

Review Article: Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*¹

ERNST R. WENDLAND (UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH)

ABSTRACT

In the review that follows, I present a selective content summary of the sequence of chapters found in this book, accompanied by my critical comments and additions from the specific perspective of Bible translating. "Translation Studies" is a growing, interdisciplinary field, and therefore, it is important for Bible scholars to be aware of the main "theories and applications" that are popular nowadays. This is because the different viewpoints expressed concern not only the numerous Bible translations that are available in English and other languages, but they also relate, in varying degrees, to distinct hermeneutical approaches to the Scriptures.

A INTRODUCTION

Jeremy Munday is Senior Lecturer in Spanish studies and translation at the University of Leeds, UK. He is a freelance translator and also the author of a number of recognized works in the field of translation studies, including *Style and Ideology in Translation* (2008),² *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book* (with Basil Hatim, 2004),³ and *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (editor, 2009).⁴

According to the Introduction:

[This] book is designed to serve as a coursebook for undergraduate and postgraduate translation, translation studies, and translation theory, and also as a solid theoretical introduction to students, researchers, instructors, and professional translators. The aim is to

¹ Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, (2nd ed.; London, New York: Routledge, 2008), xv + 236 pp.; Price: US\$40.00 (Amazon); Paperback: ISBN10: 0-415-39693-x. The third edition of this book has just been published (2012), but an online survey revealed the text to be virtually the same as that of the second edition, except that the focus of the final chapter (11) has been changed from "New Directions from the New Media" to "Translation Studies as an Interdiscipline." In any case, the publication of this third edition gives a general indication of the popularity and influence of this book in the field of translation studies.

² Jeremy Munday, *Style and Ideology in Translation* (London/New York: Routledge, 2008).

³ Jeremy Munday and Basil Hatim, *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004).

⁴ Jeremy Munday, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 2009).

enable the readers to develop their understanding of the issues and associated metalanguage, and to begin to apply the models themselves (2).⁵

That is indeed a rather challenging job-description to fulfil, but in the opinion of this reviewer, Munday has quite satisfactorily accomplished his objectives. Each of the eleven chapters surveys a major area of theoretical interest within the broad field of “translation studies,” which is “the academic discipline related to the study of the theory and practice of translation” (1). This new edition includes an update of all references, new information content in all of the chapters, and an additional chapter on “new technologies” at the end. The author has attempted to maintain a rough chronological progression in developing his material—“from pre-twentieth-century theory in Chapter 2 to linguistic-oriented theories (Chapters 3-6 *passim*) and to more recent developments from cultural studies such as postcolonialism (Chapter 8)” (2). However, there is also a conceptual progression “since some of the earlier theories and concepts, such as equivalence and universals, are constantly being revisited” (2). All of the chapters follow the same easy-to-follow format:

- An introductory summary of the central issues along with some key concepts;
- A listing of primary scholarly references;
- An ordered presentation of the main content, namely, the chief theoretical models and related issues under discussion in the chapter;
- An illustrative case study (or two), which is then evaluated;
- A succinct chapter summary;
- Suggestions for further reading; and finally
- A series of various points for group discussion and future research.

The book includes an Appendix with many useful “internet links” (200-201), a number of mainly bibliographic endnotes (202-207), an extensive Bibliography proper (208-225), and a simple topical Index (226-238).

The author calls attention to the “selective” nature of his treatment and the fact that his book “gives preference to those theorists who have advanced major new ideas and gives less than sufficient due to the many scholars who work in the field producing detailed case studies or less high profile work” (2-

⁵ Unless specified otherwise, all page references are to the book under review: Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies*, 2nd ed..

3).⁶ However, I found that his treatment of the diverse fields being considered under translation studies was more than adequate. The examples used for illustration include a broad range of text-types and a relatively wide range of languages, all accompanied by literal English translations. My review follows the book’s sequence of chapters and will consist of a basic summary of the various topics discussed along with a critique that is governed by the perspective and concerns of biblical studies and more specifically of Bible translation—its “theory” (or models of conceptualization), principles, and applications. This will inevitably result in some significant omissions in my treatment of the book, especially its latter chapters, but that is necessary to keep this review more manageable and focused.

B MAIN ISSUES OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

Under “the concept of translation” (1.1), Munday rather basically defines the “process of translation” as involving “the translator changing an original written text (the source text or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or SL) into a written text (the target text or TT) in a different verbal language (the target language or TL)” (5). Although there is a deliberate decision “to focus on written translation rather than oral translation (the latter commonly known as interpreting...)” (5), the issue of *orality* cannot be dismissed so readily. That is because many Bible translators, to name one group (anthropologists and folklorists too) must, as part of their research, also deal with the translation of oral texts into written versions, and the meaningful phonological loss which occurs in such cases is a matter of major concern that should be addressed in any “coursebook” on translation. Furthermore, most Bible translations are at some point or another read aloud, often in a public place, e.g. during communal worship. Therefore, the text needs to be fashioned with the eventual medium of communication continually in mind. This vital oral-aural dimension is a factor that is not given the attention it warrants in most writings in the field of secular contemporary translation studies.⁷

After a survey sample of some of the main “specialized translating and interpreting courses,” books, journals, and international organizations that promote the field of translation studies (1.2), Munday turns to “a brief history of the discipline” (1.3). He traces its rudimentary development in the works of

⁶ Munday’s “Introduction” to the field of translation studies is nicely complemented by Anthony Pym’s somewhat more critical and technical *Exploring Translation Theories* (London/New York: Routledge, 2010), which I have reviewed for a forthcoming issue of *JNSL* (2012). Cf. Ernst R. Wendland, review of Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, forthcoming, *JNSL* (2012).

⁷ For a survey of the oral-aural dimension in relation to “Bible translation studies,” see Ernst R. Wendland, *Finding and Translating the Oral-aural Elements in Written Language: The Case of the New Testament Epistles* (Lewiston, US/Lampeter, UK: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008), ch. 1.

Cicero, Horace (both 1st century B.C.E.), and St. Jerome (4th century C.E.) and observes that “the study of the field developed into an academic discipline only in the second half of the twentieth century” (7). A seminal paper that “puts forward an overall framework, describing what translation studies covers” (9) was published by James Holmes in 1988.⁸ Holmes’s “map of translation studies” distinguishes among three primary categories—*theoretical*, *descriptive* (as developed by Descriptive Translation Studies, DTS), and *applied* (covering translator training, translation aids, and translation criticism) (9-10).⁹ Munday then surveys some of the main developments in translation studies “since the 1970s” (1.5), correctly drawing attention to “the interdisciplinarity of recent research” and writing (14). However, he cites with apparent approval an assertion that I would take issue with:

[T]here has been “a movement away from a prescriptive approach to translation to studying what translation actually looks like. Within this framework the choice of theory and methodology becomes important.”¹⁰

This quote seems to imply, mistakenly in my opinion, that the proponents of so-called “prescriptive” approaches (one might also term these, less pejoratively, as being “pedagogical”) either do not know “what translation actually looks like,” or their methodology does not take alternative approaches into adequate consideration. There is also the erroneous implication that “the choice of theory and methodology” was/is *not* “important” within the prescriptive perspective.

The first chapter ends with a statement of the “aim of this book and a guide to chapters” (1.6). As mentioned above, each chapter concludes with a series of “Discussion and research points.” These exercises are some of the best that I have seen in any workbook-style text on translation. To illustrate this point, I will close my discussion of each chapter by citing one of these (at times it is hard to select only one!), a procedure that has special relevance for Bible translators as well as their trainers and consultants:

(Q [Question set] 1) How is the practice of translation (and interpreting) structured in your country? How many universities offer first degrees in the subject? How many postgraduate courses are

⁸ James Holmes, “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies,” in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 180-192; this publication expanded upon a paper presented at an applied linguistics conference in 1972.

⁹ This map is elaborated upon also in Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies—And Beyond* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995), 10.

¹⁰ Munday here (15) cites Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad, eds., *New Tendencies in Translation Studies* (Göteborg: Göteborg University, Department of English, 2005), 1.

there? How do they differ? Is a postgraduate qualification a prerequisite for working as a professional translator? (17)

C TRANSLATION THEORY BEFORE THE 20th CENTURY

This is a very interesting chapter from the point of view of Bible translation because the historical background that Munday provides clearly reveals how the “literal” versus “free” rendering dichotomy has been a crucial issue for years—indeed, centuries—before the present day in which we work. However, the main issues are probably well known to most biblical scholars and translators, so I can be relatively brief in my description.

