RESEARCH ARTICLE

LINGUISTIC AND SOCIO-CULTURAL APPROACHES TO TRANSLATION: THEORETICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL REFLECTIONS

Hosni Mostafa El-daly
Department of Cognitive Sciences
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
United Arab Emirates University
P.O.Box: 15551, Al-Ain, U.A.E.
E-mail: hasan.mostafa@uaeu.ac.ae

ABSTRACT

Translation was initially studied as a linguistic phenomenon and, accordingly, Translation Studies (TS was conceived as a linguistic discipline. The past twenty years or so have seen the focus of (TS) shift away from linguistics and increasingly to forms of cultural studies. The purpose of the present study is three-fold. First, on the grounds of the conviction that linguistic theory has more to offer to translation theory than is so far recognized, this study aims to show the interrelationships between linguistics and (TS). Second, because there has been a great focus on using English only as a medium of instruction in all courses taught in the United Arab Emirates University, this study attempts to answer the questions, 'how much translation is permitted in foreign language teaching?', and 'what are the factors that determine the quantity to be used?'. Third, it attempts to give some indication of the kind of work that has been done so far in (TS) within the framework of cultural studies.

The discussion in the present study proceeds primarily from the perspectives of (TS); Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition Research. It argues that inside or between languages, human communication equals translation, and a study of translation is a study of language. Moreover, disregarding L_2 learners' native language and considering it 'a bogey to be shunned at all costs' is a myth. Relatedly, providing maximum exposure to the foreign language may help in learning that language but, sometimes, at the expense of understanding and intelligibility.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Linguistic Approaches, Cultural Studies, Translation in Foreign Language Teaching.

1. Introduction

The activity of translation has a long-standing tradition and has been widely practiced throughout history, but in our rapidly changing world its role has become of paramount importance. Nowadays, in which cultural exchanges have been widening, knowledge has been increasingly expanding and international communication has been intensifying, the phenomenon of translation has become fundamental. Be it for

scientific, medical, technological, commercial, legal, cultural or literary purposes, today human communication depends heavily on translation and, consequently, interest in the field is also growing. However, translation is occasionally taken too lightly by some. Therefore, before starting a project that involved translation, we should bear in mind some misconceptions regarding translation. First, some people may, mistakenly, think that knowing a foreign language makes a translator. Being able to read, speak and write a foreign language does not give anyone license to undertake translation work. A translator must have in-depth understanding and knowledge of at least two languages: a foreign language and a mother tongue. Since translating is a skill, a translator must be able to write well and have an excellent command of the nuances in language use. In addition, language is not free of cultural influences. If the culture behind the language which is being translated is not appreciated, an accurate translation is extremely difficult. Second, translation has been perceived as a secondary activity, as a 'mechanical' rather than a 'creative' process, within the competence of anyone with a basic grounding in a language other than their own, in short, as a low status occupation (Bassnett, 1996). Translation is, as Quirk (1974: 12) puts it, 'one of the most difficult task that a writer can take upon himself.' That translation involves far more than a working acquaintance with two languages is aptly summed up by Levy (1963) (Cited in Holmes, 1970), when he declares that a translation is not a monistic composition, but an interpenetration and conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are the semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation. Manfredi, (2008) has, recently, pointed out that language is not a simple matter of vocabulary and grammar, but that it can never be separated from the culture it operates in and is always part of a context. In short, a translator deals with two different cultures, the source and the target one, and is often faced with the problem of identifying culture specificity, which obliges finding a way to convey those features to his or her culture audience. Translation can be very intricate, complex, and arduous work. Having to simultaneously concentrate on two different texts is mentally exhausting. This is because a translator is continuously moving between two languages and mind frames.

The third misconception is that computers can now do translation. No translation program can and ever will be able to take the place of a human translator. This is because computers do not understand what language is and how it is used. Computers may be able to translate simple one-dimensional sentences, but they will never be able to tackle the complexities within literature or technical texts. Moreover, some may believe that having a professional translation is not crucial. It may be true that professional translators are not always necessary; however, if the translation is to be accurate and professionally prepared and presented, then, an experienced translator is crucial. Bad translations lead to many problems including people misunderstanding texts which ultimately reflect poorly on a company or organization. As Payne (2004: 16) pointed out "If you want your car fixed you take it to a mechanic, not a car salesman. He may know a bit about cars but not enough to address your problems properly". On the other hand, translation study in English has devoted much time to the problem of finding a term to describe translation itself. Some scholars such as Savory (1957) define translation as an 'art'; others, such as Jacobsen (1958) define it as a 'craft'; while others, perhaps more sensibly, borrow from the German and describe it as a 'science'. Frenz (1961) even goes so far as to opt for 'art' but with qualifications, claiming that translation is neither a creative art nor an imitative art, but stands somewhere between the two. This emphasis on terminological debate in English points again to the problematic of English Translation Studies, in which a value system underlies the choice of term. "Craft' would imply a slightly lower status than 'art' and carry with it suggestions of amateurishness, while 'science' could hint at a mechanistic approach and detract from the notion that translation is a creative process. At all events, the pursual of such a debate is purposeless and can only draw attention away from the central problem of finding a terminology that can be utilized in the systematic study of translation (Bassnett, 1996). Belloc (1931: 32) summed up the problem of status and his words are still perfectly applicable today: "The art of translation is a subsidiary art and derivative. On this account it has never been granted the dignity of original work and has suffered too much in the general judgment of letters. This natural underestimation of its value has had the bad practical effect of lowering the standard demanded, and in some periods has almost destroyed the art altogether. The corresponding misunderstanding of its character has added to its degradation: neither its importance nor its difficulty has been grasped.

2. Statement of the Problem

One of the goals of the present study is to consider the impact of linguistics on the work of the translator and vice versa, and to look for areas where the theoretical study of language can continue to bring insights to the translator's task. This paper has emerged out of the conviction that linguistic theory has more to offer to translation theory than is so far recognized, and vice versa. One reason for the relative separation between the two fields is the domination of formal approaches to language study over modern linguistic thinking and research for a considerable period. Formal approaches to language, with their focus on structure and confinement to the sentence boundaries, are of limited benefit to translation theory and practice, for which a textually oriented approach is more appropriate. With the spread of functional linguistics in the last three decades, there have been growing hopes for establishing links between linguistics and translation studies. Although there have been a number of contributions in this direction, much work is still possible, and still required, to help establish such links (Al-Wahy, 1999; Hatim & Mason, 1990). Halliday (1961: 57) made the remark: "it might be of interest to set up a linguistic model of the translation process, starting not from any preconceived notions from outside the field of language study, but on the basis of linguistic concepts". The translation theorists, almost without exception, have made little systematic use of the techniques and insights of contemporary linguistics (the linguistics of the last twenty years or so) and the linguists, for their part, have been at best neutral and at worst hostile to the notation of a theory of translation (Gutknecht, 2001). This state of affairs seems particularly paradoxical when one recognizes the stated goal of translation: the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as is possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text. It does seem strange that such a process should, apparently, be of no interest to linguistics, since the explanation of the phenomenon would present an enormous challenge to linguistic theories and provide an ideal testing ground for them. It is, equally, difficult to see how translation theorists can move beyond the subjective and normative evaluation of texts without drawing heavily on linguistics. The need for access to and familiarity with the accumulated knowledge about the nature and function of language and the methodology of linguistic enquiry must become more and more pressing and less and less deniable if translation theory is to shake off individualist anecdotalism and the tendency to issue arbitrary lists of 'rules' for the creation of 'correct' translations and set about providing systematic and objective description of the process of translation. This paradox has arisen as a result of a fundamental misunderstanding, by both translation theorists and linguists, of what is involved in translation, which has led, inevitably, to the failure to build a theory of translation which is at all satisfactory in a theoretical or an applied sense (Ibid: 693).

3. Theoretical Framework

In his book, "The Science of Linguistics [In] the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation", Malone (1988: 1) explains that the use of the preposition 'in' meant to convey that linguistics is being put at the service of translation. He, further, claims that "it would be equally legitimate and important to study the interface of both on an equal basis or to subordinate translation to linguistics" Hatim & Mason (1990) suggest some of the reasons why earlier developments in linguistics theory were of relatively little interest to translators. Structural linguistics sought to describe language as a system of interdependent elements and to characterize the behaviour of individual items and categories on the basis on their distribution. Morphology and syntax constituted the main areas of analysis, largely to the exclusion of the intractable problem of meaning, which was either ignored or else dealt with purely in terms of the distribution of lexical items. In their evaluation of this issue, Hatim & Mason (1990: 25) argue that "since meaning is at the very heart of the translator's work, it follows that the postponement of semantic investigation in American linguistics was bound to create a gap between linguistics and translation studies. Quite simply, linguists and translators were not talking about the same thing". According to Hatim & Mason (1990: 22), the emergence of linguistics as a new discipline in the twentieth century brought a spirit of optimism to the pursuit of language study, a feeling that the groundwork was at last being laid for a systematic and scientific approach to the description of language.

In addition, linguistic description was in general limited to single language systems. For the translator, every problem involved two language systems. However, structuralist theories of language were, nevertheless, influential in translation theory and there were some serious attempts to apply structuralist notions to translation problems (Catford, 1965). As a result of Catford's work with its emphasis on contextual meaning and the social context of situation in which language activity takes place, translation theory becomes a branch of contrastive linguistics, and translation problems become a matter of the non-correspondence of certain formal categories in different languages. According to Nida (1964), the non-correspondence of grammatical and lexical categories is the main source of information loss and gain in translation.

