

In Peter France (ed) (2000) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 20-26.

Linguistic Perspectives on Translation

© Mona Baker

Centre for Translation & Intercultural Studies, University of Manchester, UK

Any discussion of translation or translated literature inevitably draws on some set of assumptions concerning the way language is structured, the way this structure is manipulated to create special effects, and the processes by which language use comes to both reflect and influence social attitudes and cultural values. Detailed attention to the linguistic make-up of a literary text and its translation is particularly evident in certain types of studies, such as those which concern themselves with questions of gender: as Simon (this volume) explains, works by feminist authors such as Louky Bersianik directly address the role that language plays in constructing certain cultural values. But practically all scholars who have concerned themselves with the study of translation, particularly literary translation, have had to address linguistic issues at some stage, with greater or lesser degrees of sophistication.

Linguistics, the academic discipline which concerns itself with the study of language at large, has traditionally been seen to provide a set of tools which enable us to produce more, and more sophisticated, descriptions of the language of translation. In recent years, however, the value of linguistic descriptions of translation has been questioned within the emerging discipline of translation studies. Indeed, much of the current literature on translation assumes that there exists a clear-cut divide between two broad orientations in the study of translation: one informed by linguistics and generally referred to as 'linguistically-oriented' and one largely based on a mixture of cultural studies and literary theory and generally known as the 'cultural' approach and sometimes presented as having initiated a 'cultural turn' in the study of translation (Baker 1996a; Venuti 1996; Lefevere and Bassnett 1990). But there is a great deal more diversity and overlap in scholarly work on translation than is often acknowledged. More importantly, it would seem that the most illuminating descriptions of translated literature in particular defy being subsumed under any labels and draw freely on a wide variety of research tools, including those of linguistics and cultural studies.

A good example comes from recent work by Keith Harvey on translations of the camp style associated with homosexual characters in French and Anglo-American post-war fiction (Harvey 1998). Harvey, a linguist by training, offers a detailed linguistic analysis of the features of camp in both languages, including the inversion of gender-specific terms ('girl talk'), renaming, the use of empty adjectives such as *adorable*, the use of French in English dialogue, and formal expressions of ambivalent solidarity. Ambivalent solidarity (or what Quentin Crisp calls 'stylised cattiness') is expressed through alternating moves of support and attack, or feigned support accompanied by innuendos relating, for example, to another gay man's sexual prowess. Harvey supplements this formal description by a detailed study of other factors which influence translation choices, such as the existence and visibility of gay subcultural codes and the

existence or absence of an established gay literature in the target culture, negative or positive evaluations of camp within each culture, the sexual identity of the translator, and the translator's identification with a gay subcultural group. In other words, recent studies of translation incorporate in their descriptions formal linguistic analysis, analysis of the cultural setting of translation, publishing strategies, biographical detail, and much else.

A Historical Overview

Linguistics and translation have long had what Fawcett (1997a) aptly calls a 'love-hate relationship'. At one time, translation studies was widely thought of as a branch of applied linguistics, and its status as such was rarely questioned. Today, it is increasingly being recognized as an independent discipline and there is some question as to how much it should draw on linguistics. Some writers argue that the study of translation must break away from its traditional association with linguistics and develop more culturally- and historically-oriented models of research. Others insist that detailed linguistic descriptions must provide the starting point for examining any work in translation. A brief summary of the history of this troubled relationship between linguistics and translation studies may help us understand the reasons for the current resistance to linguistic models and, hopefully, place the contribution of linguistic approaches in a more realistic perspective.

Early Approaches

During the fifties, sixties and seventies, when translation studies was still struggling to establish a place for itself in the academy, linguistics had already come to be recognized as a fully fledged 'scientific' discipline and had developed an impressive range of research methods and tools of analysis. Given that language is the raw material of translation and that translation studies needed a role model to follow in order to establish itself in the academy, linguistics naturally became the main source of theoretical and pedagogical insights. Initially, partly because linguistics itself was less sophisticated in its approach to language at the time, linguistic studies of translation were often extremely simplistic in their approach to meaning and highly prescriptive in their pronouncements on translation. There were far fewer descriptive studies than there are now. The thrust of much linguistically-oriented work was that clear guidelines had to be developed to ensure that translators had a set of ready made, reliable solutions for linguistic difficulties. These difficulties were perceived as essentially formal in nature: lack of equivalence at word level, culture-specific items, difficult syntax, non-matching of grammatical categories such as gender, and so on. And often translation was firmly believed to be a branch of applied linguistics rather than a separate, albeit emerging, discipline in its own right. This view of the study of translation is still held by some linguistically-oriented scholars such as Bell (1991:xvi), who attempts to develop "an intellectually satisfying and practically applicable theory of translation within a broadly defined applied linguistics". But translation scholars associated with the linguistics paradigm today are among the most active in promoting translation studies as an independent discipline. The vast majority simply see linguistics as a major (but not the only) source of insights and research tools in the discipline.

