



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**DISCOURSE IN EUGENE NIDA'S
TRANSLATION THEORY**

**HELEN GERMAN
School of Translators & Interpreters
Faculty of Arts**

University of Ottawa

**Under the supervision of
Roda P. Roberts, PhD**

**Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
and Research of the University of Ottawa
as part of the requirements for the degree of
M.A. Translation**

Ottawa - 1993



Helen German, Ottawa, Canada, 1993



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89647-7

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Special thanks to...

Dr. Roda P. Roberts for her many hours of editing, encouragement, and guidance in putting this work together. Not only is she an excellent thesis supervisor, but also a good friend.

Dr. Eugene A. Nida for his help in clarifying certain points, his encouragement, and editing.

My husband, Arny, who despite his jokes about 'dis'course and 'dat'course has been my most loyal support, and may even have picked up some new vocabulary along the way.

Claire Prodger, for patiently inputting bibliographical data.

My Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ for His daily guidance, and for giving me the strength and perseverance to finish this project.

ABSTRACT

The fields of discourse and translation are by no means new areas of study. In fact, both fields have been analyzed and studied independently for centuries. However, it is only in recent years that discourse analysis has been applied directly to translation.

This shift of focus to discourse-based translation is clearly illustrated through the writings of Eugene A. Nida. The primary objective of this thesis is to show that discourse is now a key concept in Nida's translation theory by outlining the evolution of Nida's translation theory in general. Our secondary objectives include showing the influences of discourse-based linguistics on his writings, and highlighting the similarities and differences between Nida's writing on discourse and a number of other scholars' discourse-based translation theories.

This thesis is divided into five main sections. The first section, **discourse typology**, presents the various text types as identified by Nida. The second section, **rhetorical structure**, analyzes discourse on the macrolevel, while the third section, **rhetorical features**, analyzes the study of discourse on the microlevel. The fourth section deals with **rhetorical functions**, that is, the effectiveness of the discourse or how it creates impact and appeal. And the fifth and final section is an application chapter where we analyze and translate a text according to Nida's discourse theory.

While Nida has not necessarily addressed all aspects of

discourse, the comparisons between his ideas and those of Delisle, Newmark, Neubert, and de Beaugrande and Dressler certainly show that his theory is very broad and encompasses most issues which are in current debate. In fact, in the most current books on discourse and translation, there is very little new information not already treated directly or indirectly by Nida.

Probably the most important aspect of Nida's discourse theory is its applicability to the translation milieu. Nida's study of discourse was inspired, not by theoretical goals, but by his desire to help the translator translate more effectively. As a result, his articles always include both the theoretical element which is the foundation of his discourse theory, and also practical applications for the translator.

RÉSUMÉ

Le discours et la traduction ne sont aucunement de nouveaux domaines. En fait, les deux domaines ont été analysés et étudiés indépendamment pendant des siècles. Mais l'application de l'analyse du discours ne date que depuis quelques années.

Le travail d'Eugene A. Nida démontre clairement ce changement à la traduction basée sur l'analyse du discours. L'objectif principal de cette thèse est de démontrer que le discours est actuellement un concept clé dans la théorie de traduction de Nida en illustrant l'évolution de sa théorie de traduction en général. Ensuite, on démontre comment des linguistes qui basent leur théorie sur le discours influencent sur les écritures de Nida, et on analyse des ressemblances et différences entre les écritures de Nida et celles d'autres linguistes.

Cette thèse consiste de cinq parties. La première section, **discourse typology**, présente les genres de texte selon Nida. Dans la deuxième section, **rhetorical structure**, on analyse le discours au niveau du texte entier, alors que la troisième section, **rhetorical features**, analyse le discours en petit détail. La quatrième section étudie **rhetorical functions**, c'est-à-dire l'efficacité du discours, ou comment le discours crée l'impact et l'attraction. Enfin, dans la dernière section, on applique la théorie de Nida en analysant et traduisant un texte religieux.

Il est vrai que Nida n'a pas adressé tous les aspects du discours, mais les comparaisons entre ses idées et les idées de

Delisle, Newmark, Neubert et de Beaugrande et Dressler montrent que sa théorie est très vaste et inclue la plupart des questions actuellement en traduction. En fait, même dans les textes les plus récents, on ne trouve pas beaucoup de nouvelle information que Nida n'a pas déjà traitée, soit directement soit indirectement.

