

## Translation Compréhension/re-expression

Roya Letafati<sup>1</sup>

### Abstrac

Language like other inventions was originated to serve human needs in different civilization. Different language was created later.

Contextually the importance of translation from one language to another is not only to understand words; as the words are not the elements of translation. Importance and base of translation lies in context to understand it. After getting the content, one should deliver the same idea with the words of the destination language. That is an art of creative reproduction.

There is no doubts that ideology is not specific for a special language. Difference in ideologies is originated from human essence and experiences and it is not related to the kinds of languages. Translation is the first and the most important way to convert these concepts and connect people, cultures and civilizations. Therefore it will not be an exaggeration if we say translation is a medium for creating peace.

**Key word:** Translation, Understanding, Reproduction, Translator.

"Les difficultés et l'obscurité ne s'aperçoivent en chacune science que pour ceux qui y ont entrée. Car encore faut-il pousser à une porte pour savoir qu'elle nous est close. D'où naît cette platonique subtilité que, ni ceux qui savant n'ont à s'enquérir, d'autant qu'ils savant, ni ceux qui ne savant, d'autant que pour s'enquérir, il faut savoir de quoi on s'enquiert."<sup>2</sup>

*Michel de Montaigne, Livre Troisième, Chapitre XIII*

---

1. Assistant Professor, Tarbiat Modares University

2. Montaigne's Writing, with its unique prose, belonging to the renaissance era, is beautiful and non-translatable. However, here we have translated and composed a few lines:

The dark and unknown parts of every science are only perceptible for those who are involved in it. For to know whether a door is open or not, there is no way but to push it...



## Introduction

Only human beings use language to communicate. It is this capability that makes them distinguished from other living beings. Among the various means, people have for communication, one that everybody knows is translation. The difficulties of the work of translation, for those who have not ventured into it seem to be only in one phase, which would be the pure and simple transposition of the words of one language in to another.

Although the words are indispensable, but understanding and speaking a language needs more than a mere knowledge of its words. Indeed, without grammar one can by no means understand and express oneself in a particular language. However, the translation consists of two stages: comprehension and re-expression

## Comprehension


It is an absolute necessity for the translator to understand the meaning of the message. Indeed, the goal of the translation is to communicate the ideas of a speaker/author of the source language to one or several receptors of the target language.

A transmitted message consists of four parameters: a speaker/author (S/A) addressing a receptor (R) or a group of receptors, by means of a vector (V), to describe an object (O).

The sentences (messages) are like snowflakes. However people understand. How is it possible that my reader understands me despite of the fact what I write here and now is new? It is because grammar that I employ to render me comprehensible and for

encoding my message, is the same as the one my reader uses to decode my message. This rule is employed for all the languages of the world. If a language or any form of speech did not have encoded grammar in it, the speaker could not encode his message and the reader will be unable to decode it.

The situation of communication is different in the case of a translation. Considering the ignorance of general public vis-a-vis to the foreign languages, the translators play the part of intermediary between the languages, by facilitating the access to the texts and the masterpieces of the other countries. The translator replaces the receptor. "It becomes the receiver (R) of a message in the source language, which is not intended to him. It emits then in its turn, in the target language, a message that by using a vector (V') describes an object (O') for a receptor (R'). A schematic diagram of complete communication is presented here.<sup>1</sup>



To ensure the equivalence of the two messages and to keep the same contents of information, the translator must include/understand the message in the source language. Lexical knowledge proves to be insufficient to succeed this task. The lexicons of the two languages do not overlap exactly. Each language

1. D. Moskowitz, *Le traducteur: récepteur et destinataire du message, in exégèse et traduction*, p.7.



has a semantic and denotative specific cutting. The questions such as polysemia and synonymy, the stylistic variety and the connotations prove to be awkward. Let us consider the word [korsi] in Persian, which after examination provides the following translations in French: platform, desk, chair, the capital and the seat.

The only relationship between all these expressions lies in the employment of the word in Persian. i.e. the indicated concepts are analyzed in Persian by only one word. Let us consider another example:

At first sight, the translation of the term "student" in Persian does not seem to make problem, however, this can have two equivalents in Persian which are "danechjou" and "talabéh", latter emphasizes student in religious schools.

Sometimes, fidelity to the word makes a big obstacle for the translation. It is necessary to avoid the immediate transfer of the words of a language to another. As E.Carry affirms it:

"the translator must probe each word until in its depths without losing as much as possible the movement which animates the text."<sup>1</sup>

Seleskovitch<sup>2</sup> further underlines that the translator cannot be satisfied to substitute words for words out of the context. The translation is carried out through a mental activity. For a good comprehension of the message, a simple comparison of the words proves to be insufficient. Let us compare following paragraph

with its translation into Persian:

"the fight against racism must be a daily reflex. Our vigilance should never drop. It is necessary to start by giving the example and paying attention to the words which one uses."<sup>3</sup>

"مبارزه با نژاد پرستی باید واکنشی هر روزه باشد. نباید از هوشیاری ما کاسته شود. باید از خودمان شروع کنیم و در به کارگیری کلمات دقیق باشیم."

The simple recourse to the dictionary to translate the recent paragraph into Persian would by no means make the work of the translator advanced. So it is a question of finding

the words and the sentences in Persian which convey the same thing, parallel to the original speaker/author. Words and sentences here are the equivalents rather correspondents to the originals. It is thus a question of understanding messages which were not conceived and formulated according to the translator, but according to the true receptors.

