



Theorems in Translation from Jean-René Ladmiraal's Viewpoint

Mehran Zendehboudi

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.

ABSTRACT

Certain fish species, despite their importance as food, have been used in preparation of a number of ethno-medicinal concoctions. The present study reveals the utilization of 21 species of fishes belonging to 11 families and 18 genera by the ethnic groups of Bishnupur District of Manipur in preparation of ethno-medicines. The flesh of these fishes is consumed to cure some ailments and also to provide nutrients such as proteins, steroids, vitamins and minerals. Fish species frequently used for the purpose mentioned above belong to the following genera, namely Aorichthys (1 sp.), Anguilla (1 sp.), Barilius (1 sp.), Catla (1 sp.), Channa (1 sp.), Clarias (1 sp.), Colisa (1 sp.), Esomus (1 sp.), Eutropiichthys (1 sp.), Heteropneustes (1 sp.), Hilsa (1 sp.), Labeo (2 sp.), Mastacembelus (1 sp.), Monopterus (1 sp.), Mystus (1 sp.), Osteobrama (2 sp.), Puntius (1 sp.) and Wallago (1 sp.). Modes of administering the medicinal concoctions of fishes are described.

Keywords: Traditional knowledge, Ethno-medicine, fish as medicine, Manipur, Northeast India.

Corresponding author: Mehran Zendehboudi

INTRODUCTION

1. To be or not to be

Jean -René -Ladmiraal, a founder of frenchtranslatology, provides different definitions of translation. He is an intentionalist. One of his definitions of translation action is: "Translation means transferring writer's speech by profits to potentials of target language" (Ladmiraal, 2014, p.210). This causes target context loses its alienation.

It seems true that a target context should not be alien, but where is the situation of reader in this trend? In Ladmiraal theory, there is little role for reader supposed translator has the most important role in translation. Although there are a target language and a reader separate from the translator and source context writer.

Ladmiraal, in his papers and his book " Source perspective "provides famous verse of Shakespeare that is " to be or not to be, that is a question ". This example translate to French as " Etre ou ne pas être " that means to be or not to be . From Ladmiraal's viewpoint, it is not good not bad. He continues "that is the question" means it is a question or here is a question and both of them are not perfect. He presents a translation of a Canadian translator: " Vivre ou mourir, tout est là ". That is an excellent one. Ladmiraal believes that a man likes to found it himself so "tout est là" is better than word to word source context translation. Ladmiraal translates this verse as if Shakespeare thought and wrote in French (pp.210-211)

Here, identification translator with writer is shaped that is not correct in our point of view. There is also a comparison between these two translations that is not correct, too. Because these two translations have completely separate essence. There are two verses .one of them is in English and another is in French. First is read by source language reader and second is

read by target language reader. None of them are aware of another context or even language.

2. Theory and action

Ladmiraal believes that having better target translation than source one is not probable basically (p.210-211). From his viewpoint, translator means "co-auteur" and "récrivain ". It is suggested that "co-author" for first Persian equivalence because the translator is tagged the writer. For second one, we consider "second writer" It is not suitable for translator because two comes after one. So translator is not worthwhile compare to writer.

In our theory, the essence of these context are independent .It means that there is no source context after translating it and there is just a target context that it doesn't need to any context to be read.

Ladmiraal sometimes talks about translation theory and translatology although both of them are usually considered equal .In fact, their differences are in their semantic load (connotation) not in their meaning.

Ladmiraal believes that one of the most important purposes of translation is creating a theory and trying for conceptualization. In translation theory, there are our cultural, geographical, and language contributions. He supposes, in this way, we can see the world differ from others can. European translation theorists tend to structural linguistics but Anglo-Saxon translation theorists usually appeal to Chomsky's thought. Ladmiraal himself is not interested to create a coherent theory. Contrary to Ladmiraal, we search for a theory in order to help better understanding of translation.

