past, present, and future. This process is to be seen in the depth of eternity. There is no need to go to the past back and forth. Traditions, rituals, and our cultural attitudes have already filled the gap.

Gadamer believes that a text is not what is reflected in the author's mind. It is a dialog between the interpreter and the text. The interpreter's present conditions are the preliminary means of understanding the text. The interpreter touches a text with his/her own beliefs, interactions, criteria, and constraints and that is why s/he always does her/his best to make adaptations of her/his expectations with what is included in the text.

Aynolqozat Hamadani (1097-1130 AD), the Islamic philosopher, focuses on the interpretation of poetry and states, "These poems are mirrors. Mirrors have no faces but one can see himself/herself in them. They mirror what is to be mirrored, what is reflected in them" (p. 216) (Author's translation).

4. Methods and Procedures

To investigate the possibility of testing the hypotheses developed in this paper, the following steps were taken:

- a. A list of twenty sentences were developed in English each of which could be interpreted in different ways (see Appendix A).
- b. The sentences were presented to sixty undergraduate students at Allame Tabataba'i University, who had taken and passed more than 100 credit courses of their translation training courses including Linguistics 1 and 2, grammar and advanced writing. The subjects who were selected randomly were expected to relate pronouns to their candidate antecedents, the major sources of various interpretations.
- c. The percentages of students' choices were calculated and enlisted in tables.
- d. Possible and impossible English interpretations were figured out through consultation with colleagues and then matched to the selections made by the trainees.
- e. The twenty sentences were given to another group of sixty undergraduate English majors. They were asked to translate the sentences into Persian. Since



the subjects were English majors (having registered in and passed more than 100 credit courses and about to graduate), it was taken for granted that they were competent enough to translate the sentences accurately.

- f. The frequencies were calculated. The translations with the highest frequencies were selected.
- g. The translations were given to 60 undergraduate students of Persian literature to relate the pronouns to their relevant antecedents. The students had all passed more than 100 credits. Being native speakers of Persian, the subjects were assumed to be homogeneous (See Appendix B).
- h. The frequencies were calculated.
- i. Selections made on the English versions were matched to those of the Persian ones to see the possible differences and similarities.
- j. Five English texts were developed. Five English sentences with the highest frequencies were placed in the text hoping that they would show the role a text plays in the reduction of interpretations (See Appendix C).
- k. The texts were given to a group of 20 translation trainees. They were asked to state which pronoun matched the existing nominals in the text. (All subjects had already passed more than 100 credits in their translation programs).
- l. The five texts were translated into Persian. Proper nouns were changed into Persian proper nouns to defuse the effects of a foreign culture.
- m. Twenty undergraduate students of Persian literature received the texts in their Persian versions. They were asked to draw lines to relate the pronouns to their antecedents.
- n. The results (English single sentences versus their Persian equivalents as well as the English texts versus their Persian equivalents) were analyzed.

Note 1: A shortcoming which may have affected the results is that the researcher could not test the subjects' translation competence.

Note 2: Native English speakers were not available.

5. Data Analysis

Only 5 English sentences and their equivalents in Persian as well as their corresponding texts were analyzed. The others were included in the appendices.

English Sentence 1

John kissed every child after Bill introduced him
 a b c d

d → a 81.66%

a → b 21.66

d → x 1.66

Persian sentence 1

pas ?az ?ānke ?ali ?urā mo'arefi kard hamid yek yek-e
 a g b

after of that Ali he-DO introduce did Hamid one one

bačče-hā-rā busid.
 c

child-pl.-DO kissed-he

g → b 100.00%

g → c 4.76

English Text

..... John Smith kissed every child after Bill Barbee introduced him.
 a b c d

d → a 26.66%

d → b 10.00

d → c 1.00

Persian Text

..... hamāntor ke ?āqāye kamālī yek yek-e pesar-hā-rā mo?refi mi-kard,
 a b
 as Mr. Kamali one one boy-pl-DO introduce prog-did

?qāye ?ahmadi ?u-rā mi-busid.
 c g

Mr. Ahmadi he-DO prog-kissed-he.

