Literal Translation and Connotational Meaning of Phrases and Sentences from One Language to Another

Kamal Osman Sharfi Mohamed

Abstract: This paper presents an overview of Literal Translation and Connotational Meaning of Phrases and Sentences from One Language to Another. Most philosophers and linguists accept a certain conception of the notion of the literal meaning of words and sentences and the relation between literal meaning and other semantic notions such as ambiguity, metaphor, and truth. Sentences have literal meanings. The literal meaning of a sentence is entirely determined by the meanings of its component words and the syntactical rules according to which these elements are combined. A sentence may have more than one literal meaning or its literal meaning may be defective or interpretable. The literal meaning of a sentence needs to be sharply distinguished from what a speaker means by the sentence when he utters it to perform a speech act, for the speaker's utterance meaning may depart from the literal sentence meaning in a variety of ways.

Keywords: Literal Translations, Connotation, Source Language and Target language.

I. INTRODUCTION

Literal translation, direct translation, or word-for-word translation is the rendering of text from one language to another one word at a time with or without conveying the sense of the original whole. In translation studies, "literal translation" denotes technical translation of scientific, technical, technological or legal texts.[1] In translation theory, another term for "literal translation" is "meta-phrase"; and for phrasal translation "paraphrase." When considered a bad practice of conveying word by word translation of non-technical type literal translations has the meaning of mistranslating idioms, [1] for example, or in the context of translating an analytic language to a synthetic language, it renders even the grammar unintelligible. The concept of literal translation may be viewed as an oxymoron , given that literal denotes something existing without interpretation, whereas a translation, by its very nature, is an interpretation. This translation may have been done word-for-word, but it doesn't actually convey the same meaning to an English-speaking audience. However, a "trans creation" translation would aim to make the original Spanish idiom understandable in English-speaking culture. Thus, the translator would instead choose the equivalent English idiom "I'm just pulling your leg." In most circumstances, a professional translator would recommend to not opt for a literal translation, because the intent is to make the translation not only well-written but also culturally relevant and looking as it had been originally written in the target language. Nonetheless,

There are a few cases where a literal translation may be needed. Recently, I had a client that needed us to provide a literal translation of a document, as their entire court case may have relied on the translation. The translator therefore had to include every grammatical and punctuation error, in order to preserve the integrity of the document. Literal translations could therefore be used for legal documents, in order to avoid any contention that the translation purposefully left out any important information. In most cases, a literal translation should be avoided and could reflect poorly on the quality of the translation, especially when the client is marketing towards a specific audience. However, keep in mind that some clients may have different requirements for their translation, which you as a vendor should try to gauge once initiating the sale process.

II. DISCUSSION

Literal, or word for word, translation is the direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text in which the translators' task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL. In principle, a literal translation is unique solution in which is reversible and complete in itself. Translation reflects the reality of life in the 21st century. An ever greater number of the world's citizens use two or more languages every day in school, at work, with friends or family, when travelling or on the internet. The vast number of online translation tools and apps attests to the everyday need for translation, as do the increasing quantities of multi-language material online, and when we travel. Translating from one language to another requires students to pay attention to detail in order to convey meaning accurately. Students need vocabulary, the ability to manipulate language structures and an awareness of the pitfalls of word-for-word translation. When we approach translation from the point of view of communicating the message, we introduce learners to the concept of non-literal translation. [2] View on literal translation is deeply rooted in traditional debates on the two basic translation methods, literal vs. free translation. Such debates have quite a long history both in the West and in China. In the west, the distinction between "word-for-word" (i.e. and "sense-for-sense" translation goes back to Cicero and St Jerome A.D.), who clearly expressed the "literal" and "free" poles in translation. In China, the debate on "literal" vs. "free" translation might date back to as early as the Han dynasty and the Three Kingdoms Period, during which the Sanskrit Sutras were translated into Chinese in large scales.