Hymes's (1971) notion of "communicative competence" is directly relevant to translation studies. As Hatim & Mason (1990: 33) point out, "the translator's communicative competence is attuned to what is communicatively appropriate in both SL and TL communities and individual acts of translation may be evaluated in terms of their appropriateness to the context of their use". In recent years, the scope of linguistics has widened beyond the confines of the individual sentence. Text linguistics attempts to account for the form of texts in terms of their users. If we accept that meaning is something that is negotiated between producers and receivers of texts, it follows that the translator, as a special kind of text user, intervenes in this process of negotiation, to relay it across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In doing so, the translator is necessarily handling such matters as intended meaning, implied meaning, presupposed meaning, all on the basis of the evidence which the text supplies. The various domains of sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse linguistics are all areas of study which are germane to this process (Hatim & Mason 1990: 33). The following checklist serves as a guide to the points on which linguistic theory might be expected to be of relevance to translation practice. It specifies the cognitive and linguistic tasks carried out by the translator (Hatim & Mason, 1990: 21-22). (1) Comprehension of source text: (a) parsing of text (grammar and lexis); (b) access to specialized knowledge; and (c) access to intended meanings. (2) Transfer of meaning: (a) relaying lexical meaning; b) relaying grammatical meanings; and (c) relying rhetorical meaning, including implied or inferable meaning, for potential readers. (3) Assessment of target text: (a) readability; (b) conforming to generic and discoursal TL conventions; and (c) judging adequacy of translation for specified purpose.

In their evaluation of all these developments, Hatim & Mason (1990: 35) said that "Taken together, all of these developments …… have provided a new direction for translation studies. It is one which restores to the translator the central role in a process of cross-cultural communication and ceases to regard equivalence merely as a matter of entities within texts.

4. Discussion

4.1. Translation and linguistic-based approaches

Linguistics-based approaches define translation as transferring meanings, as substituting source language (SL) signs by equivalent target language (TL) signs (Catford, 1965). The source text (ST) is to be reproduced in the TL as closely as possible, both in content and in form. Since the aim of a translation theory has often been seen as determining appropriate translation methods, language systems (as languages) have been studied in order to find the smallest equivalent units (at the lexical and grammatical levels) which can be substituted for each other in an actual text (as parole). Text linguistic approaches define translation as source text induced target text (TT) production (Neubert, 1985). The text itself is treated as the unit of translation, and it is stressed that a text is always a text in a situation and in a culture. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to situational factors, genre or text-typological conventions, addresses knowledge and expectations, and text functions.   The central notion of equivalence is now applied to the textual level, and defined as communicative equivalence, i.e, a relationship between the target text and the source text in which TT and ST are of equal value in the respective communicative situations in their cultures. Functionalist approaches define translation as purposeful captivity (Nord, 1997), as transcultural interaction, as production of a TT which is appropriate for its specified purpose (its skopos) for target addressees in target circumstances (Vermeer's 'skopos theory', Vermeer, 1996). The actual form of the TT, its textual linguistic make-up, is therefore dependent on its intended purpose, and not (exclusively) on the structure of the ST. The yardstick for assessing the quality

of target text is, thus, its appropriateness for its purpose, and not the equivalence to the source text. More modern linguistic approaches acknowledge that translation is not a simple substitution process, but rather the result of a complex text -processing activity. However, they argue that translations need to be set apart from other kinds of derived texts, and that the label 'translation' should only be applied to those cases where an equivalence relation obtains between ST and TT (House, 1997).

During its development, the focus of Translation Studies has, thus, shifted markedly from linguistic towards contextual and cultural factors which affect translation. Major inspiration for the development of the discipline has also come from research conducted with the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), aiming at the description of translating and translations "as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience" (Holmes, 1998: 71). DTS and postmodern theories thus define translation as norm-governed behavior (Toury, 1995) and / or a cultural political practice (Venuti, 1996: 197). Modern translation studies see itself increasingly as an empirical discipline, aiming to describe translations (both as products and processes), to explain why translators act in certain ways and produce target texts of a specific profile, and to assess effects of translations. The question, then, is what is it that the translation can characteristically bring to the linguist's work which should not continue to be ignored? On the one hand, as linguists, there is an opportunity of seeking the universal through the particularity of languages, drawing on the comparisons and equivalences sought by the translator in professional work. Much more than this, however, if only translation research would focus more on it, is the opportunity translation (or more exactly, translating) gives to the linguists in understanding how it is that we do construct texts and how we do go about making meanings. In short, it concentrates our attention on the process in a very tangible and goal-directed way (Gutknecht, 2001). Translators as applied linguists do have certain obligations to the furthering of our understanding of language and of our ability to explain the acts of communicating in which we are continually engaged. As Candlin (1990: viii) points out, when we read or hear any language from the past, or when we receive as human beings any message from any other human being, we perform an act of translation. Such an act involves (1) an understanding of the cultural and experimental words that lie behind the original act of speaking or of writing, ways into their schemata; (2) an understanding of the potential of the two semiotic systems in terms of their image-making; (3) a making intelligible of the linguistic choices expressed in the message; (4) an opportunity to explore the social psychological intentions of the originator or the message matched against one's own, and (5) a challenge to match all of these with our appropriate response in our semiotic and linguistic system, and our culture.

There has been an influence on linguistics of work done in the area of translation studies. The use of translating as a tool in language teaching has been of interest to many in applied linguistics (Widdowson, 1979), while psycholinguistics and the study of bilingualism are concerned with the evidence provided by 'natural' or spontaneous translation. In this regard, Candlin (1990: ix) maintains that "translation allows us to put language into perspective by asserting the need to extend beyond the opposite selection of phrases to an investigative exploration of the signs of a culture, and to the social and individual motivations for choices. It offers the possibility of unraveling the complex of human and conceptual relations which go the make up the contexts in which we communicate. As such, it is as much social as linguistic …. It offers a broader conception of what it means to understand". Translation is a useful test case for examining the whole issue of the role of language in social life. In creating a new act of communication out of a previously existing one, translators are inevitably acting under the pressure of their own social conditioning while at the same time trying to assist in the negotiation of meaning between the producer of the source-language text (ST) and the reader of the target-language text (TT), both of whom exist within their own, different social frameworks. In studying this complex process at work, we are in effect seeking insights which take us beyond translation itself towards the whole relationship between the language activity and the social context in which it takes place (Hatim & Mason, 1990: 1). They further argue that translation is a "Communicative transaction taking place within a social framework" (p. 2). As Robinson (2005: 142) points out, 'a useful way of thinking about translation and language is that translators do not translate words; they translate what people do with words. Translation is, after all, an operation performed both on and in language'.

4.2. What is Translation? Two Definitions / Two Issues

The study of translation has been dominated, and to a degree still is, by the debate about its status as an art or a science. The linguist approaches translation from a 'scientific' point of view, seeking to create some kind of 'objective' description of the phenomenon. It could, however, be argued that translation is an 'art' or a 'craft' and therefore not amenable to objective, 'scientific' description, and explanation. Translation can be defined as "the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language" (Meetham & Hudson, 1969). The authors continue and make the problem of equivalence very plain: "Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent), in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc.) and at different ranks (word – for – word, phrase – for – Phrase, sentence – for- sentence" (p. 10). Total equivalence is a chimera. Languages are different from each other; they are different in form having distinct codes and rules regulating the construction of grammatical stretches of language and these forms have different meanings. To shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally; there is no absolute synonymy between words in the same language. Something is always 'lost' in the process and translators can find themselves being accused of reproducing only part of the original and so 'betraying' the author's intentions (Bell, 1994).

Equivalence is probably the most controversial notion in Translation Studies. Some translation scholars reject this notion outright, arguing that by retaining 'equivalence' in the vocabulary, translation scholars sidestep the issue that "it is difference, not sameness or transparency or equality, which is inscribed in the operations of translation" (Hermans, 1998: 61). This view is also expressed in current approaches that are inspired by postmodern theories and Cultural Studies, which argue that texts do not have any intrinsically stable meaning that could be repeated elsewhere (Arrojo, 1998; Venuti, 1995). For Venuti, the target text should be "the site where a different culture emerges, where a reader gets a glimpse of a cultural other" (Venuti, 1995: 306). The translator has the option, then, of focusing on finding formal equivalents which 'preserve' the context – free semantic sense of the text at the expense of its context – sensitive communicative value or finding functional equivalents which 'preserve' the context – sensitive communicative value of the text at the expense of its context – free semantic sense. The choice is between translating word-for-word (literal translation) or meaning for-meaning (free translation). As Bell (1994: 5) points out, pick the first and the translator is criticized for the 'ugliness' of a 'faithful' translation; pick the second and there is criticism of the 'inaccuracy' of a 'beautiful' translation. Either way it seems, the translator cannot win, even though we recognize that the crucial variable is the purpose for which the translation is being made, not some inherent characteristic of the text itself.

