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**Translation: Definitions, Types, & Models**

There is no unanimous agreement on the definition of Translation, nor are translation theorists agreed on the types and models of translation. According to Ray (1962), translation means the transference of meaning from a language into another. Savory (1973) too is of the view that translation is concerned with the conveyance of meaning and style of the source linguistic text into the target text For Belyalyve also (Buzelli 1969), translation is a process by which thoughts and ideas are transferred from one language into another. Tweney and Hoemann (1976) define translation as the process in which meaningful utterances in one language are converted into meaningful utterances in another linguistic system. Seleskovitch (1976) considers translation as a substitution of a sequence of symbols in one language by a sequence of symbols in another language entailing the transference of source language meaning into the target language.

 For Newmark (1982), translation is "a craft which attempts to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and / or statement in another language". Some other scholars reject the suggestion that translation involves transference of meaning from the source text into the target language text.

 Nida (1974) believes that translation is concerned with the reproduction of the closest equivalent of the source language text (or textual material) in the target language (i.e., translation is based on equivalence not transference. Catford (1965) too rejects such a definition of translation and disagrees with Dostert who defines translation as " the transference of meaning from one set of patterned symbols into another set of patterned symbols", since Catford believes that meaning is the property of a language i.e., an SL text has an SL meaning, and a TL text has a TL meaning).

**Types of Translation:** Roman Jacobson (1959) classifies translation into three types:

 1. **Interlingual translation**: i.e., translation proper, in which the S.L. text is replaced by equivalent material from the T.L. Yet, Jacobson believes that no full equivalence is possible, and that even synonymous signs do not yield full equivalence; since each sign has a set of unique associations and connotations.

2. **Interlingual translation:** (or rewording). This type means or refers to Interpreting the verbal signs in a certain language by another set of verbal signs in the same language. This process may also be called paraphrase, as is the case with paraphrasing a certain poem or a literary text.

3. **Intersemiotic translation:** This is a form of transmutation in which one interprets certain verbal signs by sings of a non-verbal system.

**Popovic A. (McGutre 1980)**: classifies translation in terms of four types of equivalence:

 1. **Linguistic equivalence (i.e., a word-for-word transition).**

2. **Paradigmatic equivalence** (i.e., emphasizing elements of grammar).

3. **Stylistic equivalence:** (i.e., aiming at the reproduction in the T.L. of the expressive identity of the S.L.).

4. **Textual (syntagmatic) equivalence** (i.e., emphasizing formal similarity between the S.L. and the T.L. texts). Some linguists have considered translation as an innate and natural skill in bilinguals, a sort of translation competence in the Chomsky sense or implication (Newmark 1982). By "natural translation" they mean any translation practiced by bilinguals who have not got any previous training in the field of translating. Seleskovitch on the other hand, suggests an Interpretive translating theory in which she bases her argument on "sense" and not on the linguistic units of words or sentences; and emphasizes the translator's necessary awareness of the purpose behind the utterance, not of language and contrastive linguistics, (Ibid).

**Nida on the other hand suggests two main types of equivalence:**

**1. Formal equivalence:** In which the translator focuses his attention on the similarity of form between the S.L. text and the T.L. text as well as on the content, in order to enable the T.L. reader to grasp and understand as much as possible of the original text.

 **2. Dynamic equivalence**: What Nida means by dynamic equivalence is that the translator has to reproduce an equivalent effect on the receiver as that experienced by the S.L. receiver (i.e. establishing a similar relationship between the T.L. receiver and the T.L. message as that between the S.L. receiver and the S.L. message). It is in accordance with this principle that Nida cites J.B. Phillips' rendering of Romans 16 where the ides of ‘greeting with a holy kiss’ i rendered as "a hearty hand -shake" which goes also with the target language culture.