During that period, the first Buddhist translator to be named in Chinese sources, An Shigao , a Persian prince who renounced his claim to the royal throne of Parthia in order to serve as a Buddhist missionary monk in China, preferred slightly free translation and attracted a devoted community of followers. In Three Kingdoms Period, Zhi Qian, a Chinese Buddhist layman of Yuezhi ancestry, had a heated debate on literal vs. free translation with other translators and wrote the first extant Chinese article on translation Preface to Fajujing. From then on, this influential translator began to prefer extremely literal translation and translated a wide range of Indian Buddhist scriptures into Chinese with such translation method. Rather than repeat the long-standing debate on literal vs. free translation, this paper attempts to amend some of Peter Newark's theory, which has until now been very influential in the applied translation theories. Though I quite agree with Peter Newark's argument that "literal translation is the first step in translation", I must point out that he has emphasized literal translation so excessively that it would be even baneful to translation practice, especially to that is undertaken between Chinese and English, considering that the two languages are rather different from each other. Peter can hardly imagine the difficulties with which the translator would confront when applying his theory to Chinese-English and English-Chinese translation, for he does not know Chinese at all and has never practiced in such kind of translation. Therefore, a further consideration should be made on to what extent literal translation can be applied to Chinese-English and English-Chinese translation. Besides literal translation, has also incidentally discussed free translation, which he surprisingly labels it "not translation at all". As mentioned above, the espousal of literal translation or free translation has dominated the discussion on methods of translation for a long time both in the West and in China. In order to avoid such meaningless disputations, which at times even go to extremes, we had better distinguish literal translation from mechanical or dead translation, and free translation from random translation. Peter only distinguishes literal from word-for-word and one-to-one translation: Word-for-word translation transfers SL grammar and word order, as well as the primary meanings of all the SL words, into the translation, and it is normally effective only for brief simple neutral sentences… In one-to-one translation, a broader form of translation, each SL word has a corresponding TL word, but their primary meanings may differ. … Literal translation goes beyond one-to-one translation in including, say le courage, der mut and courage as literal equivalents; it is particularly applicable to languages that do not have definite and/or indefinite articles. We can encourage students to move beyond word-for-word rendering. In translation from the target language into English, students are encouraged to use their linguistic skills, but also their world knowledge, common sense, and to ask themselves 'what sounds right?' In both forms of translation there is the opportunity to make active use of grammar. Translating into English engages students in the conscious noticing of particular structures as they attend directly to the detail in sentences and short texts. Translation into the target language is a direct test of students' ability to manipulate language to make meaning. [3] places the beginning of translation with the production of the Septuagint which seems to have been the first translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek. It was carried out by seventy-two translators, and it provides us with the basic categories of the history of this practice. the study of translation as an academic subject began when James Holmes considered it important to study it as a discipline in itself around sixty years ago. Nevertheless, the designation 'translation studies' would seem to be the most appropriate of all those available in English, and its adoption as the standard term for the discipline as a whole would remove a fair amount of confusion and misunderstanding [4]. The main target of translation changed from being a language learning process, to being a field of academic investigation; Holmes gave it the view of a science and propounded the name of Translation Studies in his article 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies' to designate any research focused on the study of translation noting the empirical nature of the discipline. He, then, divided TS into three subcategories: descriptive, theoretical and applied . In his article, Holmes talks of two fundamental objectives of descriptive and theoretical studies: «to describe the phenomena of translating and This American scholar states that translation itself was a , a theory that was subsequently rejected by others in the second half of the century. Long after Cicero made his statement, the same issues were still discussed since, the scholar Peter claimed, in the second half of the 20th century, that the main problem of translating a text was whether to translate literally of freely .It is important to cite Horace, Pliny, Quintilian, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, John Dryden, Miguel de Cervantes, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Percy Bysshe Shelley, Newman, Ezra Pound, etc., for being thinkers who dealt with the subject of translation. The concept in a more systematic way: Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style. But this relatively simple statement requires careful evaluation of several seemingly contradictory elements. Literal translation is the earliest and simplest form of translation, it occurs whenever word by word replacement is possible without breaking rules in the target language; this, however, is quite rare unless the two languages are very closely related. The practice of translation is a secular human activity which goes back to the Roman Empire. But the theory of translation is more difficult to situate in time, for the subject matter stilt remains a moot point. In Steiner's words, "The number of original, significant ideas in the subject remains very meager." [5] maintains that the theory of translation "can be divided into four periods, though the lines of division are in no sense absolute". The first period, he says, starts with both Cicero's and Horace's empirical view not to translate "verbum pro verb" and ends with the publication of Fraser Essay on The Principles of Translation in 1793. This period is characterized by the suggestion that theoretical views on translation stern directly from the practical work of translating. Steiner's second period starts in 1793 and ends up in 1946 with the publication of Sous.