(As Mr. Kamali was introducing the boys one by one, Mr. Ahmadi would kiss him)

g → b 52.63%

g → a 31.78

g → c 5.26



The three possible interpretations in English are a to d; b to d; and d to x (exophorically). The subjects selected choices and gave priorities to, a to d, relation (John=him 81.66%). Only 1.66% reported that d could have an exophoric antecedent. 21.66% related a to b, which is quite irrelevant. More interesting is the fact that, in social relations, it seems that b to d coindexation is more acceptable and relevant, nevertheless, no subject chose the b to d relation.

To select a as an antecedent, d has to cross over b (a quantifier). One possibility is that the quantifier scopes may be different in the two languages and that might be an interference from L1 in L2. The assumption that the subjects did not know English well enough to understand the simple sentence is quite improbable. The quantifier variation also seems to be improbable because the subjects (undergraduates of Persian literature) had the same preferences when they reacted to the Persian equivalents.

All subjects coindexed g (= ?urā) to b (Hamid, 100%). Only 4.76% co-indexed (c-w-ed hereafter) c to g. No subject traced any exaphora related to g (= ?urā) since the social etiquette in Iranian culture and logic do not require an X to kiss a Y when one introduces a Z to a Q. One possible interpretation (having compared the two cases) is that subjects (English as well as Persian native speakers) have access to certain linguistic capabilities which go beyond the scope of their world experiences. Some relations are, linguistically speaking, improbable. Nevertheless, different interpretations are possible provided that one tilts towards it.

When the English sentence is used within a text, the subjects still look for the most prominent relation, that is, d to a (26.66%). The percentage is lower in frequency, nevertheless, the text instigated the subjects to seek another relation, namely d to b (10.00%), which was missing from the single sentence realization. The d to c reference (1.00%) is to be dismissed from the analysis since the antecedent and the pronoun cannot be coindexed. In other words, the pronoun cannot be bound to a potential antecedent within a minimal governing category (Chomsky's Principle B).

Comparing the English sentence with the same sentence within an English text clearly shows that the priority is given to a to d (i.e. it is John Smith who kisses every child after Bill Barbee introduces John Smith). The same is also true when one

compares the Persian sentence being used individually and the same sentence when it is used within a text. Like the English cases, the subjects gave priority to g to b relation (100% at the sentence level and 52.63% at the text level), namely that it was Ali/Mr. Kamali who introduced the boys and it was Hamid/Mr. Ahmadi who kissed each boy. Only 4.76% realized that it was the child rather than Hamid who had been introduced.

At the Persian text level, g (?u-rā) cannot be bound to c (Mr. Ahmadi) (Violation of Principle B). Nevertheless, the frequency is so low that it can be ignored. What is amazing is that 31.78% related g to a reference. It is rather ridiculous to assume that Mr. Kamali (a) receives a kiss any time he (i.e. Mr. Kamali) introduces one individual boy. This type of interpretation is from the social point of view, unpredictable though logically not improbable.

English Sentence 2

John loves his brother and Bill does too although
his father doesn't.
a b c d

d → c	71.66%
b → a	60.00%
d → a	31.66%
a → x	9.99%
d → x	3.33%

Persian sentence

?ali barādar-aš-rā dust darad va hamid ham hamčenin
a b g c

Ali brother-his-Do friend has-he and Hamid too also

?agarče pedar-aš na čandān
d h

although father-his not so

h → c	47.61%
g → a	42.85%
h → a	23.80%



h → d	14.28
g → b	4.76
g → c	4.76
g → d	4.76
b → a	4.76
a → b	4.76

English text

..... John loves his brother and Bill does too, although his father
 doesn't. a b c d

d → c	36.66%
b → a	6.66
b → c	6.66
d → b	6.66

Persian text

..... ʔāqā-ye ʔahmadi barādar-aš-ra dust dārad va ʔāqā-ye
 a g

Mr. Ahmadi brother-his-Do love has-he and Mr.

kamāli ham hamčēnin ʔagarče pedar-aš ʔu-rā dust na-dārad
 b h i

Kamali too the same though father-his he-Do love not-has-he

g → b	63.15%
h → a	57.89
j → a	52.63
i → b	47.36
j → b	31.78
h → b	26.31
i → b	26.31
g → a	15.78
i → g	5.60
i → a	5.26

There are six possible interpretations for the English sentence. The Iranian subjects preferred the sloppy reading (71.66%) and the strict reading (60%). Only 3.33% chose a to x relation. No subject selected the b to x as an alternative although the same subject who chose d to x should have chosen b to x as well. a to x (6.66%) and a to c (3.33%) are logically impossible; nevertheless, they were selected as possible options.