When introducing the section entitled “word-for-word or sense-for-sense” (2.1), Munday mentions George Steiner’s reference to the “sterile” debate over the “triad” of “literal,” “free,” and “faithful” translation (19). However, one might question the characterization of “sterile,” for how fruitless can a discussion or controversy be if it concerns a significant difference in the ultimate end product, namely, one’s translation? In any case, Munday goes back to reconsider the opinions of Cicero and St. Jerome, but he continues with a helpful overview of several notable works from “other rich and ancient translation traditions such as in China and the Arab world” (20). A section on Martin Luther (2.2) then leads to a concise discussion of faithfulness, spirit, and truth:

It is easy to see how, in the tradition of sacred texts, where “the Word of God” is paramount, there has been such an interconnection of fidelity (to both the words and the perceived sense), spirit (the energy of the words and the Holy Spirit) and truth (the “content”).
(25)

A consideration of some “early attempts at systematic translation theory” (2.4) includes reference to Dryden’s “three categories” of “metaphrase” (word-for-word rendition), “paraphrase” (sense-for-sense translation), and “imitation” (more or less “adaptation”); Dolet’s “five principles” (e.g. “The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL...”); and Tytler’s “three general laws” (e.g. “The translation should have all the ease of the original composition”) (26-27). “Schleiermacher and the valorization of the foreign” (2.5) highlights the well-known dictum: “Either the translator leaves the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him, or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him” (29). A brief summary of “translation theory of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Britain” (2.6) and a view “towards contemporary translation theory” (2.7) round out the theoretical portion of chapter 2.

In his discussion of “Case study 1: Assessment criteria,” Munday draws attention to the sometimes confusing relativity with which the key term “literal” is used in many translation evaluation procedures (31), which is a problem also in most articles dealing with the subject of Bible translation. On the

other hand in “Case study 2,” he points out the value of “the translator’s preface” (32-33), which is an important feature of all modern Bible translations, as one version attempts to distinguish or distance itself from the next. The following was a discussion point of particular interest:

(Q2) Modern translation theory tends to criticize the simplicity of the “literal” vs. “free” debate. Why, then, do you think that the vocabulary of that earlier period often continues to be used in reviews of translation, in comments by teachers and examiners, and in writings by literary translators themselves? (35)

D EQUIVALENCE AND EQUIVALENT EFFECT

The discussion of this chapter will be rather familiar to most Bible translation personnel, not only because it features the approach of Eugene A. Nida,¹¹ but also since it uses terminology that is associated with his methodology. Munday begins with earlier works by the Russian linguist and literary theorist Roman Jakobson and his views on “the nature of linguistic meaning and equivalence” (3.1). Jakobson proposed a fundamental threefold categorization of translation into “intralingual,” “interlingual,” and “intersemiotic” versions—or “rewording,” “translation proper,” and “transmutation” respectively (5). Translation always involves “equivalence in difference”; in other words, “For the message to be ‘equivalent’ in the ST [source text] and TT [target text], the code-units will be different since they belong to two different sign systems (languages) which partition reality differently...” (37).

Munday surveys “Nida and ‘the science of translating’” in one of the longest individual sections of his book (3.2). All of the main ideas of “early” Nida are summarized: “the nature of meaning: advances in semantics and pragmatics” (3.2.1; referential and emotive meaning, hierarchical structuring, componential analysis, semantic structure analysis), “the influence of Chomsky” (3.2.2; deep/surface structure, kernel sentence analysis, functional word classes—events, objects, abstracts, relationals), “formal and dynamic equivalence and the principle of equivalent effect,” or “response” (3.2.3). Unfortunately, Munday (like many other secular theorists) does not seem to consider the works of “later” Nida¹² or any of the writers who either attempted to further develop Nida’s approach or set out from him on a new theoretical tack.¹³ For

¹¹ Dr. Nida passed away in Madrid on August 25, 2011; he was 96.

¹² In particular, Jan de Waard and Eugene A. Nida, *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating* (Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1986). This deficiency of coverage is revealed also in the limited suggestions for “further reading” (53).

¹³ For example, Ernst R. Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture* (Dallas: SIL International, 2004); Timothy Wilt, *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2003); and with reference to Munday’s third edition, (2012):

example, Munday equates “dynamic” and “functional” equivalence, and although Nida does himself state that the two concepts are not “essentially different,”¹⁴ in fact, the latter incorporates a much more discriminating approach.¹⁵ Accordingly, Munday’s “discussion of the importance of Nida’s work” (3.2.4), along with the observations of several critics, is somewhat out-of-date, though his concluding summary is very much on target: “He (Nida) went a long way to producing a systematic analytical procedure for translators working in all kinds of text, and he factored into the translation equation the receivers of the TT and their cultural expectations” (44, cf. 52).

From Nida, Munday turns to P. Newmark and his distinction between “semantic and communicative translation” (3.3). After claiming that “Newmark departs from Nida’s receptor-oriented line,” Munday proceeds to cite the former’s crucial definition (44):

Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.¹⁶

Timothy Wilt and Ernst R. Wendland, *Scripture Frames & Framing: A Workbook for Bible Translators* (Stellenbosch: SUN Press, 2008).

¹⁴ Nida, *From One Language to Another*, vii.

¹⁵ For example, “dynamic equivalence” translation was defined “in terms of the degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language” and with reference to only three communicative functions: informative, expressive, and imperative. See Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 24-27. In contrast, in “functional equivalence” translation “the translator must seek to employ a functionally equivalent set of forms which in so far as possible will match the meaning of the original source-language text” (Nida, *From One Language to Another*, 36) and eight communicative functions are posited: “expressive, cognitive, interpersonal, informative, imperative, performative, emotive, and aesthetic” (Nida, *From One Language to Another*, 25). To complement this renewed focus on SL text analysis, additional rhetorical features are distinguished: “To accomplish the rhetorical functions of wholeness, aesthetic appeal, impact, appropriateness, coherence, progression-cohesion, focus, and emphasis, various rhetorical processes are employed. The principal ones are: (1) repetition, (2) compactness, (3) connectives, (4) rhythm, (5) shifts in expectancies..., and (6) the exploitation of similarities and contrasts in the selection and arrangement of the elements of a discourse” (Nida, *From One Language to Another*, 86, chs. 5-6; cf. Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, 12-16, 140-154).

¹⁶ Munday here cites Peter Newmark, *Approaches to Translation* (Oxford/New York: Pergamon, 1981), 39. Notice that the date of publication is much later than Nida’s *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.

In my opinion, Munday fails in his attempt to argue Newmark’s case that his notion of “communicative translation” and “semantic translation” are significantly different from Nida’s “dynamic equivalence” and “formal equivalence” respectively (44-45),¹⁷ but his summary of Newmark’s various “parameters” of translation (45) is helpful. Also useful is Koller’s distinction between “correspondence” and “equivalence” (3.4). The former is concerned with the linguistic similarities and differences of Saussure’s *langue* as viewed from the perspective of contrastive linguistics; the latter “relates to equivalent items in specific ST—TT pairs” and contexts of parole with reference to the translation of texts (46-47). Koller also distinguishes “five different types of equivalence”: denotative, connotative, text-normative, pragmatic, and formal (47-48).¹⁸

In a brief review of “later developments in equivalence” (3.5), Munday makes reference to several scholars who point out the problems that this notion presents theoretically, including “perhaps the biggest bone of contention,” namely, the identification of a valid “*tertium comparationis*, an invariant against which two segments can be measured to gauge variation” (49) when assessing the degree of equivalence between texts. However, Munday correctly calls attention to its practical relevance (49):¹⁹

Translator training courses also, perhaps inevitably, have this focus: errors by the trainee translators tend to be corrected prescriptively according to a notion of equivalence held by the trainer. For this reason, equivalence is an issue that will remain central to the practice of translation, even if it has been marginalized by some translation studies scholars.

Among several valuable “discussion and research points,” Munday proposes the following, which should provoke some lively interaction among a group of knowledgeable Bible scholars and translators as well as missiologists:

(Q3) “Nida provides an excellent model for translation which involves a manipulation of a text to serve the interests of a religious belief, but he fails to provide the groundwork for what the West in

¹⁷ On one page, Newmark claims that “the success of equivalent effect is ‘illusory’” (Newmark, *Approaches*, 38); on the next, he seeks a provision “that equivalent effect is secured” in a semantic translation (Newmark, *Approaches*, 39).

¹⁸ From Werner Koller, *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Heidelberg-Wiesbaden: Quelle and Meyer, 1979), 186-191.

¹⁹ Munday’s positive views on the notion of “equivalence” in translation studies are generally supported in Pym’s *Exploring Translation Theories*: “[N]atural equivalence is the basic theory in terms of which all the other paradigms in this book will be defined.” See Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 19.

general conceives of as a ‘science’” (Gentzler 2001:59).²⁰ Do you agree with Gentzler? Is this model tied to religious texts? How well does it work for other genres (e.g. advertising, scientific texts, literature, etc.)?

Indeed, one could critique Gentzler’s views somewhat further: What does he mean by the “manipulation of a text”—form, content, connotation, function, or everything? Can a “deconstructionist” like Gentzler (cf. Munday 43) fairly critique anyone else’s notion of “meaning” and how that may have been “manipulated” to serve one’s personal ends?²¹

E STUDYING TRANSLATION PRODUCT AND PROCESS

In this chapter, Munday looks at several prominent “linguistic approaches” that propose “detailed lists or taxonomies in an effort to categorize the translation process” (56). First, he surveys in some detail “Vinay and Darbelnet’s model” (4.1).²² This involves a pair of general translation strategies, “direct” (literal) and “oblique” (free) translation,²³ which comprise seven translation “procedures,” three for the direct method (borrowing, calque, and literal rendering), plus another four for the oblique method (transposition,²⁴ modulation,²⁵ equivalence,²⁶ and adaptation²⁷) (56-58). V&D recommend a basic five-step procedure, involving obligatory as well as optional changes, when “moving from ST to TT” (59): a) identify the units of translation, b) thoroughly analyze the SL text, c) conceptually reconstruct the “metalinguistic context of the message,” d) evaluate the stylistic effects, and e) produce, study, and then revise the TT.