Initially then, much of what went on under the banner of linguistics in translation studies proceeded along the following lines: here is a source text in language A; how can it best be translated into language B given what we know about the characteristics of languages A & B? A classic example of this approach is Vinay and Darbelnet's *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction* (1958). Some studies attempted to formalize in more general terms the various ways in which translators should proceed to transfer the units of a source text into another language in order to produce an accurate target text. This is typical of the work of Bible translators in general, especially Eugene Nida.

A third type of study is exemplified by J. C. Catford's *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965). Unlike Bible translators, Catford was more interested in what *can* be done in translation, given what we know about the way language works in general. In other words, he was interested in exploring the potential that language as such offers the translator. One of the interesting types of translation he proposed for instance was phonological translation. This is an idealized category, based on the idea that the translator might want to give absolute priority to the phonological level, so that the choice of lexis and syntax in the target language is dependent on the criterion of sound alone. But it can be seen to apply to a large extent in highly experimental work such as the Zukovskys' translation of Catullus (O rem ridiculum, Cato, et iocosam / O ram ridicule home, Cato, the jokes some). Other examples include humorous collections such as the *Mots D'Heures: Gousses, Rames. The d'Antin Manuscript* and *N'Heures Souris Rames. The Coucy Castle Manuscript*. The Humpty Dumpty rhyme, for example, is rendered in the d'Antin Manuscript as 'Un petit d'un petit / S'étonne aux Halles / Un petit d'un petit / Ah! degrés te fallent ...'. This suggests that exploring the potential of language as such need not be totally irrelevant, though today this line of research is not generally favoured in linguistically-oriented studies. There is far more interest now in investigating actual translational behaviour.

Generally speaking, however, the literature on translation during this period was by and large pedagogical in orientation and the approach to meaning and to what translators actually have to do was essentially simplistic and divorced from context.

The Eighties and Nineties

During the eighties and nineties, a new generation of translation scholars with training in linguistics began to carry out more sophisticated descriptive studies. These focused more on exploring what actually happens in translation than on what should happen or what can potentially happen. The starting point for much of this work was the idea that meaning is diffuse, in the sense that it is not located in the word or grammatical category but is signalled by a variety of means which cross the traditional boundaries of word, phrase, clause, sentence, and even text. It is also unstable, in that it is only realized in text, and a 'dictionary' meaning may even be negated within a specific textual environment. Moreover, meaning is now understood to be culturally constructed and all language use is seen as mediated (culturally, ideologically, cognitively). Language, both generally and in translation, has come to be seen as intimately linked to the social and cultural context in which it is produced.

There are various practical implications of this current view of meaning and language. The first is that linguistics and (eventually) linguistically-oriented studies of translation began to widen their scope of analysis: they gradually moved outwards from the word to the sentence, to structures above the sentence, to the text as a unit of analysis, and finally to the text as a cultural artefact embodying the values that a given culture attaches to certain practices and concepts. Second, having accepted that all language use is mediated, linguistic studies began to put more emphasis on the role of ideology in translation, both in terms of the conflict between source and target ideologies or world views and in terms of the translator's and other participants' own ideology and personal stakes in the communication. Ideology here is not understood in the political sense but rather as a 'point of view' which derives from "the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value-systems which are shared collectively by social groups" (Simpson 1993:5). Language is assumed to "of necessity *reflect* .. and ... *construct* ideology" (ibid:6).

In recent years, a number of studies by linguistically-oriented writers have foregrounded the issue of ideology in translation. For example, Williams (1992:75) has argued that "considerations of ideology and point of view are of relevance to the translator – not to mention the literary critic and even perhaps the writer". His position is compatible in some respects with recent calls for privileging 'weaker' cultures in translation. He argues against carrying over certain English generic formats and stylistic features in Arabic translation because this practice is "not totally beneficial to the continuing individuality of the various Arabic cultures" (ibid:91). In particular, the use of the passive to report scientific experiments, which implies the validity of the experiment regardless of the experimenter, clashes with "the established high visibility of the writer and the reader in Arabic written texts" (ibid).