According to Hatim & Mason (1990), there is a problem concerning "the use of the term 'equivalence' in connection with translation. It implies that complete equivalence is an achievable goal, as if there were such a thing as a formally or dynamically equivalent target-language (TL) version of a source-language (SL) text. Accordingly, they argue that the term 'equivalence' is usually intended in a relative sense, and the concept of 'adequacy' in translation is perhaps a more useful one. Adequacy of a given translation procedure can then be judged in terms of the specification of the translation task to be performed and in terms of users' needs". (p. 8). Nida (1964) made a distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence refers to the closest possible match of form and content between (SR) and (TT), whereas "dynamic equivalence" refers to the principle of equivalence of effect on reader of (TT). By making this distinction, Nida shifts attention away from the sterile debate of free versus literal towards the effects of different translation strategies. Nida (1964: 160) claims that 'the present direction is toward increasing emphasis on dynamic equivalence'. In this connection, Newmark (1981: 39) prefers the terms 'semantic' and 'communicative' translation. Hatim & Mason (1990: 7) maintain that "useful as these concepts are, however, they are beset with problems. On the one hand, all translation is, in a sense, communicative. Similarly, a translator who aims at formal equivalence usually has good reasons for doing so and the formally equivalent version may well, in fact, achieve equivalence of reader response. Consequently, it seems preferable to handle the issue in terms of equivalence of intended effects,

Hosni Mostafa El-daly

thus linking judgements about what the translator seeks to achieve to judgements about the intended meaning of the ST speaker/writer. Here we are in the domain of pragmatics"

Closely related to 'the literal versus free issue' is the debate on the primacy of content over form or vice versa. The translator is here faced with what amounts to a conflict of interests. The ideal, according to Hatim & Mason (1990) would be to translate both form and content, but this is frequently not possible. According to Nida (1964), the overriding criteria are (1) type of discourse, and (2) reader response: "the standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse differ radically from language to language" (p. 169). Thus, adherence to the style of the source text may, in certain circumstances, be unnecessary or even counterproductive. In this regard, Hatim & Mason (1990) maintained that "the term 'style' seems to have become a kind of umbrella heading, under which are lumped together all kinds of textual/contextual variables….. 'style' may be seen as the result of motivated choices made by text producers" (p. 10). This means that 'style' in this sense, is not a property of the language system as a whole but of particular languages users in particular kinds of settings.

In addition, there are two very different kinds or rule which control behavior, (1) those which regulate an already existing activity and (2) those which define an activity which neither pre-exists the formulation of the rules nor can be thought to have any existence without them. The 'rules' and 'principles' promulgated for translation have, for centuries, been of this first, normative, regulatory type. Translators have been told what to do "prescriptive rules) and what not to do (proscriptive rules). The 'rules' discussed in linguistics, on the other hand, seek to be of the second, descriptive, constitutive type.   The contrast between what people ordinarily assume 'grammar' to mean and this, descriptive, orientation of the linguists is clearly paralleled in translation theory; the frequent assumption that the purpose of a theory of translation is to devise and impose prescriptive rules as a means of both regulating the process and evaluating the product (Gutknecht, 2001).

Tytler (1971) was the first whole book in English devoted to translation studies, propounds the 'laws of translation': (1) That the translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work; (2) that the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original, and (3) that the translation should have all the ease of original composition (Tytler 1971: 9). A more recent formulation of the 'basic requirements' of a translation are to be found in Nida (1964: 164): (1) making sense; (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original; (3) having a natural and easy form of expression, and (4) producing a similar response. Nida suggests that correspondence of meaning should, in the last resort, have priority over correspondence of style. An alternative definition, given below, makes a second crucial point by distinguishing 'process' from 'result'. According to Meethan and Hudson (1969), translation is the process or result of converting information from one language or language variety into another. The aim is to reproduce as accurately as possible all grammatical and lexical features of the 'source language' original by finding equivalents in the 'target language'. At the same time all information contained in the original text…. must be retained in the translation. There are, in fact, three distinguishable meanings for the word "translation". It can refer to: (1) translating: the process (to translate; the activity rather than the tangible object); (2) a translation: the product of the process of translating (i.e. the translated text); (3) translation: the abstract concept which encompasses both the process of translating and the product of that process. A theory of translation, to be comprehensive and useful, must attempt to describe and explain both the process and the product. Given that the process crucially involves language, we need to draw on the resources of linguistics and, more precisely, those branches of linguistics which are concerned with the psychological and social aspect of language use: psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics

4.2.1. Translator's Competence

'What is the translators' need to know and be able to do in order to translate?' We are seeking, in other words, a specification of 'translator competence'. In this regard, Bill (1994) argues that the professional (technical) translator has access to five distinct kinds of knowledge; target language (TL) knowledge; text-type knowledge; source language (SL)knowledge; subject area ('real world') knowledge; and contrastive knowledge. This means that the translator must know (a) how propositions are structured (semantic knowledge), (b) how

clauses can be synthesized to carry propositional content and analyzed to retrieve the content embedded in them (syntactic knowledge), and (c) how the clause can be realized as information bearing text and the text decomposed into the clause (pragmatic knowledge). Lack of knowledge or control in any of the three cases would mean that the translator could not translate. Without (a) and (b), even literal meaning would elude the translator. Without (c), meaning would be limited to the literal (semantic sense) carried by utterance which, though they might possess formal cohesion (being tangible realizations of clauses), would lack functional coherence and communicative value (Bell, 1994). As Raskin (1987) argues, given the goal of linguistics to match speaker's competence, an applied linguistic theory of translation should aim at matching the bilingual native speaker's translation competence. This would necessarily involve seeking an integration between the linguistic knowledge of the two languages with specific and general knowledge of the domain and of the world via comparative and contrastive linguistic knowledge.

One approach would be to focus on the competence of the 'ideal translator' or 'ideal bilingual' who would be an abstraction from actual bilinguals engaged in imperfectly performing tasks of translation…. but (unlike them) operating under none of the performance limitations that underlie the imperfections of actual translation (Katz, 1978). This approach reflects Chomsky's view of the goal of linguistic theory and his proposals for the specification of the competence of the 'ideal speaker-hearer'. Accordingly, translation theory is primarily concerned with an ideal bilingual reader-writer, who knows both languages perfectly and is unaffected by such theoretically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention or interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying this knowledge in actual performance.

An alternative to the 'ideal translator' model would be to adopt a less abstract approach and describe translation competence in terms of generalizations based on inferences drawn from the observation of translator performance. A study of this type suggests an inductive approach: finding features in the data of the product which suggest the existence of particular elements and systematic relations in the process. We would envisage a translator expert system (Bell, 1994). A final alternative would be to deny the competence-performance dichotomy and redefine our objective as the specification of a multi-component 'communicative competence' which would consist, minimally, of four areas of knowledge and skills; grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, discourse competence and strategic competence (Swain, 1985; Hymes, 1971). This approach would lead us (adapting Hymes' definition of communicative competence) to attempt to specify 'translator communicative competence': The knowledge and ability possessed by the translator which permits him/her to create communicative acts – discourse – which are not only (and not necessarily) grammatical but…socially appropriate (Halliday, 1985). A commitment to this position would make us assert the translator must possess linguistic competence in both languages and communicative competence in both cultures.

Accordingly, the issue of the impact of both native language and culture on L$_2$ learning as a whole, and on translating, in particular, is of theoretical and pedagogical significance, not only for linguists and language teachers, but also for translators, as well. The second goal of the present study, then, is to examine this controversial issue. The following review will examine the mother-tongue's effect on L$_2$ learning according to (1) the contrastive analysis hypothesis, (2) the error analysis hypothesis; (3) interlanguage framework, (4) markedness hypothesis, (5) Chomsky's universal grammar, (6) sociolinguistic framework, and (7) the cognitive theory. My review of these hypotheses or frameworks is not meant to provide a complete account of them, but rather to highlight how L$_1$ is conceived, and how much influence it has on shaping L$_2$ learners' performance. Both linguists and translators must consider the results of such research (See Anne Brooks-Lewis, 2009).

5. Cultural Paradigm

After two decades of fighting between linguistic oriented branches and literary-oriented branches, (TS) began to coordinate and respect varied approaches (Gentzler, 2014: 18). One of the first moves towards interdicsiplinarity can be considered Snell-Hornby's (1988/1995) "integrated approach". The approach was meant to bridge the gap between linguistic and literary-oriented methods. As Baker (1992) points out, although

initially focusing on literary translation, TS "[...] is now understood to refer to the academic discipline concerned with the study of translation at large, including literary and nonliterary translation" (1992: 277).

"Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions" (Toury 1978:200). As this statement implies, translators are permanently faced with the problem of how to treat the cultural aspects implicit in a source text (ST) and of finding the most appropriate technique of successfully conveying these aspects in the target language (TL). These problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned (see Nida 1964: 130). Language and culture may, then, be seen as being closely related and both aspects must be considered for translation. The notion of culture is essential to considering the implications for translation and, despite the differences in opinion as to whether language is part of culture or not, the two notions appear to be inseparable. Lotman's theory states that "no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language" (Lotman 1978:211-232). Bassnett (1980: 13-14) underlines the importance of this double consideration when translating by stating that language is "the heart within the body of culture," the survival of both aspects being interdependent. Linguistic notions of transferring meaning are seen as being only part of the translation process; "a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria" must also be considered. As Bassnett further points out, "the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version.....To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture into the TL culture is dangerous ground" (Bassnett, 1980:23). Thus, when translating, it is important to consider not only the lexical impact on the TL reader, but also the manner in which cultural aspects may be perceived and make translating decisions accordingly (See Sebba et al., 2011; Cornelia, 2022).

Denigration of linguistic models has occurred especially since the 1980s, when TS was characterized by the so-called 'cultural turn' (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990). What happened was a shift from linguistically oriented approaches to culturally oriented ones. Influenced by cultural studies, TS has put more emphasis on the cultural aspects of translation and even a linguist like Snell-Hornby (1987) has defined translation as a "cross-cultural event. Vermeer (1989) has claimed that a translator should be 'pluricultural' (see Snell-Hornby 1988: 46), while V. Ivir has gone so far as to state that "translating means translating cultures, not languages" (Ivir, 1987: 35). In this regard, El-dali (2011: 36) points out that, modern Translation Studies are no longer concerned with examining whether a translation has been "faithful" to a source text. Instead, the focus is on social, cultural, and communicative practices, on the cultural and ideological significance of translating and of translations, on the external politics of translation, on the relationship between translation behaviour and socio-cultural factors. In other words, there is a general recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon of translation, an increased concentration on social causation and human agency, and a focus on effects rather than on internal structures. The object of research of Translation Studies is thus not language(s), as traditionally seen, but human activity in different cultural contexts. The applicability of traditional binary opposites (such as source language/text/culture and target language/text/culture, content vs. form, literal vs. free translation) is called into question, and they are replaced by less stable notions (such as hybrid text, hybrid cultures, space-in-between, intercultural space). It is also widely accepted nowadays that Translation Studies is not a sub-discipline of applied linguistics or of comparative literature. However, since insights and methods from various other disciplines are of relevance for studying all aspects of translation as product and process, Translation Studies is often characterized as an interdiscipline (Snell-Hornby et al., 1992).