²⁰ Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (2nd ed.; Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001).

²¹ “[I]n Gentzler’s view, dynamic equivalence serves the purpose of converting the receptors, no matter what their culture, to the dominant discourse and ideas of Protestant Christianity” (43).

²² Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation* (ed. and trans. Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995); trans. of *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais: Méthode de traduction* (Paris: Didier, 1958 [2nd ed. 1977]).

²³ One wonders if this nomenclature may have influenced that of Gutt’s later application of “relevance theory” to translation and the terms “direct” (relatively literal) and “indirect” (relatively free) versions. Cf. Ernst-August Gutt, *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 1991/2000), 186.

²⁴ “[A] change of one part of speech for another without changing the sense” (57).

²⁵ A semantic and/or syntactic adjustment that is required whenever a more literal rendering, though grammatical in the TL, “is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward” (57).

²⁶ “[W]here languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means” (58).

²⁷ “This involves changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture” (58).

V&D’s comparative stylistic method is illustrated later in a detailed “case study” (65-68). All of their principles and procedures, with examples, could be adapted for use in any basic Bible translator-training course.

The term translation “shift” seems to have been introduced into the discipline by John C. Catford in his pioneering study *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (4.2).²⁸ Catford posited “level shifts,” as between grammar and lexis, and “category shifts,” for example, “structural” (grammatical), “class” (one part of speech to another), “unit” (or “rank,” such as morpheme < word < phrase < clause < sentence), and “intra-system shifts” (e.g. from singular to plural) (61). Although very linguistically oriented, Catford also recognized that “translation equivalence depends on communicative features such as function, relevance, situation and culture” (61). Shortly after Catford, the influential “Prague School” of linguists and literary theorists also introduced the notion of “translation shifts” in their work (4.3), with special reference to “literary translation.” Jirí Levy, for example, sought to achieve “equivalent aesthetic effect” in terms of “denotative meaning, connotation, stylistic arrangement, syntax, sound repetition (rhythm, etc.), vowel length and articulation” (62).²⁹ Frantisek Miko also made an effort to retain “the expressive style of the ST,” including features such as “operativity, iconicity, subjectivity, affectation, prominence and contrast” (62).³⁰

Munday then makes a somewhat unexpected shift in topic to “the cognitive process of translation” (63), that is, moving from a focus on the “products” of translation to a consideration of “the cognitive processes of the translators themselves” (64). The first approach is Lederer’s “interpretive model”—a “three-stage process” involving “reading and understanding” the ST, a cognitive “deverbalization” process, and “re-expression” of the text in the TL (63).³¹ Although Munday downplays it, the correspondence between this proposal and

²⁸ John C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (Oxford: Oxford UP), 1965/2000.

²⁹ Jirí Levy, “Translation as a Decision Process,” (1967), in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 1st ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 2000), 148-159. It is interesting to note that in this same article, Levy also introduced an early edition of the “contextual effects” principle of Relevance Theory: “The translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called MINIMAX STRATEGY” (Levy, “Translation as a Decision Process,” 156; cf. Ernst-August Gutt, *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation* [Dallas/New York: SIL and UBS, 1992], 24, 42).

³⁰ Frantisek Miko, “La théorie de l’expression et la traduction,” in *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation* (ed. James S. Holmes; The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1970), 66.

³¹ Based on Marianne Lederer, *Translation: The Interpretive Model* (trans. Ninon Larché, Manchester: St. Jerome, 1994/2003).

Nida’s three-step “analysis—transfer—restructuring” process³² seems too close to be merely a coincidence. In any case, Bell’s “semantic structure analysis” approach presents a more explicit method for dealing with the “deverbalization” process, that is, by employing the “functional and pragmatic linguistic categories of clause structure, propositional content, thematic structure, register features, illocutionary force and speech act” (64).³³

Next, Munday briefly considers “relevance theory,” which “posits translation as an example of a communication based around a cause-and-effect model of inferencing and interpretation” (63). Thus, various “communicative clues” in the ST allow the necessary inferences to be made by translators, who must then “decide whether and how it is possible to communicate the informative intention, whether to translate descriptively or interpretively, what the degree of resemblance to the ST should be, and so on” (64). Unfortunately, Munday does not proceed to probe what these rather opaque directions might mean, or how they might be expressed in common language.³⁴ Finally, in his survey of “translation products and processes,” Munday makes reference to several empirical methodologies that attempt “to gather observational data towards the explanation of the decision-making processes of translation,” for example, “think-aloud protocols” and electronic software that records translator-in-action characteristics such as computer key-strokes and eye-focus (65).

In line with the chapter’s major “case study,” the following adapted (in brackets) “discussion point” is most relevant for Bible translators (69):

(Q3) Read Vinay and Darbelnet’s own description of their model and try to apply it to ST—TT pairs in your own language [with reference to an English text of Galatians 3:1-14]. Make a list of phenomena and difficult to categorize using their model. Are there any language combinations for which their taxonomy is problematic? [If so, list these and tell why they cause difficulties.]

F FUNCTIONAL THEORIES OF TRANSLATION

In this chapter Munday reviews a number of translation approaches, largely arising from Germany, that focus on the structure (text-type) and communicative function(s) of the text to be transmitted as well as the overall organization

³² Nida and Taber, *Theory and Practice*, 33.

³³ With reference to Roger Bell, *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice* (London/New York: Longman, 1991), 56.

³⁴ Although the claim is that “translation as *communication* can be explained using relevance theoretic concepts alone” (64), one wonders if this interpretive exercise might not itself violate the principle of not causing “unnecessary processing effort” (Gutt, *Relevance Theory*, 42), when one is confronted with definitions such as the following: “A receptor-language utterance is a direct translation of a source-language utterance if, and only if, it presumes to interpretively resemble the original completely (in the context envisaged for the original)” (Gutt, *Relevance Theory*, 66).

of a given translation project. All of these are highly relevant for those contemporary Bible translators and theorists who continue in the general tradition of Eugene A. Nida. This association with Nida is very apparent in the "text type" approach of Katharina Reiss (5.1), for example, in the three major categories posited—"informative," "expressive," and "operative" (72).³⁵ However, Reiss also adds a supplementary "audiomedial" function, one that has become increasingly important in today's multimedia age (72, cf. ch. 11). Reiss asserts that "the transmission of the predominant function of the ST is the determining factor by which the TT is judged," for example, "an informative text should transmit the full referential or conceptual content of the ST" (73). This is, of course, an important principle of Bible translation, although it is recognized that most texts of Scripture involve mixed, or "hybrid," types (genres). In addition to the "intralinguistic criteria," that is, "semantic, lexical, grammatical and stylistic features, by which the adequacy of a TT may be assessed," Reiss also draws attention to equally important "extralinguistic criteria" (74). These would include the translation project's situation or setting, time, place, receivers, and senders or "commissioners" (74), factors that are developed much more fully in the "translatorial action" model proposed by Justa Holz-Mänttäri (5.2),³⁶ Hans Vermeer's "Skopos theory" (5.3),³⁷ and the "text analysis" approach of Christiane Nord (5.4).

Skopos ("purpose") theory "focuses above all on the purpose of the translation, which determines the translation methods and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result" (79). Note the term "adequate" instead of "equivalent," for the assessment process in this case is to be carried out from the perspective of the intended TL readership. Thus, "the function of a [TT] in its target culture is not necessarily the same as in the source culture" (80). However, "this down-playing (or 'dethroning,' as Vermeer terms it) of the status of the ST" has caused quite a bit of controversy in translation circles, certainly in the case of high-value, authoritative texts such as any religious group's sacred Scriptures. A related criticism is that "Skopos theory does not pay sufficient attention to the linguistic nature of the ST nor to

³⁵ Katharina Reiss, "Text-Types, Translation-Types, and Translation Assessment," in *Readings in Translation Theory* (ed. and trans. Andrew Chesterman; Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 1977/1989), 108-9. These correspond to the informative, expressive, and imperative functions in Nida & Taber, *Theory and Practice*, 24-27.

³⁶ Justa Holz-Mänttäri, *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1984). Munday feels that while this approach helps to place translation "within its sociocultural context, including the interplay between the translator and the initiating institution," it suffers from "the complexity of its jargon...which does little to explain practical translation situations for the translator" (79).