Le plus important aspect de sa théorie de discours est probablement le fait qu'elle s'applique si facilement à la traduction elle-même. Son étude du discours était inspirée d'un désir d'aider le traducteur, et non pas de buts théoriques. En conséquence, ses articles incluent toujours un élément théorique, (la fondation de sa théorie du discours), et une application pratique pour le traducteur.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	OBJECTIVES	6
1.2	SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	7
1.3	PLAN OF THE THESIS	8
1.4	GENERAL VIEWS ON DISCOURSE	9
1.5	NIDA'S CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE	15
1.6	CONCLUSION	16
2.0	DISCOURSE TYPOLOGY	17
2.1	NARRATIVE	19
2.2	DESCRIPTION	20
2.3	CONVERSATION/DIALOGUE	20
2.4	EXPOSITION/ARGUMENT/DECLAMATION	22
2.5	POETRY	23
2.6	FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S DISCOURSE TYPOLOGY	23
2.7	NEUBERT AND NEWMARK ON DISCOURSE TYPES	25
2.8	CONCLUSION	27
3.0	RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	29
3.1	PRIMARY FEATURES	31
3.2	SECONDARY FEATURES	33
3.3	EVOLUTION OF FEATURES OF DISCOURSE	35
3.4	FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S DISCOURSE FEATURES	38
3.5	NIDA VS. NEWMARK ON RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	39
3.6	CONCLUSION	42
4.0	RHETORICAL FEATURES	43
4.1	FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES	44
4.1.1	EVOLUTION OF NIDA'S FORMAL FEATURES	51
4.2	SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES	53
4.3	FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S RHETORICAL FEATURES	59
4.4	NIDA VS NEWMARK ON RHETORICAL FEATURES	61
4.5	NIDA VS DELISLE ON RHETORICAL FEATURES	63
4.6	NEUBERT ON LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COHESION	65
4.7	CONCLUSION	67
5.0	RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS	69
5.1	IMPACT AND APPEAL	72
5.2	IMPACT	72
5.2.1	NOVELTY	73
5.2.2	RELEVANCE/PROXIMITY	74
5.2.3	REALISM	75
5.3	APPEAL	75
5.3.1	WHOLENESS/COMPLETENESS/UNITY	76
5.3.2	PROPORTION	76
5.3.3	COHERENCE AND COHESION	77
5.3.4	APPROPRIATENESS	78
5.3.5	PROMINENCE	79
5.3.6	AESTHETIC FEATURES	79
5.3.7	THEMATIC RELEVANCE	80
5.4	HOW IMPACT AND APPEAL RELATE TO FOCUS	80
5.5	NIDA VS. NEUBERT ON RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS	81

5.6	NIDA VS. DE BEAUGRANDE AND DRESSLER ON RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS	83
5.7	CONCLUSION	88
6.0	APPLICATION	90
6.1	FEATURES OF DISCOURSE	90
6.2	FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES	92
6.3	SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES	94
6.4	RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS	97
6.5	COMMENTED TRANSLATION	99
7.0	CONCLUSION	110
	APPENDIX A	113
	APPENDIX B	116
	APPENDIX C	135
	GLOSSARY	139
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	142

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE A -- TYPES OF DISCOURSE (Nida's evolution 1964-1991)	18
TABLE B -- FEATURES OF DISCOURSE (Nida's evolution 1964-1992)	30
TABLE C -- FEATURES OF DISCOURSE (Nida vs. Newmark)	40
TABLE D -- FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES (Nida's evolution 1964-1991)	46
TABLE E -- SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES (Nida's evolution 1979-1991)	55
TABLE F -- RHETORICAL FEATURES (Nida vs. Newmark)	62
TABLE G -- RHETORICAL FEATURES (Nida vs. Delisle)	64
TABLE H -- RHETORICAL FEATURES (Nida vs. Neubert)	66
TABLE I -- RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS (Nida's evolution 1969-1991)	70
TABLE J -- SEVEN STANDARDS OF TEXTUALITY (De Beaugrande and Dressler)	84
TABLE K -- RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS (Nida vs. de Beaugrande and Dressler)	88

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The study of *discourse* has received a great deal of attention lately in linguistic and translation circles alike. Many scholars have advocated the use of discourse analysis--or text analysis as some prefer to call it--as the only means of producing a completely faithful translation. However, while these scholars have only recently applied discourse analysis to translation, the field of *discourse* itself is far from new.