As Robinson (2005: 191) points out, it is probably safe to say that there has never been a time when the community of translators was unaware of cultural differences and their significance for translation. The more aware the translator can become of these differences, the better a translator will be. Nevertheless, Manfredi (2008:66) argues that taking account of culture does not necessarily mean having to dismiss any kind of linguistic approach to translation. As we have seen, even from a linguistic point of view, language and culture are inextricably connected. Moreover, as House (2002: 92-93),= clearly states if we opt for contextually-oriented linguistic approaches – which see language as a social phenomenon embedded in culture and view the properly understood meaning of any linguistic item as requiring reference to the cultural context, we can tackle translation from both a linguistic and cultural perspective: [...] while considering translation to be a particular

type of culturally determined practice, [to] also hold that is, at its core, a predominantly linguistic procedure (House, 2002:93). Thus, as suggested by Garzone (2005: 66-67), in order to enhance the role of culture when translating, it is not at all necessary to reject the fact the translation is primarily a linguistic activity. On the contrary, if we aim at a cultural goal, we will best do so through linguistic procedures.

Culturally oriented and linguistically oriented approaches to translation "[…] are not, necessarily mutually exclusive alternatives" (Manfredi 2007:204). On the contrary, the inextricable link between language and culture can even be highlighted by a linguistic model that views language as a social phenomenon, indisputably embedded in culture. Chesterman (2006) does not support the linguistic-cultural studies divide that is typically used to categorize the shift or conflicting focus of research in Translation Studies. As the result of this so-called Cultural Turn, cultural studies have taken an increasingly keen interest in translation. One consequence of this has been bringing together scholars from different disciplines. It is here important to mention that these cultural theorists have kept their own ideology and agendas that drive their own criticism. These cultural approaches have widened the horizons of translation studies with new insights but at the same time there has been a strong element of conflict among them. It is good to mention that the existence of such differences of perspectives is inevitable (See El-dali, 2011; Toury, 1978/1995; Edwards, 2009; Gregorious, 2011). Vermeer (1989) introduced 'Skopos theory' which is a Greek word for 'aim' or 'purpose'. It is entered into translation theory as a technical term for the purpose of translation and of action of translating. Skopos theory focuses above all on the purpose of translation, which determines the translation method and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result. The result is TT, which Vermeer calls translatum. Therefore, knowing why SL is to be translated and what function of TT will be being crucial for the translator.

Venuti (1995) insisted that the scope of translation studies need to be broadened to take account of the value-driven nature of socio-cultural framework. He used the term invisibility to describe the translator situation and activity in Anglo-American culture. He said that this invisibility is produced by: (1) the way the translators themselves tend to translate fluently into English, to produce an idiomatic and readable TT, thus creating illusion of transparency; and (2) the way the translated texts are typically read in the target culture: "A translated text, whether prose or poetry or non-fiction is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning the foreign text; the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the original"(Venuti, 1995). Venuti believed that a translator should leave the reader in peace, as much as possible, and he should move the author toward him. Foreignization, on the other hand, entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which excluded dominant cultural values in target language (see Simon, 1996).

According to Wiersema (2004), cultures are getting closer and closer, and this is something that he believed translators need to take into account. In the end it all depends on what the translator, or more often, the publisher wants to achieve with a certain translation. Ke Ping (2004) paid attention to misreading and presupposition. He mentioned that of the many factors that may lead to misreadings in translation is cultural presuppositions. Cultural presuppositions merit special attention from translators because they can substantially and systematically affect their interpretation of facts and events in the source text without their even knowing it. He pinpointed the relationship between cultural presuppositions and translational misreadings. According to him misreadings in translation are often caused by a translator's presuppositions about the reality of the source language community. These presuppositions are usually culturally derived and deserve the special attention of the translator. He showed how cultural presuppositions work to produce misreadings in translation.

Snell-Hornby (1988) situates translation into the wider context of multilingual and multicultural communication. She illustrates how recent trends, notably globalization and advances in technology, have influenced international communication and translation, and she discusses the consequences for the job profile of the translator. Globalization, however, is accompanied by an opposite trend, tribalisation, which too, influences our perception of language, and on translation. Snell-Hornby argues that advances in technology have affected people's production and perception of language. The fact that ever-increasing amounts of information

are (to be) processed with ever increasing speed, has consequences for languages. However, there seems to be a countertrend: with the rapidly growing number of Internet users, the number of languages is growing too. However, English is still by far the most widely used language, the language by which a global market can best be reached.

Wiersema (2004) stated that globalization and technology are very helpful to translators in that translators have more access to online information, such as dictionaries of lesser-known languages. Translators will then have contributed to enriching their own languages with loan words from the source language. He considered these entering loan words into TL as an important aspect of translation. Translation brings cultures closer. In each translation, however, there will be a certain distortion between cultures. The translator will have to defend the choices he/she makes, but there is currently an option for including more foreign words in target texts. Therefore, it is now possible to keep SL cultural elements in target texts. According to him translator has three options for the translation of cultural elements: (1) adopting the foreign word without any explanation; (2) adopting the foreign word with extensive explanations; and (3) rewriting the text to make it more comprehensible to the target-language audience (See El-dali, 2011, for more discussion).

One theorist who has paid attention to the project of translation in the context of post-colonialism is Gayatri Spivak. Spivak (1992: 181) describes her translating method as follows: First, the translator must sur-render to the text. She must "solicit the text to show the limits of its language, because that rhetorical aspect will point at the silence of the absolute fraying of language that the text wards off, in its special manner". The translator must earn the right to intimacy with the text, through the act of reading. Only then can she surrender to the text. Spivak herself practices total surrender by providing a first translation at top speed. Surrender at that point mainly means being literal. The revision is not in terms of a possible audience but "in a sort of English," working against the text as "just a purveyor of social realism" (Spivak 1992: 188). Spivak sees no reason why translation has to be a slow and time-consuming affair. If the translator is prepared, possesses the necessary reading skills, the sheer material production could be very quick.

The preceding discussion shows that the cultural paradigm overcomes the short comings of the linguistic paradigm. First, the definitions of translation begin to consider the context of translation. Second, they begin to pay attention to the influence of cultural aspects on the target text, rather than the equivalence between (ST) and (TT). Third, they advocate the descriptive approach instead of the prescriptive one and, fourth, they are interested in the subjectivity of the translator.

As Gentzler (2014) points out, the name "post-translation studies" was coined by Nergaard and Arduini (2011: 8): "We propose the inauguration of a transdisciplinary research field with translation as an interpretive as well as operative tool. We imagine a sort of new era that could be termed 'post-translation studies', where translation is viewed as fundamentally transdisciplinary, mobile, and open-ended". Accordingly, scholars began to view translation from outside the discipline of art, architecture, ethnography, memory studies, semiotics, psychology, philosophy, economics, and gender studies. The justification for such a shift is that often the discourse of the outside field can help scholars better identify and analyze the translational phenomena within those discourses than those developed from within the discipline of translation studies (Gentzler, 2014: 21). From the "Fictional Perspective", translation theorists begin to look at translation as follows: Similar to the complicated plots of fiction, there are also various kinds of understanding for a text, and no text has only an understanding; therefore, all of the understanding can be viewed as translation (Gentzler, 2008: 115): "Translators are authors; translation is as creative as original writing; and disorder is an acceptable as order". In this sense, translation is viewed as a creative activity, and it is given an equal position as the original. All writings are translations. There is no translation is viewed as a creative activity, and it is given an equal position as the original. All writings are translations. There is no translation which can reflect the original one completely. Even the original one is not stable, and there is no original one. The definition of translation, according to the fictional perspective, widens the scope of (TS): (A) The dichotomies in (TS) are eliminated. (TS) is not restricted to the study of another and original text, instead all understanding of a work and all readings on a work are brought into the field. (B) it is not difficult to find that there are various kinds of understanding for a work, and no work

Hosni Mostafa El-daly

has only one understanding. Therefore, the theorists regard all of the understanding as translation (see Lahiani, 2020a, b, c; 2022). (C) All the translations are translations of translations.

Finally, social and psychological paradigm is the future developing trend of translation studies. In the book *Translation and Identity in the Americans: New Directions in Translation Theory* (2008), Gentzler proposes that "the next turn in translation studies should be a social-psychological one, expanding a functional approach to include social effects and individual effects" (Gentzler, 2008: 180). As the name implies, according to Gentzler (2008), social and psychological turn has close relation with the study of psychology and sociology. The introduction of psychoanalysis plays a great role for translation studies. It is mainly based on the theory of Jean Laplanche, Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan, the last two of which are especially influential. Freud believes that the mental condition of human beings is composed of three stages, id, ego and superego. Only if we keep the three ones in balance can we maintain health. In most cases, our neurosis owes to the repression of id and we usually translate our mental condition into dream. Lacan associates Freud's theory with language study. He regards unconsciousness as the essence of language and points out that the nature of human being is unconsciousness. "I am not where I think, and I think where I am not" (Eagleton, 1996: 147). Both Freud's and Lacan's theory show a close connection between the formation and identity. Since our mental condition now is influenced by the memory of the past, psychoanalysts usually try to recreate the sights of the past to find out the specific demand which is repressed. "With a psychoanalytic reworking of an event, through the process of transference, an alternative translation is possible, one that is less repressive and more therapeutic" (Gentzler, 2008: 184). Gentzler proposes that it is translation that forms people's identity in the Americas. As Gentzler defining translation as a social and psychological activity which forms the identity of a nation, translation studies is stepping into a new paradigm …. social and psychological paradigm. The shift of paradigms again broadens the scope of translation studies. As the focus transfers from text to mind, this time, the scope includes not only language, context, but also the inside world of human being. With the broadening of the scope, translation studies will usher in a new turn – the social and psychological turn.