³⁷ See, for example, Hans Vermeer, "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action," in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 1989/2004), 227-238.

the reproduction of microlevel features in the TT” (81). In short, one can seemingly re-create a ST in the TL, depending on the wishes or whims of the project organizer or commissioner, a problem that Nord specifically addresses (see below). On the other hand, it is good to find in this approach a special concern devoted to properly organizing a translation project so that it may be efficiently and effectively carried out (81). In this case then, the job commission (or “brief”) is comprised of a primary communicative objective, which may itself be manifold, plus a clear specification of all of the requirements according to which that goal (Skopos) may be achieved, e.g. a deadline/time frame, translator(s)’ conditions of service, work facilities and essential resources, procedures for text assessment and final production.

Munday rightly, in my opinion, devotes most space to the “text analysis” methodology of Christiane Nord,³⁸ which “pays more attention to [linguistic and literary] features of the ST” and thus involves “analyzing a complex series of interlinked extratextual factors and intratextual features in the ST” (82). The former concern is reflected in the previously noted “translation commission” (brief), which necessitates a comparative study of the respective ST and TT communication settings (“profiles”), for example intended text functions, the communicators (sender and recipient), medium, and motive (“why the ST was written and why it is being translated,” 83). Of course, in the case of a Bible translation, such a comparison will be much less detailed with respect to the ST context. The “role of the ST analysis” (e.g. content, including connotation and cohesion, presuppositions, sentence structure, lexis, suprasegmental features, text organization) then is to enable the project management committee “to decide on functional priorities of the translation strategy” (83). This leads, in turn, to the positing of “the functional hierarchy of translation problems,” including above all whether a “documentary” (relatively literal) or an “instrumental” (freer, more liberal) type of translation should be undertaken (82-83). This overview of Nord’s approach is followed by an illustrative “case study” involving an application to the translation of a selection from a beginner’s cookbook (84-86).

The following suggested exercise has been adjusted with specific reference to a Bible translation project (88, suggested modifications in brackets):

(Q7) According to skopos theory, a translation commission must give details of the purpose and function of the TT in order for adequate translatorial action to take place. Try to find examples of translation skopoi to see how detailed they are and to see what this reveals about the translation initiator: For instance, what kind of translation skopos is explicitly and implicitly stated in [a Bible

³⁸ For example, Christiane Nord, *Text Analysis in Translation* (trans. J. Groos; 2nd ed.; Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005); Christiane Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997).

translation project in your country]? If you have access to [the primary translators], investigate [to what extent they were involved in negotiating the *skopos* for their project].

G DISCOURSE AND REGISTER ANALYSIS APPROACHES

Munday begins by making the following distinction: “[W]hile *text analysis* normally concentrates on describing the way in which texts are organized (sentence structure, cohesion, etc.), *discourse analysis* looks at the way language communicates meaning and social power relations” (90, italics added). One might add that in the former there is a focus on *semantic* structure; in the latter, the emphasis is on *pragmatic* structure. Of course, in all approaches to the complexities of Bible translation there needs to be a careful mixture or combination of the two. This is what we have in “the Hallidayan model of language and discourse” (6.1), “systemic functional grammar,” especially in the description or application of three register-oriented “metafunctions,” namely, “ideational” (pertaining to “field”), “interpersonal” (pertaining to “tenor”), and “textual” (pertaining to “mode”) (91). However, since “[Michael] Halliday’s grammar is extremely complex” (91), translation theorists tend to work only with selected aspects of it.

“House’s model of translation quality assessment” (6.2) “involves a systematic comparison of the textual ‘profile’ of the ST and TT,” with special reference to “theme-dynamics,” “clausal linkage,” and “iconic linkage” (structural parallels) (92).³⁹ House also proposes that prominent register features of field, tenor, and mode be compared between the ST and TT in order to establish their respective profiles, which serve as the basis for producing “a statement of ‘mismatches’ or errors” that will guide the translation process. Two basic types of version may then be rendered (or something in between, depending on the job commission)—that is, a more literal “overt translation...that does not purport to be an original,” and a freer “covert translation...which enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture” (93). As in the case of most of the approaches or models in this section, so also House’s methodology is so complex that it can be practically applied by professional translators and/or linguists only to relatively small portions of SL text.

A partial exception to the preceding assertion is “Baker’s text and pragmatic level analysis: a coursebook for translators” (6.3), which examines equivalence relations on various “levels” within a text.⁴⁰ Here we have a less obscurely worded manual that was developed specifically for training transla-

³⁹ See Julianne House, *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1997).

⁴⁰ Mona Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (London/New York: Routledge, 1992). Munday’s book was published before the second updated and expanded edition of Baker’s text appeared (Routledge, 2011).

tors, including many simple examples and practical exercises. Baker simplifies many of Halliday’s concepts and renders them accessible to non-specialists in systemic functional grammar with regard to, for example, “thematic and information structures” (6.3.1), “cohesion” (6.3.2), and “pragmatics and translation” (6.3.3), including coherence, presupposition, and implicature (Grice’s maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner). Baker’s coursebook would be a welcome supplement and resource text in any Bible translator training course. Two other, more challenging, but still helpful applications of the Hallidayan model to translation studies are two works by Hatim and Mason that focus on “the semiotic level of context and discourse” (6.4).⁴¹ Particularly helpful is their distinction between “dynamic” and “stable” elements in a discourse, where the former refer to features that are non-obligatory and “marked” or distinctive in some way, as is typical of most literary, especially poetic, works. “Stable” elements then are the unmarked, normal features—the usual way of saying something in the genre under consideration. This leads to the following principle:⁴²

[M]ore “stable” STs may require a “fairly literal approach,” while, with more dynamic STs, “the translator is faced with more interesting challenges, and literal translation may no longer be an option.”

The main “criticisms of discourse and register analysis approaches to translation” (6.5) zero in on its Eurocentric linguistic and cultural focus. However, Halliday’s model does offer a useful methodology for linking “microlevel linguistic choices to the communicative function of a text and the sociocultural meaning behind it” (104). With regard to the model’s potential weakness, one might consider this exercise (106):

(Q4) “Grice’s maxims seem to reflect directly notions which are known to be valued in the English-speaking world, for instance, sincerity, brevity, and relevance” (Baker 1992:237).⁴³ Consider Grice’s maxims with relation to the languages in which you work. What examples can you find of different maxims? How can a translator deal with any differences?

H SYSTEMS THEORIES

The special contribution of “polysystem theory” (7.1) was that it viewed “translated literature as a system operating in the larger social, literary and historical systems of the target culture” (107-8). Attention is given then towards

⁴¹ Basil Hatim and Ian Mason, *Discourse and the Translator* (London/New York: Longman, 1990); Basil Hatim and Ian Mason, *The Translator as Communicator* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997).

⁴² Munday, 100, with reference to Hatim & Mason, *Translator as Communicator*, 30-31.

⁴³ Baker, *In Other Words*, 237

determining the relative evaluative “position” of various genres of translated literature in a given language community. This leads to an interesting hypothesis, one that may be assessed with reference to various Bible translations within a country or language community (109):

If it is primary, translators do not feel constrained to follow target literature models and are more prepared to break conventions. ... On the other hand, if translated literature is secondary, translators tend to use existing target-culture models for the TT and produce more “non-adequate” [i.e. TL oriented] translations.⁴⁴

However, this polysystem approach does not seem to take into consideration countries or languages which do not have much of an inventory in terms of written literature, but which do, on the other hand, manifest a rich oral tradition (“orature”) consisting of many distinctive genres and subtypes. Many of the language-cultures in Africa, for example, would fall into the latter category.

“Toury and descriptive translation studies” (DTS, 7.2) develop more fully the polysystem model in a more text-oriented, comparative approach. The aim is to (111):

build up a descriptive profile of translations according to genre, period, author, etc. In this way, the norms pertaining to each kind of genre can be identified with the ultimate aim...of stating laws of behaviour for translation in general.

Toury’s definition of “norms” is crucial in understanding his goal. This involves (111):

the translation [i.e. transformation] of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations.⁴⁵

As far as the translation of literature is concerned, the aim is to “identify the decision-making processes of the translator” on the basis of “norm-governed activity” that is identified in “the examination of texts” or those norms which are explicitly stated by translators and others in works about translation (112). Various norms are posited “of different intensity, ranging from behaviour that is mandatory . . . to tendencies that are common but not mandatory

⁴⁴ Itamar Even-Zohar, “The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem,” in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 1989/2004), 199-204.

⁴⁵ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 55. This quote certainly sounds more “prescriptive” than “descriptive” in nature; indeed, such “performance instructions” would seem to be most appropriately used in settings of translator training and instruction.

and to behaviour that is tolerated (minimum intensity).⁴⁶ The hope is that such norms, if found to be applicable in many other places in the world, will lead to the positing of “probabilistic ‘laws’ of translation,” such as the “law of growing standardization” and the “law of interference” (i.e. features from the ST) in translated literature (114). A corollary of the second is of particular interest in translations of the Bible (114):

[T]here is greater tolerance when translating from a prestigious language or culture, especially if the target language or culture is “minor.”

This is another reason that helps explain the literal nature of virtually all of the early missionary translations in the Bantu-speaking region of Africa (at least). On the other hand, Toury’s approach cannot assist in the actual qualitative evaluation of these early versions (or any others) simply because “equivalence is *assumed* between a TT and a ST” (113).