The subjects from the Persian Literature Department preferred the sloppy reading (47.61%) and the strict reading (42.85%). The rest of the options, which are rather marked and not straightforward in their interpretations, were given the least priority. g to b (4.76%) and g to d (4.76%) are logically impossible options though a minority favored them. Since the subjects who went through these interpretations did not furnish complete questionnaires, one tends to ignore the possibilities presented.

As is seen in the Table, the sum of a(=John) c-w-ed b(=his) and a(=John) c-w-ed d(=his) raises up to 91.66%, whereas c(=Bill) c-w-ed d(=his), by itself, is 71.66%. Only 3.33% find exophoric reference for d(=his).

Comparing the two Tables (English versus Persian) reveals the possible fact that subjects go through the same procedures in making interpretations for the English sentence as well as the Persian one. Of course, it should be taken into account that, since no native speakers of English were tested, the comparisons may show some aspects of the truth but not all of it.

The first English reading goes to d to c and b to a, both at the sentence level (71.66% and 60.00% respectively) and at the text level (36.66% and 6.66%, respectively). Nevertheless, the text reduces the frequency of b to a drastically (60% to 6.66%). This signifies the role a text plays in minimizing the number of selected potential options. Some choices such as d to a (31.66%), impossible a to x (9.99%) and possible d to x (3.33%) do not manifest themselves in the English text. b to c (6.66%) and d to b (6.66%) at the text level, which are quite irrelevant, come to the surface, whatever the reasons may be.

Comparing the Persian sentence with its equivalent in English, one notices that, in English, "does" is used as a substitution, whereas in Persian, there exists 'a



zero-substitution. That might be a reason why the number of choices increases both at the sentence and the text level. The subjects give priority to d (=his) to select the nearest antecedent (=Bill). The same is true in Persian, both at the sentence and text level.

In both languages, subjects find the pronoun-external-antecedent relation very far-fetched. This, by itself, indicates that some possible interpretations are more vivid than others. Based on the two languages studied, one tends to claim that there is a universal hierarchy of interpretations with certain minor variations which might be the effect of sociocultural nonlinguistic factors or social etiquette.

Something really significant is the fact that the number of choices increases in the Persian text compared to the frequencies at the sentence level. The researcher tends to believe that, in creating an equivalent text to match that of English, most probably, some flavors have been either added to or subtracted from the translation. If this is true, one can claim that, a thorough hermeneutic analysis needs to be conducted before a rendering is to be carried on. (Delicate observations can be made if the two languages are compared in this regard. They are deliberately ignored here).

English Sentence 3

John realizes that he is a fool but Bill doesn't realize that he is a fool
 a b c d
 even though his wife does.
 e

e → c	78.33%
b → a	55.00
d → c	33.66
d → a	13.33
d → e	10.00
b → x	10.00
d → x	8.33
e → x	3.33
d → b	3.33

Persian sentence

bahrām fekr mi-kon-ad ?āqel ?ast ?ammā hamid fekr ne-mi-kon-ad
 a b

Bahram thought pr-do-3r wise is-3rd but Hamid thought not-pr-do-3rd

ke ?u ?āqel ?ast ?garče hamsar-aš intor fekr
 g c h

that he wise is-3r though spouse-his this way thought
 ne-mi-kon-ad
 nto-pr-do-3rd

g → a	95.23%
h → b	57.14
h → a	14.28
h → c	9.52
g → b	4.76
b → c	4.76

English text

..... John realizes that he is a fool but Bill doesn't realize that
 a b c

he is a fool even though his wife does.
 d e

e → c	16.66%	d → c	3.33%
b → c	10.00	d → a	3.33
d → c	10.00	e → b	3.33
e → a	6.66	e → d	3.33
b → a	6.66		

Persian text

..... ?āqā-ye ?ahmadi fekr mi-kon-ad ke ?u divāne ?ast ?ammā
 a g

Mr. Ahmadi thought pr-do-3rd that he/she crazy is-3rd but

?āqā-ye-kamāli fekr ne-mi-kon-ad ke ?u divāne ?ast
 b h

Mr. Kamali thought not-pr-do-3rd that he/she crazy is-3rd

English sentence 4

Mary believes that she knows the fact that Janet had stolen her bicycle

although her father does not agree with her.