The definition of translation in the social and psychological paradigm of translation studies not only considers the linguistic and cultural aspects of translation, but also introduces psychology into translation studies. From Edwin Gentzler's point of view, it is translation that constructs us, it is translation that forms our identity. Translation, in his eyes, is a creative activity, not merely a linguistic operation, but one of the means by which an entire continent defines itself. In this regard, Gentzler agrees with Sherry Simon's definitions of translation: writing that is inspired by the encounter with other tongues, including the effects of creative interference (See Jixing, 2012).

6. Pedagogical Reflections: Cross-Linguistic and Cultural Impact on L₂ Learning

Most SLA research in the 1960s was conducted within the framework of Contrastive Analysis. The behaviorist view of learning provided the psychological bases of the CAH. Behaviorism assumes human behavior to be the sum of its components and language learning to be the acquisition of all these elements. It viewed language acquisition as the formation of habits. Similarly, the structural approach provided the theoretical linguistic bases for the CAH. Structural linguists assume that the comparison of the descriptions of the two languages in questions would enable them to determine valid contrasts between the two languages. In the course of the controversy over the viability of the CAH, two versions of this hypothesis have emerged: "The strong vs. the weak" or "predictive vs. explanatory" versions as proposed by Wardhaugh (1970). The idea of the strong version is that it is possible to contrast the system of one language with the system of L_2. Based on the result of this contrast, investigators can discover the similarities and differences between the two languages in question so that they can make predictions about what will be the points of difficulty for the learners of other languages. According to the strong version, wherever the two languages differed, interference would occur. That is, language transfer is the basis for predicting which patterns of the target language will be learned most readily and which will prove most troublesome. This version relies on the assumption that similarities will be easier to learn and differences harder. The weak version relies on two assumptions. First, EA may help investigators know, through errors the learners make, what the difficulties are. Second, investigators may realize the relative difficulty of specific errors through the frequency of their occurrence (Schachter 1974). The weak

version may be easier and more practical than the strong version on the basis that it requires of the linguist that he use this linguistic knowledge to explain the observed difficulties in L_2 learning. Scott and Tucker (1974) refer to the reason that the usefulness of the CAH has remained limited: no language has been well enough described, and it has become increasingly apparent that not all L_2 errors have their source in the mother tongue.

The assumption that similarities between the native and the target languages will be easier to learn and differences harder is rejected by a group of scholars. Pica (1984), for example, maintains that the divergent areas between the learner's L_1 and the target language do not represent the greatest learning difficulties may be attributable to those areas which share considerable similarity. Some differences between languages do not always lead to significant learning difficulties. More than this, language transfer can be a constraint on the acquisition process. Schachter (1983) sees that the learner's previous knowledge is available for use in further L_2 learning. Another serious challenge for any contrastive description is the interaction of linguistic subsystems. As Sanford and Garrod (1981) and Bock (1982) point out, psycholinguistic research has demonstrated a strong interdependence among discourse, syntax, phonology and other subsystems in the comprehension and production of language.

The second approach in the analysis of learner difficulty in acquiring L_2 is Error Analysis (EA). This approach assumes that the frequency of errors, according to Brown (1988), is proportional to the degree of learning difficulty. As has been mentioned before, many of the errors could not be explained in terms of L_1 transfer. The point which should be clear is that the EA can be characterized as an attempt to account for learner errors that could not be explained or predicted by the CAH. Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977) have pointed out that it is difficult to be certain precisely what type of errors L_2 learner is making or why the learner makes it. The reasons for errors made by L_2 learners are numerous. In this regard, Taylor (1975) found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interlingual transfer, but once the learner has begun to acquire parts of the new system, generalization within the target language is manifested.

On the other hand, many studies have shown that developmental factors provide another explanation for some of the errors made by L_2 learners. Felix (1980) presents the theoretical assumption of the developmental nature of L_2 acquisition. As long as L_1 learners produce ungrammatical structures before they achieve adult competence, L_2 learners appear to pass through developmental stages which reflect general regularities and universal process of language acquisition. These developmental stages are not determined by the structural properties of the learner's L_1. The same idea is presented by Pica (1984). As a reaction to the "product" orientation of the morpheme studies and EA, and the feeling that a more "process" oriented approach was needed, researcher began to work according to the interlanguage framework, which was developed in the late 1970s and 1980s. So, rather than focusing on the first or the target language, researchers began to develop data analytic procedures that would yield information about the dynamic qualities of language change that made the interlanguage a unique system; both similar to and different from the first and target languages.

The term "intelanguage" was coined by Selinker (1969; 1972) to refer to the interim grammar constructed by L_2 learners on their way to the target language. The term won favour over similar construct, such as "approximate system" (Nemser, 1971) and "transitional competence" (Corder, 1967). Since the early 1970s "interlanguage" has come to characterize a major approach to L_2 research and theory. Unfortunately, the term has taken on various meanings, some authors using it as synonymous with L_2 learning generally. The term "interlanguage" means two things: (1) the learner's system at a single point in time, and (2) the range of interlockning systems that characterize the development of learners over time. The interlanguage is thought to be distinct from both the learner's L_1 and from the target language. It evolves over time as learners employ various internal strategies to make sense of the input and to control their own output. These strategies were central to Selinker's thinking about interlanguage. Specifically, Selinker (1972) argued that interlanguage was the product of five cognitive processes involved in L_2 learning (1) language transfer from L_1; (2) transfer of training process used to teach L_2; (3) strategies of L_2 learning; (4) strategies of L_2 communication; and (5) overgeneralization of the target language linguistic material. The development of the interlanguage was seen by Selinker as different from the process of L_1 development because of the likelihood of fossilization in L_2. Fossilization is the state of affairs that exists when the learner ceases to elaborate the ineterlanguage in some

respect, no matter how long there is exposure, new data, or new teaching. Selinker maintained that such fossilization results especially from language transfer.

In contrast to Selinker's cognitive emphasis, Adjeman (1976) argued that the systematicity of the inetrlanguage should be analyzed linguistically as rule-governed behavior. Whereas Selinker's use of inetlanguage stressed the structurally intermediate nature of the learner's system between the first and the target language, Adjemain focused on the dynamic character of interlanguage systems, their permeability. Interlanguage systems are thought to be by their nature incomplete and in a state of flux. In this view, the individual's L_1 system is seen to be relatively stable, but the interlanguage is not. The structure of the interlanguage may be "invaded" by L_1 when placed in a situation that cannot be avoided, L_2 learner may use rules or items from L_1. Similarly, the learner may stretch, distort, or overgeneralize a rule from the target language in an effort to produce the intended meaning. Both processes, Adjemian (1976) saw to reflect the basis permeability of the ineterlanguage. A third approach to the interlanguage notion has been taken by Tarone (1979) who maintained that the interlanguage could be seen as analyzable into a set of styles that are dependent on the context of use. Tarone proposed capability continuum, which includes a set of styles ranging from a stable subordinate style virtually free of L_1 influence to a characteristically superiodinate style where the speaker pays a great deal of attention to form and where the influence of L_1 is, paradoxically more likely to be felt. For Tarone, interlanguage is not a single system, but a set of styles that can be used in different social contexts. In this way, Tarone added to Adjeman's linguistic perspective a sociolinguistic point of view.

To conclude, the shift from a product to a process orientation has drawn attention to the subtler and non-obvious effects of L_1 on interlanguage development. It has become apparent that L_1 does affect the course of interlanguage development, but this influence is not always predictable. In addition, as Mclaughlin (1988: 81) points out, "more recent work on transfer has made apparent the folly of denying L_1 influence any role in interlanguage development. He, further, maintains that "the bulk of the evidence suggests that language acquisition proceeds by mastering the easier unmarked properties before the more difficult marked ones". In the following section the perspective shifts from a purely linguistic analysis of L_2 learning process to one that emphasizes sociolinguistic and social psychology factors as well. While transfer is primarily a psychological phenomenon, its potential effect on acquisition may be large or small depending on the complex variation of the social setting in which acquisition takes place. In this regard, Odlin (1996) noticed that although Lado and others were accused of having only been concerned with narrow structural analyses of language, the title of linguistic Across Cultures indicates otherwise. Specifically, Lado stated that the fundamental assumption of his book was that individual tend to transfer the forms and meaning, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture – both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practiced by the natives(see Alhashmi, 2019; Rahman, 2019; Thelen, 2019).

A number of researchers studying L_2 acquisition without formal instructions have been struck by the relationship between social psychological acculturation and degree of success in learning the target language. In this regard, Schumann (1978: 13) characterized the relationship between acculturation and L_2 acquisition in the following way: "Second language acquisition is just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target-language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language." In this view, acculturation and, hence, L_2 acquisition is determined by the degree of social and psychological "distance" between the learner and the target-language cultures. Social distance pertains to the individual as a member of a social group that is in contact with another social group whose members speak a different language. Psychological distance is the result of various affective factors that concern the learner as an individual, such as resolution of language shock, culture shock, and culture stress, integrative versus instrumental motivation, and ego permeability. It is assumed that the more social and psychological distance there is between L_2 learner and the target-language group, the lower the learner's degree of acculturation will be toward that group. It is then predicated that the degree to which L_2 learners succeed in socially and psychologically adapting or acculturating to the target-language group will determine their level of success in learning the target language. More specifically, social and psychological distance influence L_2 acquisition by

determining the amount of contact learners have with the target language and the degree to which they are open to the input that is available. In a negative social situation, the learner will receive little input in L_2. In a negative psychological situation, the learner will fail to utilize available input. Schumann argued that the early stages of L_2 acquisition are characterized by the same process and are responsible for the formation of pidgin languages. When social and/or psychological distance is great, the learner will not progress beyond the early stages and the language will stay pidginized. Moreover, it has been reported that if ESL writers retrieve information about a writing topic from memory in their L_1 and then have to translate into English before writing anything down, this act of translation can lead to an overload of their short-term memory and a diminishment in the equality of the content of their writing. For example, Lay (1988) found that her Chinese subjects tended to switch to their L_1 when writing about a topic studied or acquired in their L_1 background. She also reports that their L_1 served as an aid and not a hindrance to writing, since her subjects used Chinese when they were stuck in English- to find a key word, for example. Lay notes that the greater the number of switches into L_1, the better the quality of the essays in terms of organization and ideas.