“Chesterman’s translation norms” (7.3), in contrast to those of Toury, operate under the clear recognition that they do, in fact, “exert a prescriptive pressure” (117),⁴⁷ that is, in either guiding or governing how translators carry out their work. Two basic types are posited: “product norms,” which “are established by the expectations of readers of a translation (of a given type) concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like,” and “professional norms,” which “regulate the translation process itself.”⁴⁸ The latter include an ethical, or “accountability,” norm, “dealing with professional standards of integrity and thoroughness,” a social, or “communication,” norm, which “works to ensure maximum communication between the parties” of a translation project, and a linguistic, or “relation,” norm, which deals with the relation between ST and TT.⁴⁹ These norms are expressed in very general terms, but they do include important issues that any Bible translation project too needs to take into serious consideration.

Munday presents several “other models of descriptive translation studies,” in particular, the perspectives of the so-called “Manipulation School,” which focuses on the norm-governed nature and social role of the translated literature in a given language.⁵⁰ In conclusion, my assessment would be that the types of investigation that DTS theorists engage in would be helpful to situate Bible translation activities within the broader framework of literature in a specific language community, but its recommended procedures are rather too

⁴⁶ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 67-69.

⁴⁷ Andrew Chesterman, *Memes of Translation* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997), 68.

⁴⁸ Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 64, 67.

⁴⁹ Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 68-70.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Theo Hermans, *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1985).

abstract or broad to be applied in an effort “to ‘reconstruct’ the norms at work in the translation process” (122). A potentially informative exercise along DTS lines would be the following (123, sentence in brackets added):

(Q2) Consider the position of translation in the polysystem of your own country. Does it occupy a primary or secondary position? Have there been noticeable changes over the years? What about translated literature’s own polysystem? Are there variations according to genre, SL, etc.? [Note in particular the function and assessment of Bible translations within the polysystem.]⁵¹

I CULTURAL AND IDEOLOGICAL TURNS

In his initial overview of the culture-focused approach to translation studies (8.0), Munday observes that its proponents more or less “dismiss” linguistic approaches to translation “and focus on the way in which culture impacts and constrains translation” (125).⁵² These theorists seek to promote a so-called “cultural turn” as they “move from translation as text to translation as culture and politics” (125).⁵³ But one might question whether such a metaphorical approach represents rather too great of a “turn,” for is not translation most explicitly about *texts* and the messages being transmitted thereby from one language (SL) and sociocultural setting to another (TL)? Furthermore, the implication given by some of the scholars in this camp that they are the ones who have brought cultural issues to the fore in the field of translation studies, when the reality is that Bible theorists and translators had been closely engaging with such cultural challenges, beginning some thirty years earlier in point of time.⁵⁴

⁵¹ See Winckler and Van der Merwe’s attempt to use Toury’s model as a teaching tool: Winckler, Walter and Christo H. J. van der Merwe, “Teaching Tomorrow’s Bible Translators in the Light of Today’s Translations.” *JNSL* 20 (1994): 79-109

⁵² As an early instance of this, Munday cites (136) Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 1980 [rev. ed. 2002]).

⁵³ An oft-cited early collection of studies in this area is Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre, eds., *Translation, History, and Culture* (London/New York: Routledge, 1990); e.g. Mary Snell-Hornby, “Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer: A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany,” in *Translation, History, and Culture* (ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre; London/New York: Routledge, 1990), 79-86. As one of the reviewers of my article noted: “these models [of ‘translation’] are often developed at institutions where the focus is on the analysis of literary texts—not the training of translators.”

⁵⁴ That is, much earlier than 1990. Many of the articles in early issues of *The Bible Translator* deal specifically with cultural issues being confronted in translations of the Scriptures in various languages, for example: “One of the greatest problems for the missionary or native (sic) translator is the cultural context in which he (sic) is translating,” see William D. Reyburn, “Certain Cameroon Translations: Analysis and Plans,” *BT* 9/4 (1958), 171-182 (181). Many of Eugene A. Nida’s earlier works also

In ch. 8 then, Munday considers “three areas where cultural studies has influenced translation studies in the course of the 1990s” (125), and I would suggest, right up to the present day: “translation as rewriting, which is a development of systems theory” (8.1), “translation and gender” (8.2), “translation and postcolonialism” (8.3). Perhaps it is understandable that those scholars who promote the “cultural turn” tend to be uncritical of “the ideologies and agendas that drive their own criticisms,” and yet, as Munday notes, “there is also a strong element of conflict and competition between them” (136).⁵⁵ However, since this movement “might also be described as an attempt by cultural studies to colonize the less established field of translation studies” through a hermeneutical “manipulation of texts,” STs as well as TTs (136),⁵⁶ I find much less in these writings of direct relevance to mainstream Bible translation.⁵⁷ Of course,

directly address the cultural dimension of interlingual communication, e.g. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions* (New York: Harper, 1954).

⁵⁵ In fact, some theorists in the ideological camp seem to promote the notion of conflict, for example: “[T]ranslation itself is a highly volatile act. As the displacement, replacement, transfer, and transformation of the original language, translation is incapable of fixing meanings across languages. Rather, as with the story of Babel, it consists precisely in the proliferation and confusion of possible meanings and therefore in the impossibility of arriving at a single one. . . . It is precisely the disordering effect of war on our notions of space and time that brings it in association with translation that tends to scatter meaning, displace origins, and expose the radical undecidability of references, names, and addresses.” See Vicente L. Rafael, “Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire,” *Translation* (Inaugural Issue) (2011): 51-52, (excerpt reprinted from *Social Text* 101/27/4, [2009]). Indeed, with such a bleak outlook on the profession and its prospect, who would wish to translate at all?

⁵⁶ Some non-Western theorists “criticize translation studies itself for its largely western orientation” (133), for example, Tejaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 48-49.

⁵⁷ Once the concept of “translation” becomes *metaphorical*, there is apparently no limit to where or how it may be applied in “post-translation studies, where translation is viewed as fundamentally transdisciplinary, mobile, and open-ended. . . . Today, translation has to be considered as a transformative representation of, in, and among cultures and individuals. . . . Translation is moving away from being simply a concept based in certain disciplines to being an epistemological principle applicable to the whole field of humanistic, social, and natural sciences.” See Stefano Arduini and Siri Nergaard, “Translation: A New Paradigm,” *Translation* (Inaugural Issue) (2011): 8, 12, 14). The problem is, of course, that a concept thus expanded to encompass and embrace everything from a open-minded transdisciplinary perspective ultimately communicates nothing; rather, it must be continuously redefined or explained to fit the specific context in which it is being used. If “[a] whole range of changing human, institutional and cultural experiences are deemed to fall under the rubric of the translational,” the term translation itself becomes “in some sense an empty signifier.”

such an opinion may simply be attributed to my own agenda and translation “location” (including a history that reaches back to the [late] colonial age), and so perhaps the less I say by way of critical remarks concerning the cultural turn movement, the better. Thus, I will leave this section with just a few selected quotes and comments.

A consideration of the “ideological” factor in translation (126), can turn out to be very significant in the case of “interconfessional” projects, where, for example, Catholic and various Protestant as well as “independent” local denominations must learn to compromise and work together with respect to such potentially controversial issues as orthography (e.g. “Yesu” or “Jeso”), key terms (e.g. the name of “God” or “Yahweh/Jehovah”), and style (e.g. where an older “missionary” version is still popular). In the case of any Bible translation, any agenda-motivated “re-writing” of the original text in translation would be unwelcome, unless the version is intended for use in some niche constituency or is being prepared explicitly as an “adaptation” of the Scriptures, for example:

The feminist translator, affirming her critical difference, her delight in interminable re-reading and re-writing, flaunts the signs of her manipulation of the text.⁵⁸

Similarly, the application of modern, largely Western-originated ideologies, such as “queer theory” (130) in a Bible translation enterprise (for example, to “rewrite” certain controversial passages) becomes problematic, especially in many corners of Africa.⁵⁹ In the case of “postcolonial” translation theory, the issue of “power relations,” past and present, come to the fore, with special reference to certain personnel (e.g. Western missionaries) and colonial languages (e.g. English, French, Spanish, Portuguese). Thus, we read about “examples of the colonizer’s imposition of ideological values,” such as the “missionaries who ran schools for the colonized and also performed a role as linguists and translators” (132),⁶⁰ with these “power relations being played out

See Robert J. C. Young, “Some Questions About Translation and the Production of Knowledge,” *Translation* (Inaugural Issue), (2011): 59.

⁵⁸ Barbara Godard, “Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation,” in *Translation, History, and Culture* (ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre; London/New York: Routledge, 1990), 91.

⁵⁹ “Queer is by definition whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant. There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers. It is an identity without an essence. ‘Queer’ then, demarcates not a positivity but a positionality vis-à-vis the normative.” See David Halperin, *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 62. The problem here for Bible translators arises in the case of passages where “the normal, the legitimate, [or] the dominant” happens to be the undisputable majority interpretation of recognized Scripture scholars and commentators.