a	b	c	d
e	f		
d → e	76.66%	d → c	8.33%
e → a	71.66	b → d	6.66
b → a	63.33	b → e	5.00
f → a	61.66	b → o	5.00
f → c	11.66	e → f	3.33
e → c	10.00	b → x	3.33
		b → c	1.66

Persian sentence

?ali fekr mi-kon-ad ?u ?in vāqe'iyat-rā mi-dān-ad ke hamid

Ali thought pr-do-3rd s/he this fact-DO pr-know-3rd that Hamid

dočarxe-aš-rā dozdide ?ast ?agarče pedar-aš bā nazar-e ?u

bicycle-his/her-Do stolen is-3rd though father-his/her with idea his/her

movāfeq ni-st

agree not-is-3rd

h → a	57.00%	g → c	14.28%
i → a	52.38	g → h	4.76
j → a	52.38	h → b	4.76
g → a	47.61	i → b	4.76
g → b	23.80	j → c	4.76

English text

..... Mary believes that she knows the fact that Janet has stolen her bicycle

although her father doesn't agree with her.

e	f		
e → a	23.33%	b → a	3.33%
f → a	20.00	d → b	3.33

6. Conclusions

1. The first null hypothesis, namely that "Translation trainees make no preference as to the available interpretations" was rejected. We noticed that not all subjects selected one single interpretation.
2. The second and the third null hypotheses, namely, that "There is no hierarchy of interpretations" were rejected. We noticed that the most unmarked interpretations stand higher in rank in the list whereas the most marked ones receive the lowest frequencies.
3. The fourth null hypothesis stating that "There is no single model of translation" was supported. The way different readers of the same sentence or the same text read it will definitely have impacts on their renderings. The larger texts compared to single sentences will be interpreted more identically by different translators. Going through different translations presented by different subjects supports the claim.

7. Recommendations for translation training courses

Based on the analysis made and the reactions enacted by the subjects who participated in this experiment, one tends to offer the following suggestions being that they can improve the translation training programs:

1. Students should familiarize themselves with the range of possible interpretations attributed to even single sentences.
2. Teachers should teach students how to come to know what they are genetically endowed with. They should be taught how to activate what they already possess as linguistic subconscious capabilities.
3. Students should be taught that the first step towards rendering a text from one language into another is to understand the text; that to be able to create an accurate translation, they should not confine themselves to micro- and macro-analyses of the texts involved but that they should make attempts to conduct supra-macro analysis.



4. Course designers should enrich their syllabi with activities which may help students understand the difference between dictionary meaning and contextual meaning.
5. Before beginning a translation, students should be required to explain certain aspects of the text to ensure that they have a clear understanding of it. This is not possible unless students are taught how to go about the hermeneutic analysis of the related text.
6. Texts are loaded with delicacies and specific problems (literary allusions or cultural references, for example). Teachers should draw the students' attention to these delicacies. "They can do so by distributing a text to the students, with certain sections designated with asterisks, and asking the students to provide both a translation and a commentary" (Pamela Russel, 1986, p. 3).
7. When working with languages which differ greatly in their syntactic structures, students must be taught how to analyze the grammatical structures of the sentences in the source text.
8. When working with long, syntactically complicated sentences, students should be taught how to expand their views as to the possible interpretations that can arise if pronouns are coindexed with different potential antecedents.
9. Students should be taught how to attune themselves to the cadence of their native languages and how those languages are used to represent the worlds around them. Students must constantly struggle to free their translations from the foreign language from which they are translating (i.e. syntactically, semantically, discoursally, stylistically, culturally, etc.)
10. As Simon Chau states, "A hermeneutic translator ... chooses his words each time the occasion arises, with its own unique particulars, in existential dialogue with the Source Language Text. One can actively prepare for the moment by sharpening various tools useful for understanding, but would not discuss how to translate in the vacuum in general ..." (1986, p. 132).

Appendix A

Out of 40 Persian and English sentences, 10 sentences were analyzed and reported.