To sum-up, in their discussion of native language influence SLA theorists have argued whether bilingual individuals have two separate stores of information in long-term memory, one for each language, or a single information store accompanied by selection mechanism for using L_1 or L_2 (McLaughlin, 1984). In this regard, O'Malley, Chamote and Walker (1987) pointed out that if individuals have a separate store of information maintained in each language, they will select information for use appropriate to the language context. To transfer information that was acquired in L_1 to L_2 would be difficult because of the independence of the two memory systems. An individual in the early stages of proficiency in L_2 would either have to translate information from L_1 to L_2 or relearn L_1 information in L_2, capitalizing on existing knowledge where possible. A contrast to this argument for separate L_1 and L_2 memory systems, Cummins (1984) has proposed a common underlying proficiency in cognitive and academic proficiency for bilinguals. Cummins argues that at least some of what is originally learned through L_1 does not have to be relearned in L_2 but can be transferred and expressed through the medium of L_2. L_2 learners may be able to transfer what they already know from L_1 into L_2 by (a) selecting L_2 as the language for expression, (b) retrieving information originally stored through L_1 but presently existing as non-language-specific declarative knowledge, and (c) connecting the information to L_2 forms needed to express it. Learning strategy research (O'Malley, Chamote, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper and Russo I985a, I985b) indicates that students of English as L_2 consciously and actively transfer information from their L_1 for use in L_2.

7. Views on the Place of Translation in FL Teaching

The issue of the place of mother-tongue in FL instruction is one of the controversial topics in the field of foreign language teaching. Many arguments have been raised and the various language teaching methods (conventional and non-conventional) hold different fluctuating opinions. Some recommend it while others condemn the use of mother-tongue in the FL classroom. There are two extremes which are represented by the Grammar Translation Method and the Direct Method. The former, as its name suggests, makes liberal use of mother-tongue. It depends on translation and considers L_1 a reference system to which the foreign language learner can resort to understand the grammatical as well as the other features of the foreign language. The latter (the other extreme) tries to inhibit the use of mother-tongue. It depends on using the foreign language in explanation and communication in the language classroom and excluding L_1 and translation altogether. Those who condemn mother-tongue use view that optimal FL learning can be achieved through the intralingual tackling of the various levels of linguistic analysis as this helps provide maximum exposure to the foreign language. It is true that providing maximum exposure to the foreign language helps a lot in learning that language, as the following discussion will demonstrate.

On the other hand, confining oneself to the foreign language only may be done at the expense of understanding and intelligibility or in a routine and non-creative way. With careful and functional mother-tongue use intelligibility can be achieved and the time saved (by giving the meaning in the mother-tongue) can be used for practice. So, mother-tongue use does not mean wasting time that can be better used for providing maximum exposure to the foreign language. Disregarding the mother-tongue and considering it "a bogey to be shunned at all costs" is a myth. Those who recommend nothing, but English in an English lesson neglect many important

facts. First, they have forgotten that FL learners translate in their minds and think in their own language, and this cannot be controlled: "The teacher who says: I forbid the use of the pupil's own language in my class; nothing but English in the English lessons is deceiving himself. He has forgotten the one thing he cannot control what goes on in the pupil's mind, he cannot tell whether, or when, his pupils are thinking in their own language. When he meets a new English word, the pupil inevitably searches in his mind for the equivalent in his own language. When he finds it, he is happy and satisfied, he has a pleasurable feeling of success". (French, 1972: 94). Supporting this idea, Finocchiaro (1975: 35) says: We delude ourselves if we think the student is not translating each new English item into his native language when he first meets it. Second, they have also forgotten that "the unknown (L_2 pattern) cannot be explained via something less known (the L_2)" (Hammerly, 1971). This idea was supported by Seleim (1995). Third, they have forgotten that the mother-tongue is first in terms of acquisition and proficiency and so FL learners cannot escape its influence: "The mother-tongue is so strongly ingrained that no amount of direct method drill can override its influence. Therefore, according to this line of thought it is better to capitalize on the students' knowledge of (mother-tongue) than to pretend it is not there". (Grittner, 1977: 165). Fourth, they have forgotten that there are individual differences among students and that the weaker students may have difficulties in grasping a point in the foreign language.

In a study conducted by Latke-Gajer (1984), she tried to look for a solution for what she observed while teaching English. The problem is that students, to understand an utterance in the foreign language, translate each word separately and then add together the meaning of individual words. This is harmful as it does not enable students to grasp the meaning of more complex statements, especially those that contain idiomatic expressions. She decided, in this study, to introduce English-English explanations of new words and expressions. She started the experiment with her advanced students by giving them a list of words to be explained in English at home and then they compared their explanations with the definition in Homby's dictionary. Although the experiment proved successful, especially with advanced students, it was not possible to eliminate Polish (as a mother-tongue) from the lessons. It was necessary to use it to explain several difficult and complicated grammatical patterns so that the weaker students could understand. With the beginners it was impossible to use this same method. For them, she suggests using different ways such as: opposition, describing pictures and using games.

It becomes then clear that the mother-tongue cannot be totally excluded or disregarded. There are many situations in which a few words in the mother-tongue will help clarify something students may not have comprehended in English. It is a myth to believe that "the best criterion for effective target language teaching is the absence of the mother-tongue in the classroom. Although the need for a target language environment in the classroom is controvertible, this does not imply, however, that the mother-tongue has no role to play in effective and efficient language teaching. Where a word of Arabic can save Egyptian learners of English from confusion or significant time lost from learning, its absence would be, in my view, pedagogically unsound" (Altman, 1984: 79). Absence of the mother-tongue may result in meaningless and mechanical learning situations. This contradicts the recent research findings which stress that the two-way type of communication should be the ultimate goal of instruction and the tool which ensures better teaching results. With total exclusion of the mother-tongue the teaching-learning situations may degenerate into a mechanical process in which "one may memorize (learn how to repeat) a phrase or a sentence in a foreign language, without knowing what it means. In such a case, one could say the person knows it (knows how to say it), but we could also say that the person does not understand what he or she is saying (comprehend its meaning)" (Soltis, 1978: 55).

It is pedagogically important to emphasize the element of meaningfulness in the teaching learning process. Students become motivated and active if they understand what is involved and if they know what they are doing. So, it is important not to disregard the learners' need for the comprehension of what they learn or exclude the mother-tongue because it is their right that they should make sense in their own terms of what they are learning. It is also important to use the learners' native language so as to avoid misunderstanding and achieve intelligibility. The reasons for using the native language to get meaning across is that it prevents any misunderstanding, saves time and makes the gradation of the language free from physical demonstration.

Mother-tongue plays a vital role in diminishing or at best eliminating the psychological factors that have an inhibiting effect on FL teaching and learning. It has been noticed that the non-conventional methods of language teaching make use of the mother-tongue and translation in FL/SL teaching and learning. They emphasize that mother-tongue employing removes the fear of incompetence, mistakes and apprehension regarding languages new and unfamiliar. One point is that, to overcome the problems of dissatisfaction and avoidance, FL teachers should permit some mother-tongue use. Students, having linguistic inadequacies, can get confused and become hesitant about their oral participation. They may abandon a message they have started because a certain idea or a thought is too difficult to continue expressing in the foreign language. To overcome the feeling of dissatisfaction and psychological avoidance, FL learners should come to terms with the frustrations of being unable to communicate in the foreign language and build up, cognitively and effectively, a new reference system which helps them communicate an idea. This reference system is the mother-tongue which is indeed very important for enhancing the FL learners' feeling of success and satisfaction. Another point is that mother-tongue use helps create a climate that alleviates the learners' tension, insecurity and anxiety. It makes the class atmosphere comfortable and productive and helps establish good relationships between the teacher and his students. In one of the most recent research, Anne Brooks-Lewis (2009) challenges the theory and practice of the exclusion of the adult learners' first language by reporting learners' overwhelmingly positive perceptions of its incorporation in foreign language teaching and learning. However, it must be kept in mind that mother-tongue should be used as little as possible, but as much as necessary. MT should be rule-governed and not be freely or randomly used: "The individual is able to switch from one language to another... in a rule-governed rather than a random way" (Bell, 1978: 140-41)

It is important to emphasize the fact that mother-tongue should not be used in the wrong way. It is desirable in cases where it is necessary, inevitable and where otherwise valuable classroom time would be wasted. We do not want the FL teacher to use the mother-tongue freely and to automatically translate everything on the learners' book. This unlimited use is so harmful that it discourages the learners from thinking in English (the language they are learning) and so it will not be taken seriously as a means of communication. "Translating can be a hindrance to the learning process by discouraging the student from thinking in English" (Haycraft, 1979: 12). Students in most cases think in their mother-tongue and lean too much on it. This makes them acquire and develop the habit of mental translation. They interpose the mother-tongue between thought and expression developing a three-way process in production and expressing their intentions: Meaning to Mother-tongue to English Expression. They always think, while trying to express themselves (in the foreign language), in their mother-tongue and all their attempts to communicate in the foreign language are filtered through the mother-tongue: "The mother-tongue is not relinquished, but it continues to accompany - and of course to dominate the whole complex fabric of language behavior.... all referent- whether linguistic or semantic - are through the mother-tongue. (Grittnerm 1977: 81). This is pedagogically dangerous as it makes the FL learners believe that, to express themselves in the foreign language, the process is mere verbal substitution of words of the mother-tongue to their equivalents in the foreign language and this is an extremely a tiring way to produce correct sentences in the foreign language and creates no direct bond between thought and expression. The nonexistence of this bond results in hindering fluency in speech and proficiency in productive writing. Interposing the mother-tongue between thought and expression hinders the intralingual associative process which is necessary for promoting fluency and automatic production of FL discourse. "The explicit linkage of a word in one language with a word in another language may interfere with the facilitative effects of intra-language associations. Thus, for instance, if a student repeats many times the pair go: aller, the association between the two will become so strong that the French word will come to the student's mind whenever he uses the English equivalent and inhibit the smooth transition from "go" to the other English words, a skill necessary for fluent speech. (Anisfield, 1966: 113-114).