Ladmiraal uses of "théoremes "which is divided theory. His first book was named: Traduire: théoremes pour la traduction means the theorems for translation. In other words it can be translated as partial theory which means a set of separate propositions for facing difficulty of translating action. (p. 163)

He ignores of a coherent theory that is far from action and in which a translator like a scholar teaches to his assistant.

Ladmiral's viewpoint is that theorizing is not to give the keys or techniques to translator but it is creating an atmosphere for a theorist thinking beyond translating action. (p. 164)

Ladmiral considers three points about dialectic theory and action:

- 1- In translation, the relation between theory and action is not possible in a linear way.
- 2- Action is independent of theory.
- 3- There is a specific clear sightedness for action.

This French contemporary translation theorist placed clear sightedness in the word "Umsich" that Heidegger mentions to. Heidegger in "Being and Time", states that there is a kind of knowledge accompany to action and an expert artisan who is skillful in his work knows what he does. He does not wait for a philosopher or scientist or engineer tells him what he should do. There is a special clear sightedness in his work itself.

Ladmiral accepts this idea and asks himself where a theorist should be placed. He considers the role of theorist to provide an action theory that he himself aware of and limits his aim and describes hidden clear sightedness in translating action in order to let translator provides a compiled and meaningful words for conceptualizing his problems. (pp. 166-167)

To sum up, contrary to Ladmiral's viewpoint, there is a linear connection between theory and action in translation. Some theoretical principles could be suggested that are directly applicable in translating action. Who can forget Vinay and Darbelnet's book: Comparative stylistics between French and English in which theoretical and applied principles are provided? It is important that the method is so noticeable and applicable that became a model for translation method in different language.

Vinay and Darbelnet consider units for translation that are universal. (borrowing, coinage, literal translation, transposition, modulation, adaptation, equivalence). In this book, writers not only provide strong theoretical principles but also mention their direct and applicable use.

Daniel Gouadec has published the book, Understanding and translation: Translation techniques in mother tongue (Comprendre et traduire : techniques de version). It composes of theory and practice in translation. Contrary to Ladmiral's belief, in this book, theory interferes to translating action directly in linear way. Gouadec's book is about language, syntax, translation errors and elementary principles of writing and etc. These are theoretical parts of the book followed by practical section. First chapter includes different noun phrases (NP) and syntax relations. Second chapter contains of thirteen units of translation. There are enormous applied examples and theoretical descriptions or applicable aspects of theories. Third chapter composed of various contexts of famous English writers that are followed by their translation and explanations. The book, Comparative syntax of English and French: problems of translation (Syntaxe comparée du français et de l'anglais : problèmes de traduction) is published by Jacqueline Gillemine-Flescher is a perfect example composing theory and practice based on Madame Bovary corpus.

Gillemine-Flescher's theoretical method is based on grammatical structure analysis of this novel and relates it to theoretical bases. In its preface is stated that translation theories is separated from translating action most of the time. Writers of the preface Culioli emphasizes on action and comparing aspects of translation. In This novel, he avoids of simple grammatical elements and study theoretical elements of translation. The relation of theory and action is obvious in Jacqueline Gillemine-Flescher's book.

The second point is Ladmiral believes that action is independent on theory. Action and theory are not separated and theoretical thought that is unrelated to action has no

observational facts and it could not be firm and proper. In foremost context, translator like Marcus Cicero wrote his theoretical thought about translation and he suggested that translation should not be word to word (verbum pro verbo). Saint Jerome, in Holy book, stated that some aspects in order to relate theory and action.

Practice can not be independent on theory. anti-intentionalism theory is not about how a translator works in all parts of the action. It is better understanding of translation. In our viewpoint, most theoretical words about translation are not apparently related to the action, they are connected to translating action because theoretical speech is a deep looking to what we do.

Third point That Ladmiral counts in dialectic theory and action of translation is a kind of clear sightedness in it. The problem is that he does not make it clear just by hint to Heidegger. He also plays with words and states that there is a kind of knowledge (Savoir) in skill (Savoir faire). If it be considered clear sightedness in skill, it causes the problem: skill may be acquired without deep knowledge.