The other sentences used in the analysis are as follow:

11. Everyone corrected his paper before the teacher did.

a	b	c
a → b	93.33%	b → c
		1.66%
b → c	1.66	b → x
		1.66

12. qable ?az ?inke mo?alem maqāle-aš-rā tashih kon-ad
a h
before of that teacher article-his-DO correction do-3rd

har <u>dāneš ?āmuz</u> <u>maqāle-aš-rā</u> tashih kard
b g
any student did-3rd
g → a
90.47%
g → a
4.76%

13. Which picture of himself did John buy?

a	b	c
b → c	96.66%	b → ∅
		1.66%

14. hamid kodām ?aks-e xod - aš-rāxarid
a b c g

Hamid which picture self-his-DO bought-3rd

g → a	80.95%	a → c	9.52%
g → c	9.52		

15. John wonders which picture of himself Bill took.
a b c d

a → c	63.33%	c → d	31.66%
		c → x	1.66

16. ?ali ne-mi-dān-ad kodām ?aks-aš-rā hamid bar dāšt
a b g c

Ali not-know-3rd which picture-his-DO Hamid took-3rd

g → a	85.71%	g → c	9.52%
-------	--------	-------	-------



17. John greeted everyone before Mary did.

a

b

c

b → ∅ 41.66% b → c 5.00%

a → b 8.33

18. ?ali qabl az hamsar -aš be hame salām kard

a

b

g

c

g → a 95.23% g → b 4.76%

19. Her mother gave every student her picture.

a

b

c

a → c 58.33% a → b 3.33%

b → c 31.66 c → x 3.33

c → ∅ 5.00

20. mādar -aš be har kudak ?aks -aš -rā dād

a

g

b

c

h

mother-his to every child picture-his/her-DO gave-3rd

h → b 57.14% a → c 9.52%

g → a 23.80 g → b 9.52

h → a 19.04 g → c 4.76

21. Which picture of him did John like?

a

b

c

b → x 50.00% a → b 1.66%

b → c 26.66

22. kodam ?aks -aš -rā ?ali dust mi-dāšt vali hamid

a

g

b

c

picture-his-DO like had-3rd but Hamid

dust ne-mi-dāšt

g → b 61.90% g → a 9.52%

g → c 19.04

23. His mother packed every boy his sandwich.

a

b

c

b → c 85.00% a → c 3.33%

a → b 10.00 c → x 3.33

24. mādar -aš barāye har bačče-i sāndovič -aš-rā ?āmāde kard
 a g b c h

mother-his/her for any child prepare did-3rd

h → b	80.95%	g → a	4.76%
g → b	28.57	h → a	4.76
h → c	4.76		

25. Dan likes golf, and he does too.

a b c

c → x	46.66%	b → c	1.66%
a → c	26.66		

26. ?ali basketbāl dust dār-ad va ?u ham hamčenin

a b g
 love has-3rd and too the same

g → b	23.80%	g → x	4.76%
g → a	14.28		

27. John revised his paper before the teacher did, and Bill did

a b c d
 his paper too. e

a → b	95.00%	a → e	1.33%
d → e	95.00	e → x	1.33
b → x	1.33	a → c	1.33
c → d	1.33		

28. ?ali maqāle -aš-rā qabl az mo?alem morede taǰdide

a b h c
 teacher review

nazar qarār dād va hamid ham hamčenin
 d

view place gave-3rd

g → a	90.47%	b → a	4.76%
-------	--------	-------	-------

33. Mary was standing on the shore when she started gazing at her.

a		b		c
a → c	83.33%	b → c	8.33%	
b → ∅	13.33	c → x	3.33	
a → b	11.66			
b → x	11.66			

34. ?ali dar kenār-e sahel ?istāde bud vaqti ?u be ?u xire šod
 a beside shore standing was-3rd when g h gaze became-3rd

h → a	47.61%	g → x	4.76%
g → a	23.80		

35. Life to her was a disaster. Mary had no choice but to advise her
 a b c
 not to commit suicide. Her father was anxious too.
 d

a → c	33.33%	a → x	3.33%
d → b	30.00	a → ∅	3.33
a → d	26.66	d → ∅	3.33
a → b	16.66	b → x	1.66
b → c	16.66	d → x	1.66
a → ∅	10.00	c → x	1.33
c → ∅	6.66		