FL teachers should guard against mental translation. This can be achieved by permitting the learners to express themselves (in speech or writing) within their linguistic capacities and capabilities. This means that the student, for instance, should first practice expressing given ideas instead of trying to fit language to his free mental activities and if he is freed from the obligation to seek what to say, he will be able to concentrate on

form and gradually acquire the correct habits on which he may subsequently depend. It is important to familiarize the learners with the fact that no word in one language can have or rightly be said to have the same meaning of a word in another language. FL teachers should provide more than one native equivalent for the FL word, give the meaning on the sentential level and in various contexts. According to Byram and Morgan (1994: 18), cultural learning positively affects students' linguistic success in foreign language learning. Culture can be used as an instrument in the processes of communication when culturally determined behavioural conventions are taught. Tavares and Cavalcanti (1996), further, claims that "culture shouldn't be seen as a support to language teaching but that it should be placed on an equal footing with foreign language teaching". Post and Rathet (1996) support the use of student's native culture as cultural content in the English language classroom. In fact, a wide range of studies has shown that using content familiar to students rather than unfamiliar content can influence student comprehension of L_2 (Anderson and Barnitz, 1984; Long, 1990). In other words, unfamiliar information can impede students' learning of the linguistic information used to convey the content. So why overburden our students with both new linguistic content and new cultural information simultaneously? If we can, especially for lower-level students, use familiar cultural content while teaching English, we can reduce the "processing load" that students experience (Post and Rathet, 1996: 12). In this regard, Tavares and Cavalcanti (1996) argue that the development of people's cultural awareness leads us to more critical thinking as citizens with political and social understanding of our own and other communities.

To conclude, the problem does not lie in whether mother-tongue has a place in FL, teaching/learning or not, but in how much of it is permitted. In this respect, it can be said that there are many factors determining the quantity to be used. The quantification will differ according to the maturity level of the learners and their linguistic level. It also depends on the competence of the teacher, the material to be taught and the availability of teaching aids. Another point is that it is the individual teacher who sensitizes when to switch codes and when not to. It is also the teacher who can decide the pragmatic quantity to be used because what is workable in a certain class may not be so in another.

8. Concluding Remarks

Although most scholars today do agree that Translation Studies is not a sub-discipline of (applied) linguistics, the question 'where do we stand?' and 'where do we go?' are being discussed more and more vigorously. Translation Studies continuously brings new theoretical developments to bear upon its disciplinary object. What is obvious in the substantially growing literature is that scholars have come to translation (studies) from a variety of fields and disciplinary backgrounds. Whereas traditionally this background was linguistics (or its sub-disciplines, particularly pragmatics, text linguistics), and literature. Nowadays there is an increasing input from Cultural Studies. One of the consequences is terminological inconsistency (Schaffner, 1999). When we take concepts from different disciplines, we should clearly define them and clarify their disciplinary origin. It seems to be a general phenomenon that different academic disciplines use the same labels, however, with different meanings.

The preceding discussion shows that different paradigms of translation studies have different views on translation. The shifts of the paradigms can be viewed as the results of the development of definitions, and to some extent, the results of the wars of definitions. In this regard, Chesterman (2006: 19) considers that the growth in Translation Studies as an interdiscipline has led to fragmentation and that concepts and methodologies are 'borrowed [from other disciplines] at a superficial level' which leads to 'misunderstandings' since those working in Translation Studies are often lacking expertise in the other field and even borrowing concepts that may be outdated. This is an important criticism; Chesterman's solution is for collaborative work with scholars in other fields. Chesterman's proposal is for the adoption of the term 'consilience', which has its roots in the ancient Greek concept of the unity of knowledge and was recently revisited in the field of sociobiology by Edward Wilson. Consilience is relevant, in Chesterman's view, since 'modem Translation Studies [...] announces itself as a new attempt to cut across boundaries in the search for a deeper understanding of the relations between texts, societies and cultures.

In conclusion, a translator deals with the two different languages and two different cultures: "He is a bilingual mediating agent between monolingual communication participants in two different language communities (House, 1977: 104). In addition, taking account of culture does not necessarily mean having to dismiss any kind of linguistic approach to translation. Even from a linguistic point of view, language and culture are connected. In order to enhance the role of culture when translating, it is not at all necessary to reject the fact the translation is primarily a linguistic activity. On the contrary, if we aim at a cultural goal, we will best do so through linguistic procedures. As Manfredi (2007: 204) affirms: Culturally oriented and linguistically oriented approaches to translation are not necessarily mutually exclusive alternatives. The Soviet Scholar Juri Lotman (1978) has maintained that no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture, and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language. Language, then, is the heart within the body of culture. It is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy. In the same way that the surgeon, operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his peril. Language is not a simple matter of vocabulary and grammar; it can never be separated from the culture it operates in. Language is a guide to social reality, and human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for their society. Experience is largely determined by the language habits of the community. Communication between different individuals and nations is not always easy, especially when more than one language is involved. The job of the translator and/ or interpreter is to try to bridge the gap between two foreign languages. This can also include translation problems arising from historical developments within one language (Gutknecht, 2001). Translating was and is a profession, with its own codes of conduct and criteria of performance, not accessible to all. In short, inside or between languages, human communication equals translation. A study of translation is a study of language (Bassnett-McGuire, 1980).

From a pedagogical perspective, the question that arises from the preceding discussion is how translation courses should be designed and organized so that they would offer the students exactly what they need for their prospective career. This question implies that the task of the translation teacher does not consist only in developing in their students those skills which underlie the general translation competence, but also in creating a psychological climate which is very likely to turn the educational process into a positive experience for future translators.

References

Adjemian, C., 1976. On the nature of interlanguage systems. Language Learning 26: 297-320.

Alhashmi, R., 2019. Image and Truth: Paradigms of Modern Translation Theory. Language, Literature, and Interdisciplinary Studies, 71-89.

Altman, H., 1984. Language Teaching and Teacher Training: Myths and Mandates, in Teacher Education for TEFL. Proceedings of the Third National Symposium on English Teaching in Egypt, CDELT Ain Shams University.

Al-Wahy, A., 1999. Translation and the textual meaning of the clause: A systematic-functional perspective. Philology XXXIII: 68-106.

Anderson, B. and J. Barnitz, 1984. Cross-cultural schema and reading comprehension instruction. Journal of Reading 27: 103-107.

Anisfield, M., 1966. Psychologic Perspectives on Linguistic Learning, in Valdman (ed.) Trends in Language Teaching, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Anne Brooks-Lewis, K., 2009. Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L_1 in foreign language teaching and learning. Language Learning, vol. 62.

Arrojo, R., 1998. The revision of the traditional gap between theory and practice and the empowerment of translation in postmodern times. The Translator 4: 28-48.

Baker, M., 1992. In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation, London/New York: Routledge.

Bassenet, S. and Lefevere. A. (eds), 1990. Translation, History and Culture, London: Printer.

Bassnett, McGuire, S., 1980. Translation Studies. Methuen, London.

Bassnett, S., 1980. Translation Studies, London/New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S., 1996.Translation Studies. London: Routledge.

Bell, R.T., 1978. Translation theory; where are we going? META 31 (4): 403-415. Montreal.

Bell, R.T., 1994. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice London/ New York: Longman.

Belloc. H., 1931. On Translation (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).

Bock, K., 1982. Toward a cognitive psychology of syntax: information processing contributions to sentence formulation. Psychological Review 89: 1-47.

Byram, M. and Morgan, C., 1994. Teaching and learning language and culture. Multilingual Matters, No. 100, Clevedon.

Candlin, C., 1990. General Editor of 'Discourse and the Translator'; Hatim & Mason, I. Longman, London and New York.

Catford, J., 1965. A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics, London, Oxford University Press.

Chesterman, A, 2006. Memes of Translation: The Spread of Idea: In: Translation Theory. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Corder, S., 1967. The significance of learner's errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 5 (4): 161-69.

Cornelia, Z., 2022. On turns and fashions in translation studies and beyond, Translation Studies, DOI: 10.1080/14781700.2022.2052950

Cummins, J., 1984. Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy. Clevedor, England: Multilingual Matters.

Edwards, J., 2009. Language and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

El-dali, H., 2011. Towards an understanding of the distinctive nature of translation studies. Journal of King Saud University 23: 29-45.

Felix, S., 1980. Interference, interlanguage, and related issues. In Second Language Development, ed. by Felix. Tubingen: Gunther Narr.

Finocchiaro, M., 1975. Myth and Reality: A Plea for a Broader View: in the Art of TESOL: Selected Articles from the English Teaching Forum, Part one, Washington, D.C.