⁶⁰ With reference to Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 33-34.

in the unequal struggle of various local languages against ‘the one master-language of our postcolonial world, English’” (133).⁶¹ Of course, global languages like English do present problems for national legislators, educators, language-planners, and Bible translation strategists alike.⁶² But it must also be remembered that it is no longer the colonialists who are making the crucial legislative decisions in these matters, especially in cases where this means essentially retaining the colonial status quo. Hence, the following queries are important (140, material in brackets added):

(Q7) How far do you agree with Niranjana that translation studies [and/or Bible translations in your country] has been overly dominated by western theories [and/or languages]? If this is true, how can or should the situation be changed?

J THE ROLE OF THE TRANSLATOR: VISIBILITY, ETHICS, AND SOCIOLOGY

As its heading might suggest, chapter 9 takes up a number of diverse topics, some of which are only indirectly connected with “the role of the translator.” The main unifying subject would appear to be the ideas of Lawrence Venuti, which appear in several sections. When considering “the cultural and political agenda of translation” then (9.1), Munday begins with Venuti’s concern over “the ‘invisibility’ of the translator,” with particular reference to their work “in contemporary Anglo-American culture” (9.1.1). But to a great extent, this problem (if actually genuine and widely recognized) is self-caused, that is, “by the way translators themselves tend to translate ‘fluently’ into English, thus creating an ‘illusion of transparency’” (144).⁶³ And the reason for this appears to be pure practicality, for “[a] translated text...is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently.”⁶⁴ So why should translators, whether of secular or scriptural works, change their procedure if it is what their target constituency wants?

⁶¹ Citing Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (London/New York: Routledge, 1999), 13.

⁶² Karen Bennett, for example, calls attention to “the ‘epistemicide’ caused by the dominance of English scientific and academic style, which effectively eliminates (or at least massively overshadows) more traditional, discursive...writing” in the vernacular (137, with reference to Karen Bennett, “Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse,” *The Translator* 13/2 [2007]: 111-128). A similar negative result is obtained, for example, in the case of a minority language Bible translation project whose translators cannot access the text via the original languages and must base their renderings on English versions, whether more or less literal (e.g. ESV) and/or free (e.g. CEV).

⁶³ With reference to Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London/New York: Routledge, 1995/2008), 1.

⁶⁴ Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility*, loc.cit.

Munday overviews Venuti's socio-political agenda under the theme "domestication and foreignization" (9.1.2). The problem of overly "fluent" translations (into English) is due to a policy of domestication, which involves "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to [Anglo-American] target-language cultural values" by means of an "invisible style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT" (144). A "foreignizing" approach, on the other hand, which is Venuti's ideal, adopts the strategy of "resistance," that is, "a non-fluent or estranging translation style designed to make visible the presence of the translator by highlighting the identity of the ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture" (145). However, one does seriously question whether a "foreignized" version is able to accomplish all the Venuti aspires for it. A far more likely outcome is that the translator would simply be judged to be technically poor or incompetent due to the "foreign-sounding" text that s/he has put forward for publication. In the case of Scripture translations, on the other hand, the situation is rather more complicated, and the "acceptability" of a translation depends on other significant factors, such as, the history of translations in the language concerned, the number of different versions available and their relative popularity, the theological evaluation of certain translations (usually too "free") by critical church denominations, the nature and purpose of the version involved, and so forth.

Also an enthusiastic supporter of "the foreign in translation," A. Berman promotes what he terms "the 'negative analytic' of translation" (9.1.3), which embraces any technique that opposes the "strategy of 'naturalization'" (147). Within the latter procedure, he identifies twelve "deforming tendencies," including "rationalization" (of syntactic structures), "clarification" (e.g. explication), "expansion" (again, for the sake of clarity in the TT), and "the destruction of rhythms...underlying networks of signification...linguistic patterning... idioms" (147-148).⁶⁵ Berman praises the "literal translation," which in his opinion "restores the particular signifying process of [SL literary] works...and, on the other hand, transforms the translating language."⁶⁶ While such a procedure might work out successfully in English and other languages with a long literary history, it certainly fails in the various Bantu languages that I am acquainted with, where such a literalistic policy only "transforms the translating language" for the worse. Indeed, I have also found "fluency" in the TT to be a desirable quality, but one that is achieved through the perceptive and competent use of the full linguistic and literary resources of the TL.⁶⁷ Munday

⁶⁵ From Antoine Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 280.

⁶⁶ Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," 288-289.

⁶⁷ Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, ch. 8.

presents a critical summary of Venuti’s approach (and others like it) in section 9.4, basing his observations largely on the work of Pym.⁶⁸

Four other, somewhat disconnected topics are also considered in ch. 9, which in the interest of space, I will simply mention in passing:

- “The position and positionality of the literary translator” (9.2): This issue again deals with theorists and practitioners who call for a greater “visibility” of translators in their work, for example through the use of “creative” techniques, especially in the case of poetic literature (150).
- “The power network of the publishing industry” (9.3): This is a significant consideration also in the production of Bible translations whenever the legibility of the text/readability of the page is decreased by strict rules of format, such as a relatively small font size, two columns of print, and worst of all, the practice of “justification,” resulting in much hyphenization in the case of agglutinative languages like those of the Bantu group.
- “The reception and reviewing of translations” (9.5): Here is another vital factor that concerns Scripture translations as well, indeed, to a much greater extent, since the drafts of selected books need to be carefully “tested” among the target group before the whole Bible is published—and periodically thereafter, in preparation for a future revised edition.⁶⁹
- “The sociology and historiography of translation” (9.6): “The study of translators” (157) is not so much in focus where the history of Bible translation is concerned (though influential individuals are not ignored), but rather the multifaceted history of entire projects, involving many different contributors over the years until a particular version is finally published.⁷⁰

Following up then from the preceding point, one might consider this exercise for possible research (160, material in brackets added):

(Q10) Many translation theorists speak of the need for more “raw material”...about translators, their history, and their working practices. What works of translation historiography have been published concerning your languages? Where might you find out? What kinds of “raw material” might be available and how might you go about

⁶⁸ Anthony Pym, “Venuti’s Visibility,” *Target* 8/1 (1996): 165-177.

⁶⁹ For a detailed model for translation testing, see Ernst R. Wendland, *Contextual Frames of Reference in Bible Translation* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2008), 226-239.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Philip Noss, ed., *A History of Bible Translation* (Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007): “With the publication of this book, the Nida Institute for Biblical Scholarship at the American Bible Society (www.nidainstitute.org) launches a comprehensive history of Bible translation” (xix).

researching it [with specific reference to the Bible translations available in your country]?

K PHILOSOPHICAL THEORIES OF TRANSLATION

I must admit that I had to scratch my head in the search for relevance as I read through this chapter, which deals with “modern philosophical approaches to translation that have sought out the essence of (generally literary) translation” (162). To be sure, the several theories discussed are certainly important in literary studies and comparative literature, but I found little of significance that I could either apply or meaningfully relate to the specific field of Bible translation, which is the focus of this review. As a result, I will simply note the various topics discussed and make a few comments along the way.

Munday begins with “Steiner’s Hermeneutic Motion” approach (10.1), which is delineated in the “hugely influential” work *After Babel*:⁷¹

The hermeneutic motion which forms the core of Steiner’s description (pp. 312-435) consists of four parts: (1) initiative trust; (2) aggression (or penetration); (3) incorporation (or embodiment); and (4) compensation (or restitution). (163)⁷²

Unfortunately, Steiner’s explanations of his terms and ideas (as paraphrased or cited by Munday) are of little help, for example, if one would like to know what constitutes a “good translation” (166):

Good translation...can be defined as that in which the dialectic of impenetrability and ingress, of intractable alienness and felt “at-homeness” remains unresolved, but expressive. Out of the tension of resistance and affinity, a tension directly proportional to the proximity of the two languages and historical communities, grows the elucidative strangeness of the great translation.⁷³

Indeed, one wonders how true Munday’s claim is that “Steiner’s work...has introduced many non-specialists to translation theory” (167)!

We turn next to “Ezra Pound and the energy of language” (10.2), which refers to Pound’s efforts to search out “the expressive qualities of language, seeking to energize language by clarity, rhythm, sound and form, rather than sense” (167). In my opinion, however, such an important goal cannot be easily achieved (if at all) by the “archaizing,” “foreignizing strategy” that he pro-

⁷¹ George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (London/Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975 [3rd ed., 1998]).

⁷² Once again we hear echoes of Nida’s three-stage approach to translation: analysis—transfer—restructuring, at least in Munday’s description of Steiner’s moves (Nida & Taber, *Theory and Practice*, 33).

⁷³ Steiner, *After Babel*, 413.

pounded.⁷⁴ The same applies to the literalizing methodology that Walter Benjamin saw as “the task of the translator” (10.3)—in his words, “a ‘literal rendering’ which allows the ‘pure language’ to shine through” (169).