Mason (1994) analyses a text and its translation which appeared in a bilingual format in the *UNESCO Courier* (*Tiene la Historia un Destino? / History or Destiny?*). He demonstrates that the source and target texts express two very different world views and ideologies. The source text concedes that the Spanish Conquistadors were the official chroniclers of Mexican history but states that there were also indigenous voices that remain under-represented; these voices have preserved the 'memory' of the peoples of Mexico. The discourse is one of a nation striving to forge its own destiny by actively searching for its past and recording it. In the target text, the role of memory is downplayed and "the active search for the past and the task of recording it turn into a passive 'view' of the past and a 'desire' to interpret it" (ibid:29).

This study by Mason is typical of linguistically-informed research in two respects. First, although the focus is very much on ideology, Mason suggests that "there is no need to attribute the divergent discourse of the target text to any deliberate intention of the translator" because mediation "may largely be an unconscious process" (ibid:33). In other words, unlike some of the work done on translation from a cultural studies perspective, there is no attempt here to promote a view of deliberate, conscious manipulation on the part of the translator. A similar view of ideology is expressed in a study by Peter Fawcett of Stuart Gilbert's translation of André Malraux's *La Voile*

royale, where he explicitly refers to racist elements in the translation. In his conclusion, however, he states that he “should have been saying not that Gilbert was a racist, but that he was living and writing in times when the pressure of the dominant discourse made such language almost inescapable, since it was part of the wallpaper, so to speak” (1997b:264).

Second, the linguistic analysis offered to support the statement that there is an ideological mismatch between source and target texts in Mason’s study is far more detailed and more varied than the analysis we find in the work of scholars associated with the cultural paradigm. Mason supports his claims with analyses at a variety of levels. Lexically, he points out many differences in the choice of vocabulary (‘sabios’ becomes ‘diviners’; ‘testimonios’ becomes ‘written records’, and so on). He also analyses the divergent structures of the two texts in some detail, particularly with reference to the flow of information or the linear arrangement of elements in the clause. In this kind of analysis, the clause is treated as a message rather than a string of grammatical and lexical items. As a message, the clause consists of two elements: the theme, what the clause is about, comes first and provides a point of orientation. The rheme is what the speaker or writer says about the theme and provides new information. Mason shows how the source text places ‘effort’/‘memory’/‘destiny’ in theme position, providing a point of orientation at the beginning of sentences. The target text, by contrast, puts humans in theme position and places in rheme position (where new information is usually placed) verbs that do not portray these humans in a pro-active role: for example ‘met with mixed fortunes’, ‘succeeded one another’. Cumulatively, the effect is one of portraying a view of destiny as passive observation rather than personal commitment. Such detailed analyses at a variety of levels are noticeably different from the discussions found in works such as Lawrence Venuti’s *The Translator’s Invisibility* (1995) or Venuti (1996). Apart from analyses of poetic devices such as metre, rhyme, alliteration and so on, Venuti draws on categories which a linguistically-oriented researcher would consider too broad and too restricted to the traditional levels of vocabulary and syntax: archaisms, dialect, regional choice, syntactic inversions. A linguistically-oriented scholar would typically want to provide analyses which offer finer distinctions at the levels of lexis and syntax and which also incorporate other levels of description, such as information flow, cohesion, linguistic mechanisms of expressing politeness, norms of turn taking in conversation, and so on.

The 1990s in particular then have witnessed a growing interest in the role of ideology and power play in shaping translational behaviour, with most studies adopting a descriptive, theoretical approach to the data. This contrasts with the earlier treatment of culture as a question of cultural artefacts, for instance in much of the work by Peter Newmark and Eugene Nida, and essentially as a problem that had to be solved at the applied level. It also means that the emphasis on the translator’s obligation to be totally neutral, which was traditionally taken for granted as part of a strict code of ethics that governed all translation work, has now begun to give way to a realistic view of translators and interpreters as real personae in any communicative act. Descriptive studies in sensitive areas such as face-to-face interpreting in particular have shown quite clearly that interpreters are not totally neutral, even when they believe they should be. These studies are largely informed by research in sociolinguistics and the

ethnography of speaking, in particular the work of Erving Goffman and Dell Hymes (see for instance Wadensjö 1992; Berk-Seligson 1988, 1990; Roy 1993).