36. zendeği barā-y-aš yek faje?e bud. ?ali čāre-i na-dāšt
 g a

life for-him one disaster was-3rd help no-had-3rd

jozinke be ?u nasihat kon-ad ke xod-aš-rā na-koš-ad
 h i

except advise do-3rd self-his-Do kill

pedar-aš niz delvāpas bud
 b j
 too anxious was-3rd

h → a	28.71%	i → j	4.76%
-------	--------	-------	-------



h → g	14.28	i → b	4.76
h → j	14.28	g → x	4.76
g → i	14.28	h → a	4.76
g → a	14.28	h → x	4.76
i → x	4.76		

37. In order for him to be tested by him, John had to spend \$1000.

	a	b	c
a → c	63.33%	a → x	3.33%
b → c	20.00	a → ∅	1.33
b → ∅	6.66	a → b	1.33
b → x	6.66		

38. barāye ?ānke ?u be-tavān-ad be xārej safar kon-ad

for that subjunctive-be able-3rd to abroad journey do-3rd
?ali be hodud-e hezār dolār niyaz dašt
 a to about 1000 need had-3rd

g → a	28.57%
g → x	4.76

39. For me to recognize him as the honest boy, John should pay back

a b c d
his debts.
 e

e → d	68.33%	e → a	1.33%
b → c	18.33	a → ∅	1.33
b → d	16.66	b → ∅	1.33
e → c	5.00	b → x	1.33
b → a	3.33	e → b	1.33
c → d	3.33		

40. barāye ?ānke man be-tavān-am ?u-rā pesar-i dorostkār

for that I subjunctive-be able-1st boy-a honest

be-dān-am,	<u>?ali</u>	bāyad	bedehi-y-aš-rā	be-pardāz-ad
	<u>b</u>		<u>i</u>	
subjunctive-know-1st		should	debts	subjunctive-pay-3rd
	i → b	38.09%		g → b 4.76%
	h → b	28.57		i → h 4.76
	h → a	19.04		i → g 4.76
	g → a	14.28		a → b 4.76
	i → a	9.52		

Appendix B

English Texts

1. A group of orphans gathered to welcome John Smith, the new President of the orphanage. Bill Barbee, the boys' guardian welcomed the new president on behalf of the boys. John Smith kissed every child after Bill Barbee introduced him.
2. John Smith lives next door to Bill Barbee. They are close friends. The two families know one another. Sometimes, they gather in either John Smith's house or in Bill Barbee's flat. John's younger brother plays chess with Bill's brother. John loves his brother and Bill does too, although his father doesn't.
3. John Smith and his wife live in a flat close to Newhampshire. Sometimes, there are clashes between the two, but they have rather a quiet life. Bill Barbee and his wife, who come from a worker family, live nearby. Very rarely the two families meet. Having visited one another on a Sunday, they started gossiping. Generally speaking, John realizes that he is a fool but Bill doesn't realize that he is a fool even though his wife does.
4. John Smith, his wife and their daughter, Mary, welcome Bill Barbee, his wife and their daughter, Janet, on a hot summer evening. After having had their lunch, the two girls go bike-riding. Mary has bought a new bicycle. The next day, the bicycle disappears. Apparently, it has been stolen. Mary puts the blame on Janet. No one really knows who has stolen the bicycle. Janet and Mary blame each other. The parents are so anxious. The family relation is about to break. Mary believes that she knows the fact that Janet has stolen her bicycle although her father doesn't agree with her.



5. A group of boys including John and Bill went on a picnic. Tasks were divided and each one was assigned a task. John was the cook and was also expected to serve the food. Bill rushed in and said to John that he was hungry though John had no idea who he was.