It is the task of the translator to release in his own language that pure language which is under the spell of another, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work.⁷⁵

The fulsome philosophizing aside, such an approach does not present much of a “task” or challenge, for all the translator really needs are a TL good grammar and lexicon and s/he is ready to match words with the ST. Thus, the ultimate, in Benjamin’s opinion, the “ideal” Bible translation, would be “an interlinear version” (169)!⁷⁶

In the case of “Deconstruction” (10.4) we reach the limits of comprehension (or incomprehension), as we must “[suspend] all that we take for granted about language, experience, and the ‘normal’ possibilities of communication” (170).⁷⁷ “Its leading figure is the French philosopher Jacques Derrida,” who employs terminology that is “complex and shifting, like the meaning it dismantles” (170)—or seeks to destabilize. Accordingly, there can be no “relevance” in translation “because, in Derrida’s view, a relevant translation relies on the supposed stability of the signified—signifier relationship” (171).⁷⁸ Such a philosophical perspective promotes an “abusive fidelity” that “involves risk-taking and experimentation with the expressive and rhetorical patterns of language, supplementing the ST, giving it renewed energy...[tampering] with usage” (172). The result is inevitably a new text, one that reflects the image of its creator—and hence cannot be called a “translation” in the usual sense at all, certainly not where the Scriptures are concerned. As Munday himself observes in his “discussion of case study 2”: “[S]uch a translation strategy demands a certain ‘leap of faith’ from the reader to accept that the translator’s experimentation is not just facile wordplay,” which may in fact “be easier if the text in question is philosophical” (177).⁷⁹ In the case of this chapter (alone), there

⁷⁴ One can judge for oneself by reading the various selections to be found in Ezra Pound, *The Translations of Ezra Pound* (London: Faber & Faber, 1953).

⁷⁵ With reference to Walter Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator” (trans. Harry Zohn), in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 82.

⁷⁶ Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator” 83.

⁷⁷ Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1991), xi.

⁷⁸ Jacques Derrida, “What Is a ‘Relevant’ Translation?,” in *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed. Lawrence Venuti; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 425.

⁷⁹ “Facile wordplay” indeed—so much so that when attempting to read and comprehend the writings of these translation philosophers, one requires the assistance of an intralingual “translator” to help decipher them. For example: “Cultural difference emerges from the borderline moments of translation that Benjamin

were no "discussion and research points" (178) of special interest or importance, that is, from the viewpoint of Bible translating.⁸⁰

L NEW DIRECTIONS FROM THE NEW MEDIA

Munday ends his study with a survey of the newest and most dynamic field of translation studies where we have a semiotic shift from the printed page to diverse "new media," involving the audio, visual, audio-visual, and electronic channels of communication. "Although they do not represent a new theoretical model, the emergence and proliferation of new technologies have transformed translation practice and are now exerting an impact on research and, as a consequence, on the theorization of translation" (179). In this chapter, along with "audiovisual translation" (11.2), Munday also considers the influence of "corpus-based translation studies" (11.1) and the adaptive strategies necessitated by "localization and globalization" (11.3).

The approach of "corpus linguistics" employs the manifold text-processing capacity of the computer:

to create an electronic *corpus*...of naturally occurring texts...that could then be processed and analyzed with software to investigate the use and patterns of the word forms it contained...particularly collocations and typical uses of lexical items. (180)

Three different types of corpora are currently being used in translation-oriented research: "monolingual corpora," which are analyzed generally for features of "natural" or "normal" usage in a language, "comparable bilingual corpora," which investigate selected linguistic features in similar sets of texts in two different languages, and "parallel corpora, of ST-TT pairs, which, when aligned (sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph), can allow the strategies employed by the translator(s) [in the TT] to be investigated" (181).

describes as the 'foreignness' of languages. Translation represents only an extreme instance of the figurative fate of writing that repeatedly generates a movement of equivalence between representation and reference but never gets beyond the equivocation of the sign. The 'foreignness' of language is the nucleus of untranslatable that goes beyond the transparency of subject matter." See Homi K. Bhabha, "DissemiNation," in *Nation and Narration* (ed. Homi K. Bhabha; London/New York: Routledge, 1990), 315; (pp. 314-315 reprinted in *Translation* [Inaugural Issue] [2011]:24-25).

⁸⁰ In this case, a "suggested project" from Pym's roughly parallel chapter on "uncertainty theories" might help. For example, *true or false*: "Meanings are always context-bound" and more or less stable "depending on our viewpoint and our circumstances"; hence, "no translation will ever be definite or universally acceptable, [and] no translation will ever escape ideology or perspectivism." See Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 119, citing Rosemary Arrojo and Andrew Chesterman, "Forum: Shared Ground in Translation Studies," *Target* 12/1 (2000): 151. What are the practical implications of such a perspective?

Although such text comparative and contrastive studies are popular in some circles (mainly in Europe) the results thus far are not all that earth-shaking (cf. the case study on pp. 192-193) and have not as yet been applied to an appreciable extent in the field of Bible translation.

Similarly, in the area of “audiovisual translation,” it seems that most scholarly efforts in translation studies has been more or less limited to theoretical explorations, with practical applications largely limited to “screen translation,” that is, textual subtitling and vocal dubbing (11.2.2; cf. the “case study” on pp. 193-194). Applied research in Bible translation studies appear to have gone much more broadly and deeply with concrete experimentation in languages all over the world. For example, an early review of these developments states:

Multimedia translation begins where print translation leaves off, engaging with issues that print translation never needs to face or resolve. ... [T]hanks to a sociosemiotic approach to translation...coupled with the power of digital media, it can reproduce more than just rhetorical, grammatical, and lexical meaning. ... for example, the images and sounds, together with the cultural, historical, aesthetic, and performative information that also constitutes the meaning of biblical discourse.⁸¹

More recently then a “multimodal” approach to communication has also been proposed and applied in modern translation studies (187), for example, to describe “the signifying codes of cinematographic language,” that is, the linguistic, paralinguistic, musical, sound arrangement, iconographic, photographic, planning, mobility, graphic, and syntactic codes (188-189).⁸²

“Globalization” is a term that is becoming ever more prominent in the news with reference to all aspects of human communal endeavour, from commerce to communication. It commonly denotes the expansion of large multinational businesses and corporations into markets throughout the world, accompanied by infusions of capital investment. Such development obviously calls for “localization,” which “involves taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold” (191).⁸³ Many quick and accurate translations

⁸¹ Robert Hodgson and Paul A. Soukup, eds., *From One Medium to Another: Basic Issues for Communicating the Scriptures in New Media* (New York: American Bible Society, 1997), 8. Of course, the theory to more fully support such claims developed somewhat later in “cognitive linguistics” (cf. Wendland, *Contextual Frames*, 19-35).

⁸² With reference to Frederick Chaume, “Film Studies and Translation Studies,” *Meta* 49/1 (2004): 17-22.

⁸³ Munday cited this from LISA (the Localisation Industry Standards Association), www.lisa.org. However, “LISA closed on 28 February 2011 and their website went

are an essential element in such efforts, which often turn to machine translation (computer software) to provide ready TT drafts of a basic “internationalized” version in the SL (an “interlingua version”), which is normally some language of wider communication (191). The development of various computer programs for assisting the translation as well as the production process has also been going on in Bible translation circles for many years,⁸⁴ the sophistication and quality of these tools in many respects matching or even surpassing those available on/for the secular market. Munday suggests a practical exercise to research this last point (196):

(Q10) How are translation memory and other computer-assisted translation tools changing the way translators work? How do theories of equivalence and function, amongst others, need to adapt to this new translation scenario?

M CONCLUDING REMARKS

I found three items of special interest in Munday’s relatively short conclusion—a timely warning, an interesting case study, and a final word of encouragement. The warning is borrowed from Chesterman’s concept of “consilience” (197):

He considers that translation studies has been importing concepts and methodologies from other disciplines “at a superficial level” which tends to lead to “misunderstandings” since translation-oriented researchers often lack expertise in the other field and may even be borrowing outdated ideas.⁸⁵

offline shortly afterwards” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Localization_Industry_Standards_Association).

⁸⁴ For example, the *Biblical Analysis and Research Tool* (BART, SIL International), *Paratext* (United Bible Societies), *Logos 4 Bible Software*, *Adapt-It* (Word for the World).