In terms of the clear-cut divide that is sometimes assumed to exist between linguistically- and culturally-oriented studies, one area that throws doubt on these assumptions is signed language interpreting and translation. Scholars working in this field have always, and by necessity, had to draw very heavily on linguistics *and* had to consider questions of culture and ideology from the start. The Deaf community has suffered as a minority from marginalization worldwide, and part of its struggle to affirm its identity has involved demonstrating that signed languages do not consist of arbitrary gestures but are languages in the full sense of the word. For example, a bid was recently made to secure recognition of British Sign Language as one of the many source languages for which funding might be sought from the Translation Committee of the Arts Council of England: this is the committee that allocates subsidies to allow publishers to bring out in English translation literary works which would not otherwise be commercially viable. The argument was essentially for the right of the Deaf community in Britain to be recognized as a distinct cultural group by the institutions of the dominant, hearing culture. Winning this argument would secure access to public funds in order to support translations of signed language poetry into English. But this argument had to be fought on linguistic grounds. The Committee required proof that BSL is a language before it would officially recognize it as a source language for translation. Thus we see that issues of language are inextricably linked with issues of culture and of ideology in this type of translation. There is no question here of choosing between approaches, of prioritizing a specific approach, indeed not even of positing a distinction between approaches to start with. The kind of close attention to linguistic detail that we find in the work of writers such as Mason becomes a prerequisite to any successful promotion of a cultural agenda.

The use of corpora in studying translation

Another area of research which emerged in the nineties involves using computerized corpora to study the language of translation as such. This work is informed by a specific area of linguistics known as corpus linguistics. Corpus linguistics relies on the large scale analysis of a very large body of authentic running text to capture regularities in language use. The texts are held in machine readable form and are thus amenable to automatic or semi-automatic analysis. Within linguistics, this methodology has revolutionised lexicographic practices and methods of language teaching in particular. In spite of its initial focus on regularities, it is highly relevant to the study of literary text in general, and hence of literary translation. John Sinclair, one of the leading scholars in corpus linguistics, explains that the initial focus on repeated events “does not mean that unique, one-off events are necessarily ignored, but rather that they cannot be evaluated in the absence of an interpretative framework provided by the repeated events” (1996:81). The creativity we associate with literary texts in particular can only be explained against the backdrop of typical language patterning.

Here is an example. Louw (1993) describes a phenomenon of linguistic patterning now known as ‘semantic prosody’. A semantic prosody is a consistent aura of meaning

which a lexical item acquires through its repeated association with other items in the language; it often expresses attitudinal meaning. Louw uses this notion to explain a feature in the poem *Days* by Philip Larkin, which starts “What are days for? / Days are where we live”. ‘Days are where we live’ should communicate happy associations, and yet it is “a line which leaves the reader with inexplicable feelings of melancholia” and foreshadows the theme of death which emerges in the second half of the poem (ibid:162). By looking at the occurrences of *days* in a corpus of 37 million words, Louw is able to demonstrate that *days* has a very strong association with items such as *gone*, *over*, *good and over*. Our experience of the language, our regular exposure to this type of patterning, makes us subliminally associate *days* not with where we are now but with where we were, where we *have lived* and where we perhaps are unable to return.

A number of translation scholars are currently engaged in building a corpus of translational English, with a view to identifying features which distinguish the language of translation from that of ordinary language users (Baker 1996b, Laviosa 1997). It has been argued, Baker (1996b), that translation is subject to a set of constraints which inevitably leave traces in the language that translators produce: the fact that a translated text is constrained by a fully articulated text in another language, for instance, would seem to be a major and unique constraint. Moreover, a variety of claims have been made about the language of translation in recent years. These claims need to be tested by analysing a large body of translated texts, including fiction, a category which is well-represented in the Translational English Corpus (Laviosa 1997). For example, Pym (this volume) suggests that “translations into English have tended to be in a language that is less specific, more international, than most works originally written in English”. Researchers engaged in corpus-based analysis of translated text want to examine claims of this type closely: they want to identify the actual features which make the language of translation less specific.