Ladmiral's mistake is that he conceives translation as a handy works like sewing which a tailor teaches to his apprentice by experiences not by knowledge. Ladmiral supposes that there is a kind of clear sightedness here because sewing is Savoir faire so there is also Savoir in it.

It is preferable to use "talent" instead of clear sightedness (Clairvoyance). Every works needs talent so how it possible is that translation does not need it? Talent is needed for being a physician, mathematicians, painter, singer, runner, writer, poet, musician or etc., but how is it possible to be a translator does not need any talent where as translating is the most important action during the human history?

There are some qualifications for being a translator:

- Proficiency in source language.
- Proficiency in target language.
- Having translating talent
- Proficiency in subject
- Proficiency in special major.
- Having sufficient experiences (it is obvious that experiences should be acquired gradually).
- Recognizing specific cultural aspect of each context (it is differ from dominating in source context culture).

Another important point is that one can not reach to high quality level of translating just by studying more and more. Some people believe that by studying more about source language and reading more novels and poetries or classical masterpieces, a translator will dominates over mother tongue and will expand his vocabulary. But they forget translation is different from passing a language test. In language exam, one is tested in his vocabulary knowledge and knowing the more vocabulary, getting the better marks. But it is not true about translation. If one studies all poetical works and he doesn't have any talent in poetical arts, he will never become a poet. It is exactly the same as translator. If he does not have any talent in translating and studies all literal masterpiece in his mother tongue, he may not translate a simple literal context. Some translators tell proudly they can translate 200-pages book in three years. It may seem that he is a careful translator or has subtlety in his work but spending much time for translating does not guarantee a high quality translation.

Value system of a European is different from value system of an Iranian. A Muslim's value system is different from Christian's value system. Cultural features of France society is not alike cultural features of Iran society. They live in different worlds. Even Globalization doesn't cause Descartes, s country (France) think as similar as Hafez and Saadi's country. Even

Hollywood cartoons that are shown in France, Iran and Japan don't cause a child playing at down town of Bushehr has the same feeling as a child playing at downtown of Caen in France. Even computer games (another production of globalization) are used now a days by children don't cause them to have similar profits and systems. But it is not absolute and we don't reject the mutual effects of cultures.

These cause many problems for translator and he should pass them and create a context with its value system free from the source one.

Daniel Gouadec believes that central roles of transferring data is to give awareness and he names some examples : a manual of an electronic vehicle ,a text should be read at radio , a work report and etc.(Gouadec, 2001,42) . From anti-intentionalists' view that is near to Ladmira's theorems in translation, even context translation that is just for transferring data, is followed the above principle. If we consider a manual of an advanced washing machine that is translated from French to Persian , what will be valuable is independent source translation not method of choosing word or arrangement. It is understandable for a housewife with any grades of education and she can use it properly. Is the translator's purpose and his creativity important here? If ten translators with ten various thoughts, ten kind of creativities , ten capacity of cognitions and ten different purposes translate the same manual.(without any mistakes) and create a context, This context will be an independent life and everybody will use it. It doesn't matter for reader what is the purpose of translator and why does he translate this context.

The purpose of a translator may be financial and he can sign an agreement with a company or institution, independently receives the wage. (Gouadec, 2011, 25)

It will be a reason for anti-intentionalism in our viewpoint. What does a reader of target context need to be aware of translator's purpose? Is it important for him that a translator get a high wages or do it free for a charity center?

Although it may affect the time that a translator spend to. If fifty thousand tomans instead of two thousand per page is given to a translator, he will spend more time to translate it and consequently the quality of translation will decrease.

In translation process it can be claim that a text chooses and attracts a translator rather than a translator chooses a text . A translator of literature area doesn't attract to a botany book. A translator who work on novel choses a novel more than drama or poet. He chooses a novel for translation because if its reputation and reaction of publishing a novel in a country. Does a translator chooses the book or is he chosen by reputation? He may say « I will choose this book » because its subject, its prose, literal kind and style but actually these parameteres affects translator to choose the special book.