This period is a phase of theory and hermeneutic research where translation is studied in terms of theories or Languages and mind. 9 The third period begins in the 1940's with the publication of the first papers on machine translation and is characterized by the application of structural linguistics and information theory in the study of translation. translation is "a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/ or statement in one language by the same message and! or statement in another Language .It is an art that "merits a careful study as does any another work of fine arts". A similar concept of translation in terms of a necessary requirement which a translator must satisfy. The latter, should himself be an artist. At least enough of one to yearn for a living expression of the work to which he has committed himself". **[6]** In his article "Third Thoughts on Translating poetry", considers translation as a creative art and maintains that "one thing seems clear: to translate a poem is to compose another poem". though what we are translating belongs to two linguistically and culturally different systems, always respecting the fact that perfect synonymy does not exist in language **[7]** , and respecting that, the translators obviously have the last say, for they are the only people doing the creative work of translation . **[8]** He maintains that the translator's interest is in the meaning first of all. Therefore, he performs his operation within the semantic field and based his views on translation units on a "semiotic of translation units". The distinction between literal and free translation which Nida and Catford define in their own terms has always been a controversial issue in the field of translation. when the theory of translation was still in its early stage, Cicero had already distinguished between translating the words and translating the sense .

III. CONCLUSION

The problems of literary translation are still open to conducting debates and individual proposals. The disagreement voiced by translation theorists as regards the problems that are involved In the process of literary translation stems from the confusion between a literary text and a literary translation. In fact the two are different and need to be clearly distinguished. A literary text is the direct product of an author. Its quality is assessed in terms of its relation to the literary tradition of the literature and the language in question. A literary text is not the product of such direct and unitary relation. It is not the direct product of an author and its quality is not assessed in terms of its relation to one literary tradition and one linguistic system. It is rather the result of a complex series of relations and correspondences. It is a relation, which the translator in his attempt to interpret the source language (SL) message, should establish between the meaning of the SL text and the extra linguistic factors which condition it, i.e., the author's thought and concept of life. It is a relation between the translator and the text to be translated. Finally, it is a result of an approximate correspondence between the stylistic effect of the original text and that of the target language (IL) version.

REFERENCES

1. Olive Classe, Encyclopedia of literary translation into English, vol. 1, Taylor & Francis, 2000, ISBN 1-884964-36-2, p. viii.
2. Steiner, George (1975). After Babel: Aspects of Language and TransLation Oxford University Press, London.
3. Tytler, Alexander Fraser, (1791). Essay on the Principles of Translation J. Dent and Co., Condor.
4. HOLMES, James (1975-1994): «The Name and Nature of Translation Studies», in J. Holmes: Translated Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies, Rodopi, Amsterdam, pp. 67–80.
5. Mathews, J. (1966) "Third Thoughts On Translating Poetry" in: Brower, R.A. (ed) On Translation Oxford University Press pp: 67 – 77.
6. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
7. NIDA, Eugene and TABER, Charles (1969-1982): The Theory and Practice of Translation, E. J. Brill, Leiden
8. BERNAL MERINO, Miguel Ángel (2002): La traducción audiovisual: análisis práctico de la traducción para los medios audiovisuales e introducción a la teoría de la traducción filológica, Universidad de Alicante, Alicante.