The idea that the language of translation is distinct from ordinary language has been debated in the literature for some time. With the exception of corpus-based work, however, no attempt has been made to investigate this issue on a large scale. One of the earliest references to this issue can be found in Frawley (1984). Frawley suggested that the confrontation of source text and target language during the process of translation results in creating what he called a ‘third code’. In other words, the code (or language) that evolves during translation and in which the target text is expressed is unique. It is a kind of compromise between the norms or patterns of the source language and those of the target language. A concrete example of this phenomenon can be found in Bernard Dulsey’s English translation of an Ecuadorian novel (*Huasipungo*) by Jorge Icaza. The word *pes*, which is a derivative of the Spanish *pues*, is borrowed directly in the translation. *Pes* means something like *well* or *then* and can simply be used as a filler. The pattern of borrowing in this particular translation illustrates how the third code works in practice. In addition to the positions in which it would normally occur in the Ecuadorian dialect, *pes* also occurs in the English translation in positions where it would not occur in its original code. So we have two patterns. The first is straight borrowing, as in ‘Dónde estás, *pes*?’ / ‘Where are you, *pes*?’. Here *pes* occurs at the end of the clause, where it would normally occur in the Ecuadorian dialect and where *pues* would occur in Spanish. The second pattern, which occurs in the same translation,

follows the norms of *Well* in English, as in ‘Dos o tres veces he sido capataz, *pes*’ / ‘*Pes*, I have been a foreman a few times’. In effect, this second patterning tries to accommodate the lexis of the source text and the syntax of the target language. In both cases we end up with a ‘third code’ in Frawley’s terms: a pattern where either the borrowed word would not occur in its original environment or one where the equivalent of the borrowed word would not occur in the target environment.

The notion of the third code provides a useful starting point for explaining some of the concerns of translation scholars who are attempting to apply the techniques of corpus linguistics to investigating the language of translation. It is useful because Frawley approaches what he sees as different in the language of translation from a descriptive and theoretically sophisticated angle. There is no question here of talking about ‘translationese’, with all the pejorative connotations of this term. Translation results in the creation of a third code because it is a unique form of communication, not because it is a faulty, deviant or sub-standard form of communication.

Scholars working in the area of corpus-based studies are interested in investigating the notion of the third code more closely. First, they stress that the co-presence of codes is not the only constraint that operates in translation: other constraints exist and contribute to the distinctive patterning of translated text. Moreover, the nature of this co-presence of codes itself needs to be clarified. This is because the mere presence of two codes in the same event is not sufficient to distinguish translation from things like the speech and writing of second language learners, where it is also recognized that the learner or speaker is consciously operating with two codes. Second, scholars working in this area also wish to develop a methodology for investigating the distinctiveness of translational language. Having access to a vast amount of translated text in machine readable form, and a suite of software tools to process it with, is only a starting point. One has to develop a method for approaching the data: knowing what to look for and how to look for it. And third, scholars ultimately want to be able to provide a detailed description of the language of translation and to offer some hypotheses about the motivation behind certain types of patterning.

For example, let us assume that we do find, as is often claimed, that there is a tendency towards normalisation in translated English. That is, translators into English tend to be more conservative in their use of language, drawing heavily on core patterns of English and largely avoiding highly marked patterns. There is in fact some evidence for this tendency in the Translational English Corpus, but the corpus is currently too small to substantiate strong claims: it is approximately two million words, which is very small by the standards of corpus linguistics. But one interesting feature is that there is a striking homogeneity among the translated texts compared to texts originally written in English, in the same domain. That is, whatever area of patterning we look at, the translated texts seem to behave more like each other, while the original texts are more individual in their make-up.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon, if it were to prove widely representative of translated text, is that translators subconsciously respond to what they perceive to be the textual and social status of translation. They know that translations are not received

in the same way as original texts. Readers and reviewers have different expectations concerning what constitutes a good translation and what constitutes a good original work of literature. The reception of *Ulysses* would almost certainly have been different if it had been presented to the literary community as a translation from another language. Subconsciously then, translators may monitor their linguistic output in order to conform to the expectations of readers and reviewers. So they end up drawing on the 'safer', more typical patterns of the language.