The Ancient Greeks were the first group to define the concept of rhetoric and establish certain rules and formulas for writing prose and poetry. In his famous work *Rhetoric*, Aristotle defines rhetorical discourse as a method for "discovering all the available means of persuasion in any given case" (Abrams, 1981: 159). His discussion centres around the devices an orator might use in order to achieve both intellectual and emotional effects on his audience and to persuade them to accept his point of view. Classical rhetoricians agreed with Aristotle's definition of rhetorical discourse and further established that it consisted of "invention," "disposition" and "style." "Invention" dealt solely with the research of arguments and proofs, "disposition" handled the sequential organization of the arguments, and "style" dealt specifically with the word choice, figures and rhythms that would be most effective in communicating the material (Abrams, 1981: 159). In the Middle Ages, rhetoric was a principal subject of study, grouped with grammar and logic, and belonging to what was referred to as the "trivium". The study of rhetoric which was

focussed mainly on the training of public orators during this time was, in fact, an important subject right through to the Renaissance. The focus then shifted away from discourse and did not reemerge either with the development of philology, a 19th century field of study which analyzed the "organization and evolution of language sounds and forms in historical time" (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 20) or with that of modern linguistics in the first half of this century, which concentrated on the sentence rather than the text as a whole. It was Zellig Harris who first proposed a type of discourse analysis in a 1952 article entitled "Discourse Analysis", and although it was not a popular theory at the time, 'text linguistics' finally became a full-fledged field of study some twenty years later. Although the terminology and concepts of text linguistics are not identical to those of rhetoric, Aristotle's original elements of "invention," "disposition," and "style" are still considered the hallmarks of all quality texts.

It therefore, seems only natural that in the field of translation, a field whose practitioners pride themselves on capturing the essence of the original text (including the arguments, their arrangement, and style), the study of discourse would eventually take on great importance. It is only surprising that discourse has taken so long to become a major feature of

modern translation theory.¹ Indeed, when Vinay and Darbelnet wrote the now classic Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais (SCFA) in 1958, there was no mention of discourse whatsoever. This apparent void by today's standards has led to strong criticism that SCFA treated only one half of translation theory: *langue*, and not the other crucial element: *discours* (Vinay 1983, 425). However, as Vinay pointed out in this eloquent defense against these criticisms, at the time SCFA was written no one was writing about discourse. Discourse was not even an issue in 1958. It has only emerged as a distinct and established branch of linguistics since the 1970s (International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics, 1992: 358) and has come to the forefront of translation theory only in recent years.

The shift of focus to discourse in translation theory can be clearly seen through the writings of Eugene A. Nida, a renowned theoretician whose work has evolved considerably over the 42 years that he has been writing.² Nida's major concern has always been to communicate meaning, and he sees meaning as being communicated on three distinct levels: lexical, syntactic and rhetorical. Over Nida's career, he has moved systematically through each of these three areas, moulding and developing his translation theory in the

¹Realizing that many will object to the use of the term *theory*, since there is no one theory of translation, we must clarify that, for the purposes of this thesis, *theory* refers to the theoretical concepts of the scholars in question as opposed to the practical applications.

²For a short biography of Eugene A. Nida, see Appendix A.

process. His earliest writings dealt with the lexical level. In Nida's first book, Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words (1946), he strove to explain the many and varied ways in which languages form and use words. However, he soon realized that words were only a small problem when compared with the entire sentence structure, and moved on to analyze syntax. In this second phase of Nida's writing, we find the classic books, Toward a Science of Translating (1964) and Theory and Practice of Translation (1969). Although traces of his interest in discourse can already be seen in his work during this phase, it is only in the last few years that Nida has devoted much of his effort to the study of discourse. Working with Bible translators who were translating between languages with long literary traditions, Nida came to the realization that while a poorly chosen word or an awkward sentence could be forgiven, if the translator lost the overall essence of the text, the inherent meaning would also be lost. Thus, his recent writing on discourse structure has grown from a concern that some of the most misleading mistakes by translators are due to the fact that they do not understand the nature of discourse or the functions of the various rhetorical devices (1991a: 234).

Nida, who has constantly adjusted his theoretical viewpoint to take into consideration modern linguistic ideas and translators' practical needs, has gradually developed the concept of discourse to make it a key concept of his translation theory. The emphasis of his recent writing has been on the types and features of discourse along with the rhetorical devices which are used to

create impact and appeal. Using as a starting point the views of other scholars who have approached discourse from a linguistic or translation viewpoint, Nida focusses more particularly on the practical implications of discourse analysis for the translator.

1.1 OBJECTIVES

This thesis on Nida's views about discourse has four main objectives. If the primary objective is to show that discourse is now a key concept in Nida's translation theory, demonstrating this necessitates a secondary objective: that of showing the evolution of Nida's translation theory in general to this point. Our third objective is to situate Nida within the linguistic field by showing the influences of discourse-based linguistics on his writing. Our final objective is to show the similarities and differences between Nida's writing on discourse and a number of other scholars' discourse-based translation theories.