## Re-Expression

Comprehension by itself is not enough to succeed the translation work. The essential basis consists in repeating the same thing in the target language. Indeed, comprehension is a first stage of the work which "must be expressed by means of a re-

3. Tahar Ben Jelloun, *Le racisme expliqué à ma fille*, seuil, 1998, p.61.

۴. معنای نژادپرستی برای دخترم. طاهر بن جلون. رؤیا لطافتی، ۱۳۷۸، انتشارات زمستان.

1. E.Cary, *Comment faut-il traduire?* p.32.

2. f.: D.Seleskovitch, *Vision du monde et traduction in Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, 1973.



expression of equal quality."<sup>1</sup>

The differences between the linguistic structures do not prevent "from going from the language to the meaning, then meaning to the word, whatever are at the beginning and whatever at the end the means used are."<sup>2</sup>

Certain languages do not have all verbal times, but there remains erroneous to believe that the men who speak them do not make the conceptualization between the past and the present. By studying the languages, one can find that there are differences and different ways to express the things and opinions e.g. "I ate with Marie" has the same meaning as "I took the meal with Marie" where as in Persian:

با ماری غذا خوردم.

In these three examples the linguistic elements (do not overlap completely) are not superimposed completely.

The translation is an operation which transposes "what the man sees and not what its language names."<sup>3</sup>

The translation is compared to the word and not compared to the language. The idea that the word expresses is not the category which the language expresses. When the linguistic statement being translated there is a word. There would be thousands of words one would not seize more.

The words are only "virtualities of words, not

carried out,"<sup>4</sup> and the linguistic differences constitute an insuperable obstacle for the word to word translation. The distinction between the feminine and the masculine, "il", "elle", "celle-ci", "celle-là", "celui-ci", "celui-là", does not exist in Persian.

However the Persian possesses other means and terms for this distinction. A language is the reflection of a culture and an immense world which surrounds us. To describe this vastness every language has its way:

"It is up to the translator to give to the foreign reader additional but sufficient knowledge to half-open door which leads to the knowledge of the other."<sup>5</sup> In this respect, the translator is obliged to consult works and documents, in the target language of the same subject of the text which is going to be translated.

We would like to high light a problem which we confronted during the translation of one of the short stories of A. Tchekhov, *The Student*. Let us read the following sentence: "the student remembers that in his departure his father was lying on the heater coughing."<sup>6</sup>

"پدرش روی بخاری خوابیده بود."

The poor and unacceptable translation of above in Persian is at.

Sentence which has no meaning. Indeed, the cultural variety obliges the translator to examine to

1. K.Déjean Le FEAL, Quelques aspects non linguistiques de l'interprétation et de la traduction, in exégèse et traduction, p.100.

2. Ibid., p.105.

3. D.Seleskovitch, Ibid, p.108.

4. Idem.

5. M.Lederer, La Traduction aujourd'hui, Paris, Hachette, p.123.

6. A. Tchekhov, Le violon de Rotschild, traduit en français par André Markowicz, Alinéa, 1986, p. 232.



succeed in his intermediary task.

And so, concerning the same sentence the Persian translator must explain to the reader the characteristic of the Russian architecture which, for climatic reasons introduces in the houses, a series of benches over heaters to warm the persons who live there.

Through this explanation, separate from the main text - we can thus obtain the following translation:

پدرش روی سکوی بخاری دراز کشیده بود.

The effectiveness of the work of translator thus depends on the way in which he/she re-expresses the received message. The translators must find the rhythm, the breath which animates the text. In this respect it is necessary that they enter the intimacy of the author.

Let's think, for example, of the beautiful translation by A.Nadjafi of Saint-Exupéry's the *Little Prince*. We cannot prevent us from quoting the beautiful French sentences as well as its Persian translation:

"J'ai vu une belle maison en briques roses avec des géraniums aux fenêtres et des colombes sur le toit..."

"I saw a beautiful house in pink bricks with gerania in windows and doves on the roof"

"یک خانه قشنگ از آجر گلی رنگ دیدم با گلدهای شمعدانی لب

پنجره‌هایش و کبوترهای روی پشت بامش..."

Here, any distinction between these two languages disappears.

The genius transposes and annexes that which it translates.

So the quality of the translations depends upon the quality of the translators.

## Conclusion

All the languages have their own way of describing the world, the colors, the objects. It is the human communication which enables us to understand the translation and not linguistic differences.

Let us conclude with Seleskovitch who says: "I consciously do not call words which would describe my thought, but I graft my words on the knowledge which I suppose to exist at my interlocutor; my speech takes a form, it adopts a direction which varies according to whether it is addressed to friends or to adversaries, whether it teaches or that it attacks. The same thought does not fall down automatically on the same words, but is channeled differently according to circumstances".

It is starting from this relationship between the thought and the language that one must study the translation and it is after having fixed this starting point that one is brought to pose the sense (meaning) like fundamental object of the translation. We can then set the interpretative method against the comparative method and assert that the translation does not recover from the study of the language but from that of the analysis, by the word, from the thought. "<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Seleskovitch, Ibid, pp.107-110.

**Quelques Références Bibliographies**

[1] E.Cary, *Comment faut-il traduire?*, Lille, PUF.

[2] M. Lederer, *La Traduction aujourd'hui*, Paris, Hachette.

[3] *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, n°spécial exégèse et traduction, 1973.

[4] *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, langue maternelle et étrangère, n°11.