In Ladmira's views and ours, first perception should be search in translator himself. He reads the source context then interprets it and creates target context. There are other's perception In this complex process .How will it be understood? Numerous readings and readers make the perception difficult.

Ladmira, besides translatology (traductologie), creates two new words: cibliste and sourcier. First means aim or target and second means source. First ones are source oriented theorists and the seconds are target oriented theorists .Source oriented theorists are who emphasis on signifier of source language but are who target oriented theorists emphasis on signified rather than signifier. In other words, they stress on the context effect in target language (p. 30).

Ladmira considers two concepts of Georges Mounin: opaque glass and transparent glass.

Transparent glasses are a kind of translations that is directly written in target language but opaque glasses are a kind of

translations that is translated word to word in order to give a sense of alliance to reader because he never forgets to read a translation of a foreign book .

Ladmira considers these two as the metaphors through conceptualizing. Then he suggests that concept is nothing but a successful metaphor.

Ladmira creates another concepts "dissimilation" (he adds extra meaning to existed word). We suggest "distance" for its equivalence.

Distance means destination of source language words from target language in order to create meaning (as we refer before). Ladmira has named it as a key concept in translatology. We use distance in our two personal examples of translations.

First, we translated the book: "Inch Allah". It is an Arabic word and we use it in Persian, too. We suggest to write it on the book cover and keep the exact word .This common word is not interesting for Persian readers and does not attract them to read the book. Besides, they may think to face a religious book.

Then we profit of Ladmira's dissimilation .It is very practical for translating book titles. The book was a detective – spy novel happen imaginarily in Egypt. A reader who wants to read a spy book at least to pay attention to its title. So we choose the title "Spy in Egypt Pyramids" and publisher also designs an eagle , pyramids , Nile river , a boat and an Egyptian man with traditional clothes .Destination plays its role perfectly and we choose a suitable title for our book.

Another example was a book with the title "Votre enfant est doué et vous ne la savez pas" .Translation of this sentence is: your children are talent but you don't know. The book consists of aptitude tests and test some abilities like memory, observation sense, will power, logical thought, social relations, etc.

If we translated the title exactly the same and didn't changed it ,it wouldn't have any attraction for readers .The readers of this kind of book, first of all, are parents, then teachers of children and teenagers . So we get the words from sources and directly created the words in target context by using of Ladmira's dissimilation and create the title: "Aptitude test for children". From these three words "children "attracts people who search for this kind of content to choose this book.

In our theory, final text is not all things passing through the translator mind and it is not words written on paper. The words talk to readers themselves and have their meaning. In translation, meanings are not every things and not necessarily most important ones but it is just a part of translation.

One of the differences between intentionism theory and Ladmira's theory is that he believes that a translator should refer to action in all context in footnotes if it is necessary. He thinks that it is translator's faithfulness (p.183).We provide our opinion in previous pages.

Ladmira's view is that "the purpose of translation is to exempt us for reading source context (Ladmira, 2002,15). There are two matters in his definition: purpose of translation and purpose of translator. Ladmira just considers the purpose of translation and does not pay any attention to the translator purpose in translating action .The reader of target context is not considered and doesn't have any worth. Ladmira assumes to substitute translation of source context to target one. (p.15). We doesn't emphasis on problematic basis as he also agree with it and says that all the problems in translation happen because of the word "same".

Anti-intentionism theory doesn't agree with Ladmira because he doesn't consider translation as the same pages as the source context. We emphasis again that target context is an independent context from the source one and it does not need to compare it to other context.