⁸⁵ Andrew Chesterman, “Towards Consilience?” in *New Tendencies in Translation Studies* (ed. Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad; Göteborg: Göteborg University, Department of English, 2005), 19. The problems posed by Chesterman would appear to be magnified and multiplied by a modern prospectus such as the following: “[T]ranslation has become a fecund and frequent metaphor for our intercultural world... We welcome new concepts that speak about translation and hope to reshape translation discourse within these new terms and ideas. To achieve this goal, we must go beyond the traditional borders of the discipline, and even beyond interdisciplinary studies. . . . In an epistemological sphere it becomes less important to distinguish and define clearly what translation is and what it is not, what stands inside the borders of translation and what stands outside. . . . [T]ranslational processes are fundamental for the creation of culture(s) and identities, for the ongoing life of culture(s), and for the creation of social and economic values” (Arduini and Nergaard, “A New Paradigm,” 8, 9-10, 13). Within this “new paradigm,” does the notion of *translation* actually

One of the reasons that Bible translation theorists need to keep abreast with the new developments and debates in translation studies is to avoid such superficial or extraneous “consilience” in their own specialized field. On the other hand, theorists in translation studies could learn a thing or two from the field of Bible translation, especially in terms of practical applications, for example: (a) employing a cognitive perspective in translation assessment, for example, the activity of summarizing to evaluate the ease of text processing;⁸⁶ (b) paying greater attention to the oral-aural dimension of texts when preparing a translation;⁸⁷ (c) making use of the increasingly sophisticated tools of electronic text processing that are becoming available;⁸⁸ and (d) contributing to a fuller scope of the “interdisciplinary” character of modern translation studies, including its history, theories, methodologies, specific problem areas, organizational operations, networking facilities, and so forth.⁸⁹

The final illustrative case refers to “a close study of the strategies employed in King Alfred’s translation of Boethius’s *De consolatione philosophiae*

“mean” anything—other than some sort of general sociocultural *transformation* as viewed from the perspective of a certain individual’s (or group’s) “rhizomatic” reconceptualization (Arduini and Nergaard, “A New Paradigm,” 9)?

⁸⁶ There are “two types of translations: one which is intended to be analyzed by its user and one that is to be synthesized. They are roughly equivalent to [Bible] translations for study and translations for reading, but the similarity is only rough. The *analytic* vis-a-vis *synthetic* distinction is to emphasize the cognitive process by which one uses the translation. . . . I can’t help but think that a good text—that is, a well written [synthetic] one—enables a reader to summarize.” See Mike Sangrey, “When Summarizing Is Too Hard,” n.p. (cited 7 March 2012), online: <http://betterbibles.com/2012/03/07>.

⁸⁷ See, for example, the articles in James Maxey and Ernst R. Wendland, eds., *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance* (Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, forthcoming).

⁸⁸ “Computers have moved from being simple word-processors to being resource providers, text manipulators and checkers, and translation environments (using platforms such as Paratext and Translator’s Workplace), and this progress has been universally welcomed and celebrated. But the degree to which machines should be used to actually do translation has been more controversial.” See Simon Crisp and Brian Harmelink, “Computers as Translators: Translation or Treason?” *The Bible Translator* 62/2 (2011): 59-60. The various articles in *The Bible Translator* 62/2 (2011) debate this issue: “Computers as Translators: Translation or Treason?”

⁸⁹ Indeed, the only new(er) chapter (11) in Munday’s third edition focuses on “translation studies as an interdisciplinary.” The question is, why should a more thorough and comprehensive treatment of the field of “Bible translation studies” not be included?

from Latin to Old English in late ninth-century England (198). The author discusses:⁹⁰

How Alfred’s aim [was] to educate his people through his translations was realized through a translation strategy of the domestication of lexis and syntax to make the target text more comprehensible (p. 124). Despite the difference in prestige and resources available to Latin and English, Alfred used relatively few borrowings and calques (pp. 15-16) and aimed mainly at using language that was recognizable and acceptable to the target text audience.

Bravo King Alfred! In conclusion then (199):

The wealth of work and the number of scholars worldwide who now locate themselves within translation studies is a testimony to its growth and popularity. Trends and fashions change over time, of course, so it is imperative now that those within the field continue both their specialization, understanding and using new tools and methodologies at their disposal, and working collaboratively for the better comprehension of the ways in which translation operates at all levels.

So whether one is working on sacred texts or secular works, it is clear that the potential for instructive correction as well as conceptual enrichment is mutual, and the possibility of some collaborative, truly multidisciplinary engagement in translation studies “at large” is perhaps greater now than it has ever been before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aijmer, Karin and Cecilia Alvstad, eds. *New Tendencies in Translation Studies*. Göteborg: Göteborg University, Department of English, 2005.

Arduini, Stefano and Siri Nergaard. “Translation: A New Paradigm.” *Translation* (Inaugural Issue) (2011): 8-15.

Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London/New York: Routledge, 1992.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 1980 (rev. ed. 2002).

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevre, eds. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bassnett, Susan and Harish Trivedi. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.

Bell, Roger. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman, 1991.

⁹⁰ With reference to Nicole G. Discenza, *The King’s English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2005).

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Translated by Harry Zohn. Pages 75-83 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Bennett, Karen. "Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse." *The Translator* 13/2 (2007): 111-128.

Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Pages 276-289 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Dissemination." Pages 314-315 in *Nation and Narration*. Edited by Homi K. Bhabha. London/New York: Routledge, 1990. (Pp. 314-315 reprinted in *Translation* [Inaugural Issue] [2011]: 24-25).

Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965/2000.

Chaume, Frederick. "Film Studies and Translation Studies." *Meta* 49/1 (2004): 12-24.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997.

_____. "Towards Consilience?" Pages 19-28 in *New Tendencies in Translation Studies*. Edited by Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad. Göteborg: Göteborg University, Department of English, 2005.

Chesterman, Andrew and Rosemary Arrojo. "Forum: Shared Ground in Translation Studies." *Target* 12/1 (2000): 151-160.

Crisp, Simon and Brian Harmelink. "Computers as Translators: Translation or Treason?" *The Bible Translator* 62/2 (2011): 59-60.

Derrida, Jacques. "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" Pages 423-447 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Discenza, Nicole G. *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Poly-system." Pages 199-204 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

Godard, Barbara. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation." Pages 87-96 in *Translation, History, and Culture*. Edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Gutt, Ernst-August. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1991/2000.

_____. *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation*. Dallas/New York: SIL and UBS, 1992.

Halperin, David. *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman, 1990.

_____. *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.

Hermans, Theo. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1985.

Hodgson, Robert and Paul A. Soukup, eds. *From One Medium to Another: Basic Issues for Communicating the Scriptures in New Media*. New York: American Bible Society, 1997.

Holmes, James. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." Pages 180-192 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa. *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1984.

House, Julianne. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1997/2011.

Koller, Werner. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg-Wiesbaden: Quelle and Meyer, 1979.

Lederer, Marianne. *Translation: The Interpretive Model*. Translated by N. Larché. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1994/2003.

Levy, Jirí. "Translation as a Decision Process." (1967). Pages 148-159 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 1st ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2000.

Maxey, James and Ernst R. Wendland, eds. *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, forthcoming.

Miko, Frantisek. "La théorie de l'expression et la traduction." Pages 61-77 in *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Edited by James S. Holmes. The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1970.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2008.

———. *Style and Ideology in Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, 2008.

———, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 2009.

Munday, Jeremy and Basil Hatim. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon, 1981.

Nida, Eugene A. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions*. New York: Harper, 1954.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Nord, Christiane. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur, vol. 94. Translated by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

———. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Noss, Philip, ed. *A History of Bible Translation*. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007.

Pound, Ezra. *The Translations of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber & Faber, 1953.

Pym, Anthony. "Venuti's Visibility." *Target* 8/1 (1996): 165-177.

_____. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London/New York: Routledge, 2010.

Rafael, Vicente L. "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire." *Translation* (Inaugural Issue) (2011): 51-52.

Reiss, Katharina. "Text-types, Translation-types, and Translation Assessment." Translated by Andrew Chesterman. Pages 105-115 in *Readings in Translation Theory*. Edited by Andrew Chesterman. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 1977/1989.

Reyburn, William D. "Certain Cameroon Translations: Analysis and Plans." *The Bible Translator* 9/4 (1958): 171-182.

Sager, Juan C. and Marie-Josée Hamel. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

Sangrey, Mike. "When Summarizing Is Too Hard." No Pages. Cited 7 March 2012. Online: <http://betterbibles.com/2012/03/07>.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. "Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer: A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany." Pages 79-86 in *Translation, History, and Culture*. Edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London/Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975 (3rd ed., 1998).

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies—And Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge, 1995/2008.

Vermeer, Hans. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." Pages 227-238 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Edited and translated by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. *Translation of Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier, 1958 (2nd ed. 1977).

de Waard, Jan and Eugene A. Nida. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1986.

Wendland, Ernst R. *Translating the Literature of Scripture*. Dallas: SIL International, 2004.

_____. *Finding and Translating the Oral-Aural Elements in Written Language: The Case of the New Testament Epistles*. Lewiston, US/Lampeter, UK: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008.

_____. *Contextual Frames of Reference in Bible Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2008.

_____. Review of Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*. Forthcoming (2012).

Wilt, Timothy, ed. *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2003.

Wilt, Timothy and Ernst R. Wendland. *Scripture Frames & Framing: A Workbook for Bible Translators*. Stellenbosch: SUN Press, 2008.

454 Wendland, “Review article: Jeremy Munday,” *OTE* 25/2 (2012): 421-454

Winckler, Walter and Christo H. J. van der Merwe. “Teaching Tomorrow’s Bible Translators in the Light of Today’s Translations.” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994): 79-109.

Young, Robert J. C. “Some Questions About Translation and the Production of Knowledge.” *Translation* (Inaugural Issue) (2011): 59-61.

Ernst Wendland, *Centre for Bible Interpretation and Translation in Africa* and the Department of Ancient Studies, University of Stellenbosch. Email: erwendland@gmail.com.