French, F., 1972. Translation, in Byrne, D. (ed.), English Teaching Extracts. London: Longman.

Frenz, H., 1961. The Art of Translation, in: N.P. Stalknecht and H. Frenz (eds.), Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective (Carbondale): Southern Illinois University Press.

Garzone, G., 2005. Sull' intrinsecavaghezzadelladefinizione di traduzion: prospective traduttologiche e linguistiche, in Garzone, G. (a cura di), Esperience del tradurre: Aspettiteorici e applicative, Milano Franco Angeli, 53-79.

Gentzler, E., 2008. Translation and identity in the Americans: new directions in translation studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Gentzler, E., 2014.   Translation studies: Pre-discipline, discipline, interdisciplinary, and post-discipline. International Journal of Society, Culture and Language, 14-24.

Gregorious, C., 2011.Language, Ideology and Identity in Serial Killer Narrative. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Grittner, F., 1977. Teaching Foreign Languages. Second edition, New York: Harper and Row.

Gutknecht, C., 2001. Translation. In Aronoff, M. and Miller, J. (eds.), The Handbook of Linguistics. Blackwell Publishers.

Halliday, M., 1961. Linguistics and machine translation. In McIntosh, A. and Halliday, M. Theory of Translation. Methuen, London.

Halliday, M., 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar, 2nd Edition, London: Arnold.

Hammerly, H., 1971. Recent Methods and Trends in Second Language Teaching. The Modern Language Journal IV (8).

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

Haycraft, J., 1979. An Introduction to English Language Teaching. London: Longman.

Hermans, T., 1998. Translation and normativity. Current Issues in Language and Society 5: 50-71.

Holmes, J., 1970. Translated Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies. Rodopi, Amsterdam.

Holmes, S., 1998.Translated papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

House J., 2002. Universality versus Culture Specificity in Translation, in Richardi, A. (ed.); Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline, Cambridge: CUP, 92-110.

House, J., 1977. A Model for Translation Quality Assessment, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

House, J., 1997. Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. Narr, Tubingen.

Hymes, D., 1971. On communicative competence. In Pride, J. and Holmes, S. (eds.). Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ivir, V., 1987. Procedure and Strategies for the Translation of Culture. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics [Special issue on Translation Across Cultures. G. Toury (ed.) 13 (2): 35-46.

Jakobson, R., 1958. On linguistic aspects of translation. In Venuti, L. (ed.) (2002/2004). The translation studies reader, 2nd edition, New York/London: Routledge, 138-143.

Jixing, L., 2012.   Changes of translation definitions and turns of translation studies.   Cross-cultural Communication 8 (5): 35-43.

Katz, J., 1978. Propositional structure and illocutionary force: A study of the contribution of sentence meaning to speech acts. Harvester Press, New York.

Lahiani, R., 2020a. 'Landscape in Literary Translation: A Comparative Study of English and French Translations of an Arabic Verse Line.' Arab World English Journal for Translation and Literary Studies. 4:3, 17-33. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol4no3.2.

Lahiani, R., 2020b. Poetry in Translation: Traveling Pleonasm and Beyond. 3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. 26:3, 96-109. http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-20202603-08.

Lahiani, R., 2020c. Unlocking the Secret of Locksley Hall. Comparative Critical Studies. 17:1, 25-46. DOI: 10.3366/ccs.2020.0342. DOI: 10.3366/ccs.2020.0342.

Lahiani, R., 2022. Translate or Transliterate? When Metonymic Names are more than Proper Names. The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research. 14:1, 160-176. DOI: 10.12807/ti.114201.2022.a09.

Latka-Gajer, E., 1984. Thinking in English. English Teaching Forum, vol. XXII, No. 3: 38-39.

Lay, N., 1988.   Composing processes for adult ESL learners. TESOL Quarterly 16: 406-432.

Long, D., 1990. What you don't know can help you: An exploratory study of background knowledge and second language listening comprehension. SSLA 12: 65-80.

Lotman, J. and Uspensky, B., 1978. On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture, New Literary History, pp. 211-32.

Malone, J., 1988. The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation. State University of New York Press.

Manfredi, M., 2007. The Issue of 'Visibility' in Translating Topography and the Culture of London and Bombay/ Mumbai, in Jottini, L., G. Del Lungo & J. Douthwaite (eds.), Cityscapes: Islands of the Self. Language Studies, Vol. 2, Cagliari: CUEC, 203-214.

Manfredi, M., 2008. Translating Text and Context: Translational Studies and Systematic Functional Linguistics. Vol. (1), Cagliari, CUEC.

McLaughlin, B., 1984. Second language acquisition in childhood. Volume 1: Pre-school Children. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence. Erlbaum

McLaughlin, B., 1988. Theories of Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Meetham, A. and Hudson, R., 1969. Encyclopedia in Linguistics, Information and Control. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Nemser, W., 1971. Approximative Systems of Foreign language learners. Newbury House.

Neubert, A., 1985. Text-bound translation teaching, in Willis, W. & G. Thome (eds.), Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting. Tubingen: Narr., 61-70.

Newmark, P., 1981. Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon.

Nida, E., 1964. Principle of Correspondence. In: Venuti, L. The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.

Nord, C., 1997. Text analysis in translation: Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kopper, L. and Russo, R., 1985a. Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly 19: 285-296.

Hosni Mostafa El-daly

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, Kuppper, L. and Russo, R., 1985b. Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning 35: 21-46.

O'Malley, J., Chamote, A. and Walker, C., 1987. Some applications of cognitive theory to second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 9: 287-306.

Odlin, T., 1996. Language Transfer. Cambridge University Press.

Payne, N., 2004. Translation Misconceptions. www.kwintessential.co.uk/translation/ translation.html.

Pica, T., 1984. L_1 Transfer and L_2 complexity as factors in syllabus design. TESOL Quarterly 18 (4): 609-623.

Post, R. and Rathet, I., 1996. On their own terms: Using student native culture as content in the EFL classroom. Forum 34: 3-4.

Quirk, R., 1974. The linguistic and the English language. London: Edward Arnold.

Rahman, A., 2019. In Translation: Positions and Paradigms. ISBN 13: 9789352874620

Raskin, V., 1987. Linguistics and natural language processing. In Nirenburg, S. (ed.). Language Processing, Manchester, pp. 42-58.

Robinson, D., 2005. Becoming a Translator: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation. Routledge, London and New York.

Sanford, A. and Garrod, S., 1981. Understanding Written Language. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley.

Savory, T., 1957. The Art of Translation (London Cape).

Schachter, J. and Celce-Murcia, M., 1977. Some reservations concerning error analysis. TESOL Quarterly 11: 441-451.

Schachter, J., 1974. An error in analysis. Language Learning 24 (2): 137-141.

Schachter, J., 1983. A new account of language transfer. In Language Transfer in Language Learning, eds. S. Gass and Larry Selinker. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Schaffner, C., 1999. Globalization, Communication, Translation. Current Issues in Language and Society, Vol. 6, No. 2.

Scott M. and Tucker, C., 1974. Error analysis and English language strategies of Arab students. Language Learning 24 (1):69-97.

Sebba, M., Mahootian, S. and Johnson, C., 2011. Language mixing and code-switching in writing. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Seleim, S., 1995. Using Arabic to facilitate learning English in the preparatory stage. Proceedings of the 15th National Symposium on English Language Teaching, CDELT, Cairo.

Selinker, L., 1969. Language transfer. General Linguistics 9: 67-92.

Selinker, L., 1972. Interlanguage. IRAL 10: 209-231.

Simon, S., 1996. Gender in Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission. London Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M., 1995. Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach, Revised edition, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, M., 1988. Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, Pochhacker, Franz and Kaindl, Klaus (eds.), 1992. Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Soltis. J., 1978. An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts. London: Wesley Publishing Company.

Spivak, G., 1992. 'The Politics of Translation', in: Barret Michele; and Philips, Anne (eds.). Destablizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates, Cambridge: Polity Press, 177-200.

Steiner, G., 1975. After Babel: Aspects of language and translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., 1985. Large-scale communicative testing: A case study. In Lee, Y. et al. (eds.). Testing Communicative Competence of L_2 Learners. Harvester Press, New York.

Tarone. B., 1979. Interlanguage as chameleon. Language Learning 29:181-191.

Tavares, K. and Cavalcanti, I., 1996. Developing cultural awareness in KFL classrooms. Forum 34: 3-4.

Taylor, B., 1975. The use of over-generalization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students in KSL. Languauge Learning 25: 73-107.

Thelen, M., 2019. Quality and Quality Assessment in Translation: Paradigms in Perspective. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5225-3.ch001

Hosni Mostafa El-daly

Toury, G., 1978. (Revised 1995). "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." In: Venuti, L. The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.

Toury, G., 1995. Descriptive translation studies and beyond. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, P.A.: John Benjamins.

Tytler, A., 1971. Essay on the Principles of Translation. London: Dent.

Venuti, L., 1992. 'Translation as Cultural Politics: Regimes of Domestication in English, Textual Practice 7 (2): 208-23.

Venuti, L., 1995/2008. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation, Second Edition, London & New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L., 1996. Translation as a social practice; or the violence of translation. In Gaddis, R. (ed.), Translation Horizons. State University of New York, pp. 195-213.

Vermeer, H., 1989. Skopos and Commission in Translational Activity. In: Venuti, L. The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.

Vermeer, H., 1996. A Skopos Theory of Translation. Heidelberg.

Wardaugh, R., 1970. The contrastive analysis hypothesis. TESOL Quarterly 4 (2): 16-28.

Widdowson, H., 1979. Explorations in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiersema, N., 2004. Globalization and Translation. Translation Journal, vol. 8, No. (1): 1-5.

Hosni Mostafa El-daly