Pym (this volume) offers another possible motivation for the kind of patterning we are beginning to identify even in translated English fiction. Translations into English have tended to use a less specific, more international form of the language because of the status of English on the world market and because "translators and publishers set about to address many regions at once". This might explain certain types of patterning that have been observed in the Translational English Corpus. For instance, the most frequent words in English are significantly more frequent in translational English, and this applies to both newspaper texts and translated novels and short stories. Also, both type/token ratio and lexical density are consistently lower in translational English. Type/token ratio is a measure of the variety of vocabulary used in a text or corpus: the higher the ratio the more varied the vocabulary used, the lower it is the more restricted a text or corpus in terms of the number of different words that occur in it. Lexical density is a measure of the redundancy built into a text: it concerns the ratio of lexical or content words vs. grammatical items. The higher the ratio of lexical items such as 'love' or 'peace' and the lower the ratio of grammatical items such as 'in' and 'the', the more dense the text. Conversely, the higher the ratio of grammatical items the more redundancy is built in and the easier it is to process a text.

This may all sound too technical for the non-linguistically trained reader interested in understanding how the language of translation functions and how it differs from ordinary language. As in all specialized fields, the analysis is inevitably too focused on very specific phenomena and draws on specialized terminology. In due course, the results of such analyses can be packaged in less technical language for the layperson. In the first instance, however, linguistically-oriented scholars would argue that the analyses themselves have to be undertaken in order to support or refute the claims made about translational language from a more informed position.

Concluding Remarks

Linguistically-oriented work continues to demonstrate the relevance of linguistic insights to the study of translation. It has gained considerably in sophistication in recent years, by widening its scope of analysis and by increasingly paying attention to cultural and human factors. More importantly, recent studies of translated literature in particular (e.g. Tymoczko 1985, Harvey 1998) explicitly draw their insights from a wide range of sources: from cultural studies to formal logic and from literary theory to functional linguistics. This suggests that the time has perhaps come to abandon some of our unproductive assumptions about clear-cut divisions in the discipline.

References

- Baker, Mona (1996a) 'Linguistics and Cultural Studies: Complementary or Competing Paradigms in Translation Studies?', in Angelika Lauer, Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Johann Haller & Erich Steiner (eds) *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch: Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 9-19.
- Baker, Mona (1996b) 'Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges that Lie Ahead', in Harold Somers (ed) *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering, in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 175-186.
- Bell, Roger (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, London & New York: Longman.
- Berk-Seligson, Susan (1988) 'The Impact of Politeness in Witness Testimony: the Influence of the Court Interpreter', *Multilingua* 7(4): 441-439.
- Berk-Seligson, Susan (1990) *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1965/1980) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Fawcett, Peter (1997a) *Translation and Language. Linguistic Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Fawcett, Peter (1997b) 'Macerated Malraux: A Study of *La Voile royale* in Translation', in Karl Simms (ed) *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects*, Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi, 247-265.
- Frawley, William (1984) 'Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation', in William Frawley (ed) *Translation: Literary, Linguistic, and Philosophical Perspectives*, London & Toronto: Associated University Press.
- Harvey, Keith (1998) 'Translating Camp Talk. Gay Identities and Cultural Transfer', in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *Translation and Minority*, special issue of *The Translator* 4(2): 295-320.
- Laviosa, Sara (1997) 'How Comparable Can Comparable Corpora Be?', *Target* 9(2): 289-319.
- Lefevere, Andre and Susan Bassnett (1990) 'Introduction. Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies', in Susan Bassnett & Andre Lefevere (eds) *Translation, History & Culture*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Louw, Bill (1993) 'Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer. The Diagnostic Potential of Semantic Prosodies', in Mona Baker, Gill Francis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 157-176.

- Mason, Ian (1994) 'Discourse, Ideology and Translation', in Robert de Beaugrande, Abdulla Shunnaq and Mohamed Heliel (eds) *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 23-34.
- Roy, Cynthia (1993) 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Interpreter's Role in Simultaneous Talk in Interpreted Interaction', *Multilingua* 12(4): 341-363.
- Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Sinclair, John (1996) 'The Search for Units of Meaning', *Textus* IX: 75-106.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1996) 'Translation, Heterogeneity, Linguistics', *TTR* IX(1): 91-115.
- Vinay, J.-P. and Darbelnet, J. (1958) *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*, Paris: Didier. Translated into English by Juan Sager and M.-J. Hamel as *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Wadensjö, Cecilia (1992) *Interpreting as Interaction. On Dialogue Interpreting in Immigration Hearings and Medical Encounters*, Linköping: Linköping University.
- Williams, Malcolm (1992) 'Ideology, Point of View, and the Translator', *Turjuman* 1(1): 75-94.