Appendix C

Persian text

1. ?ede?i ?az ?aytām gerd ?āmade bud-and tā be ?āqāye
 some of orphans round come had-they in order to Mr.
 ?ahmadi ra?is-e ?adid-e parvarešgāh xoš?amad be-guy-and.
 Ahmadi president new orphanage welcome subjunctive-say-3rdpl
 ?āqāye Kamāli, sarparast-e pesar-hā be nemāyandegi az taraf-e
 supervisor boy-pl as representative of side
 ?ānhā be ra?is-e ?adid xoš?āmad goft. Hamāntorke ?āqāye kamāli
 them said-he as
 yek yek-e pesar-hā-rā mo?arefi mi-kard, ?āqāye ?ahmadi ?u-rā mi-bus-id
 one one introduce did kiss
2. xānevāde-ye ?āqā-ye ?ahmadi dar hamsāyegi-ye ?āqā-ye kamāli
 family in neighborhood
 zendegi mi-kon-and. ?ānhā dustān-e besyār samimi hast-and
 living do 3rdpl they friends very intimate are
 har do xānevāde hamdigar-rā be xubi mi-šenās-and. gāh dar
 each two each other well know sometimes in
 xāne-ye ?āqā-ye ?ahmadi va gāh dar āpartemān-e ?āqā-ye
 house apartment
 kamāli dor-e ham mi-nešin-and. Ma?mulan pedar-e ?āqā-ye ?ahmadi
 round each sit usually
 va pedar-e ?āqā-ye kamali bā ham šatranj bāzi mi-kon-and. barādar-e
 chess play
 kuček-tar-e ?āqāye ?ahmadi niz bā barādar-e kuček-tar-e ?āqāye
 small-er too with



kamāli šatranj bāzi mi-kon-and. ?āqāye ?ahmadi barādar-aš-rā
dust dār-ad va ?āqāye kamāli ham hamčenin ?agarče pedar-aš
though

?u-rā dust na-dār-ad
love not-has-3rds

3. ?āqāye ?ahmadi va hamsar-aš dar āpārtemān-i dar ?ekbātān
wife apartment-a Ekbatan
zandegi mi-kon-and. gāh beyn-e ān do barxord-hā-ye sathi
between that two clash-pl

insignificant

piš mi-yā-y-ad ?ammā dar maǰmu? zandegi-ye ?ārāmi dār-and.
near come but all together life calm have

?āqāye kamāli va hamsar-aš ke az sath-e ?elmi-ye bālā-?i
level knowledge high

barxordār ni-st-and, dar nazdiki-ye ?ānhā zandegi mi-kon-and.
enjoy not-are-they neighborhood

?in do xānevāde benodrat hamdigar-rā molāqāt mi-kon-and.
rarely one another meet do

ruz-e ǰom?e gozašte ?ānhā hamdigar-rā molāqāt kard-and.
day Friday past

pas az ?ānke be xāne resid-and šoru? be qeybatgu?i kard-and.
after of that to home arrive- began to gossiping did-

dar maǰmu?, ?āqāye ?ahmadi fekr mi-kon-ad ke ?u divāne ?ast
crazy

?ammā ?āqāye kamāli fekr ne-mi-kon-ad ke ?u divāne ?ast
harčand hamsar-aš fekr mi-kon-ad ke ?u divāne ?ast.

4. ?āqāye ?ahmadi, hamsar-aš va doxtar-e-šan, maryam xānom
daughter-their Maryam Miss

ba?d ?az zohr-e yek ruz-e garm-e tābestāni be ?esteqbāl-e
after of noon warm summer

?āqāye kamāli, hamsar-aš va doxtar-e-šan, parvāne mi-rav-and.
Parvane go



pas ?az xordan-e ?asrāne, maryam va parvāne dar bāq-e manzel
 after having tea court house
 be dočarxe-savāri mi-pardāz-and. maryam ?axiran yek dočarxe-ye
 to bike-riding play recently
 no xaride-?ast. ruz-e ba?d, dočarxe gom mi-šav-ad. zāheran
 new bought-has next bicycle lost become apparently
 dočarxe-rā dozdide-and. maryam taqsir-rā be gardan-e parvāne
 stolen fault to neck

mi-?andāz-and. hič-kas ne-mi-dān-ad če-kasi dočarxe-rā dozdide
 put no one who

?ast. maryam va parvāne yekdigar-rā morede sarzaneš qarār
 each other blame place

mi-deh-and. Vāledeyn-e ?ānhā besyār negarān hast-and. ravābet-e
 give parents very anxious relation

xānevadegi dārad beham mi-xor-ad. maryam fekr mi-kon-ad ?u
 ?in vāqe?iyat-rā mi-dān-ad ke parvāne dočarxe-aš-rā dozdide ?ast
 this fact

harcānd pedar-aš bā nazar-e ?u movāfeq ni-st.
 although with idea agree not-is

5. goruhi ?az pesar-hā menjomle ?ali va hamid be piknik raft-and
 group-a of boy-pl including to picnic went-they

vazāyef-rā taqsīm kard-and va har kasi mas?uliyat-i-rā
 responsibility divide did any one responsibility-a-DO

bar ?ohde gereft. ?ali mas?uliyate poxt-o-paz va hamčenin pazirā?i-rā
 undertook cooking also entertaining

bar ?ohde dašt. hamid bā ?ajale vāred šod va be ?ali goft ke
 with hurry enter became and to said that