We assume a novel as a source context and a reader buy it in order to want reading a novel. Now we consider these two suppositions about target context. Interpretation of novel is different in two cultures. Reader of the source context laughs to one thing but reader of target context laughs to another thing. French reader used to read Proust thick novel but Persian reader does not any deep relation to this kind of books. So if we consider these two, what will be a translator duty? He translates these books or should he shorten them in order to be bought by Persian readers or should he translate all the book without any summarizing? It is sufficient to refer to destiny of some books in Iran.

Another question is "how should Proust translate to Persian?" "We know that there is his translation before. Should his long sentences, sometime about a line, be translated exactly the same? Whatever his aim was, it caused to create such long sentences, but does a reader of target context read it in French? Do Persian reads who is used to short sentences like to see.(etc.)?"

What is the purpose of translator here? As we say before his purpose doesn't have any role on reader's reading? And the reader's reading also doesn't have any role on translation.

Both of them had lived, one in source and another in target, before they published that made them dead.

Does Proust sum up in his long sentences? Many people think that he sum up in his long sentences. Deeper reading of his work layers shows that it is not true and it is contradictive.

One of the most important point is that there is not any comparison between source and target context in anti-intentionalism theory. Two contexts are independent and from two different worlds. Translation criticizer should not ask "why does a translator translate?" Or "why does he omits two words or even some pages?" In the same way, reader should not search different layer of context in order to find translator's purpose of choosing different words.

Reader of context should communicate with the context words free from external factors.

We agree with Ladmiraal in which every translation theory faces to old problem "same" or "other". It means target context is not source one but it is not another context, too.

We believe that target context is not the same context rather it is other context. Suppose that there are two person in two different cities and two different countries with two languages and without any information from each other, they write a book. After publishing the book, it makes clear that there are similar in their styles, elements and etc.

Is it important not translate all the sentences? Is it important to omit some sentences or pages if it is necessary? Is it important that one sentence is lone and another is short? Is it important that a reader is in Iran or in French?

3. Thought rather than knowledge

Translation is an "event" with its special characteristics. It shapes because of a choice but this choice is chosen by translator and it finishes just after it had done. It is similar to different person in different counties who write a book.

In Iran, ZabihollahMansouri is accused to not be a faithful translator, they don't use the suitable word. He is the most important adaptor in Iran literature not a traitor. Although he sometimes translate context but most of the time he tries to adapt the context.

In our point of view, it is a kind of translation and I cut the bridge between source and target context. If one passes the bridge, it will pass but if one doesn't pass, he missed it.

In short, Ladmiraal's translatology, as he refers to it, is based on his thought rather than his knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Berman, Antoine. 1999. « Le penchant à traduire », in Des différentes méthodes du traduire et autre texte, Editions du Seuil, Paris.
2. Eco, Umberto. 2007. Dire presque la même chose. Expériences de traduction, Paris, Grasset.
3. Gouadec, Daniel. 2011. La traduction, la comprendre, l'apprendre, Paris : PUF.
4. Guillemin-Flescher, Jacqueline. 1998. Syntaxe comparée du français et de l'anglais. Problèmes de traduction, Paris : Ophrys.
5. Ladmiraal, Jean-René, Meschonnic, Henri. 1981. « Poétique de.../ Théorèmes pour... la traduction, in Langue française, n° 51, septembre, pp. 3-18.
6. Ladmiraal, Jean-René. 2002. Traduire : théorèmes pour la traduction, Paris : Gallimard.
7. Meschonnic, Henri. 2007. Ethique et politique du traduire, Paris : Verdier.
8. Reiss, Katharina. 2009. Problématiques de la traduction, Paris : Economica&Anthropos.
9. Steiner, George, Après Babel : une poétique du dire et de la traduction, Paris, Albin Michel, 1998.
10. Vinay, Jean-Paul et Darbelnet, Jean. 2011. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais, Paris : Didier.
11. Zendejboudi, Mehran, Philosophical Hermeneutics Approach to translation, in Translation Studies, 11th Vol, n. 48, septmber 2013, pp:59-70.
12. Zendejboudi, Mehran. 2015. Approches to Traslatology, Mashhad, Mohaghegh.