?u gorosne ?ast ?ammā ?ali vāqe?an ne-mi-dānest če-kasi
 hungry really not know who

gorosne ?ast.

hungry is-3rds

References

- [1] Beaugrande, Robert (de.) (1978). *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- [2] Beaugrande, Robert (de.) (1994). *Language, Discourse and Translation*. Amsterdam John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- [3] Casagrande, Joseph B. (1954). The ends of translation. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 20, 335-340.
- [4] Catford, John C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- [5] Chau, Simon (1986). How to translate "this is a red rose?", unpublished paper. Great Britain: Univ. of Edinburgh.
- [6] Delisle, Jean (1980). *L'analyse du discours comme methode de traduction*. Ottawa: Univ. of Ottawa Press.
- [7] Dilthey, W. (1961). *Pattern and Meaning in History*. New York.
- [8] Dilthey, W. (1976). *Selected Writings*. In. H. P. Richkman (ed.). Cambridge.
- [9] Gadamer, H. G. (1977). *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Translated by D. E. Linge. London.
- [10] Gadamer, H. G. (1983). *Reason in the Age of Science*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- [11] Gadamer, H. G. (1985). *Philosophical Apprenticeships*. Translated by R. Sullivan. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- [12] Gadamer, H. H. (1988). *Truth and Method*. London.
- [13] Gutt, Ernst (August, 1993). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. London: Blackwell.
- [14] Heidegger, M. (1975). *Nietzsche*. Vol. 1. Translated by P. Klossowski, Paris.
- [15] Heidegger, M. (1988). *Being and Time*. Translated by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. London.



- [16] Miremadi, Seyed-Ali. (1994). *Theories of Translation and Interpretation*. Tehran: SAMT Publications.
- [17] Miremadi, Seyed-Ali. (1998). *Persian Syntax: A G-B Based Grammar*. Tehran: SAMT Publications.
- [18] Newmark, Peter (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- [19] Nida, Eugene A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating, With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translations*. Leiden: Brill.
- [20] Nida, Eugene A. (1971). Semantic Components in Translation Theory. In G. E. Perron and Trim J. L. M (eds.), *Application of Linguistic Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics*.
- [21] Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber (1969). *Theory and Practice of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- [22] Rake'i, Fateme (1998). A hermeneutic analysis of Nima's poems. Unpublished Diss. Tarbiyat Moddares University. Tehran.
- [23] Reiss, Katharina (1977). *Texttyp Und Übersetzungsmethode, Der operative Text*. Kronberg/Ts.: Scriptor.
- [24] Schleirmacher, F. D. E. (1989). *Hermeneutique*. Translated by C. Berner Lille.
- [25] Toury, Gideon (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Jerusalem: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- [26] Vinay, Jean Paul (1958). *Stylistique comparee du francais et de l'anglais: Methode de traduction*. Paris: Beauchemin.
- [27] Wilss, Wolfram (1980). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Narr.
- [28] Ahmadi, Babak. *Saxtar va Taveel-e Matn: Shalude Shekani va Hermenotik*. Tehran: Nashre Markaz.
- [29] Ahmadi, Babak (1372, 1993). *Xerad-e Hermenotik*. Kelk Publications. Vol 38.
- [30] Ahmadi, Babak (1374, 1995). *Ketab-e Tardid*. Tehran: Nashr-e Markaz.
- [31] Mojtahede Shabastari, Mohammad (1375/1996). *Hermenotik, Ketab va Sonnat*. Tehran: Tarh-e Now Publications.
- [32] Monzavi, Ali-Naghi (1362). *Name-Ha-ye Aynolqozat-e Hamadani*. Tehran: Bonayad-e Farhang-e Iran Publications.