Since there does not appear to be any one translation scholar who has extensively treated all of the areas we will examine, we have chosen to use different ones as a point of comparison in each major section. Thus, in the first section on discourse typology, we have compared the views of Nida with those of Albrecht Neubert, who represents the German school, and Peter Newmark, who represents the English school. In the second section on rhetorical structure, we will compare Nida's presentation again with that of Newmark. Since, in the Preface to his book Approaches to Translation, Newmark acknowledges that he owes much to Eugene Nida, it is only

natural that the two theories will have many similar features. However, there are also differences that need to be pointed out. In the section on rhetorical features, Nida's views will be compared and contrasted with those of Jean Delisle, who represents the French school of thought, and again with those of Newmark and Neubert, who have written extensively on this subject. In the final section, which deals with rhetorical functions, Nida will be analyzed in comparison with the German school, represented by Neubert, and the American school in conjunction with the German school, represented by de Beaugrande and Dressler.

1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Initial research for this thesis involved immersion in Nida's numerous publications³ in order to gain a full appreciation of his translation theory. It was immediately evident that Nida's translation theory had undergone some dramatic changes over the years and that it was impossible to look at every aspect of that evolution. We therefore limited the scope of the research to Nida's most recent writings (many of which are yet to be published), which focus more particularly on discourse.

After becoming familiar with Nida's current theory on discourse, we began to look for its roots in earlier writings. It soon became evident that his concept of discourse has been germinating over a number of years, and traces of his current discourse theory can be found as far back as 1964. We thus charted

³For Nida's complete bibliography, see Appendix B.

how each aspect of this theory developed and at what point each element entered into Nida's writing.

We then began to question the external influences on his writing on discourse. We wondered which books had influenced Nida along the way and how much of his own discourse theory was adapted from the writing of other theoreticians. Fortunately, Nida always documents his sources extremely well and it was a fairly simple process to determine who had been the major influences. For example, Nida bases his discourse typology on that of Roman Jakobson, as set out in "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics" (1960). Since we wanted to know how Nida's views fit into the general field of linguistics, we then researched the general history and development of discourse studies.

We felt that an analysis of Nida's views on discourse analysis in translation warranted comparison with those of other contemporary translation scholars. So we examined the work of Newmark, Delisle, Neubert, de Beaugrande and Dressler among others to bring out the similarities and differences between different discourse-based translation theories.

Finally, in keeping with Nida's tradition of linking theory and practice, we analyzed and translated a text according to Nida's discourse theory to see to what extent the theory really helps the practising translator.

1.3 PLAN OF THE THESIS

This thesis is divided by subject matter rather than by

objectives and, as such, the material is grouped by theme with each section treating all of the objectives. The first main section deals with **discourse typology**. It presents the various text types identified by Nida. The second section deals with the study of **rhetorical structure**. In this section we will analyze discourse on the macrolevel, examining how Nida has developed this aspect and where Nida's views on rhetorical structure are similar to and different from Newmark's. In the third section, we will study discourse on the microlevel. This will involve a close analysis of **rhetorical features** (both formal and semantic) and will lead into some of Nida's recent explorations into semiotics. We will compare Nida's ideas on rhetorical features with those of Delisle, Newmark and Neubert to see where Nida is situated in the linguistic and translation fields. The fourth section will deal with **rhetorical functions**, that is, the effectiveness of the discourse or how it creates impact and appeal. This section will include a comparison with Neubert's and de Beaugrande and Dressler's conception of rhetorical functions. We have included a number of tables in order to show graphically the evolution of Nida's theory in each of the above sections. The fifth and final section is an application chapter where we analyze and translate a text according to Nida's discourse theory.

1.4 GENERAL VIEWS ON DISCOURSE

The divisions of this thesis into sections on discourse typology, rhetorical structure, rhetorical features and rhetorical

functions by no means signifies universal agreement on discourse and its constituents. In fact, the concept of discourse is not at all clear cut. Like the word "translation," which is polysemous in that it can refer to both a process and a product, the term "discourse" also has a two-fold meaning. Firstly, it can be defined in structural terms (a unit of language larger than a sentence) and secondly in more pragmatic terms (the language in use). Some linguists (e.g. Coulthard) apply the term only to speech, while others use it to cover both speech and writing (e.g. Brown & Yule, Hatim & Mason). Some scholars make a distinction between discourse and text: Stubbs, for instance, makes the comment that "*discourse* implies length, whereas a text may be very short" (1983: 9), many other scholars do not seem to subscribe to such views. Given the diversity of opinions on discourse, it is little wonder that there is a great heterogeneity in approaches to studying discourse as a whole, despite some general agreement on the kinds of data to be investigated, and methodologies to interpret the data.

In an early work, Halliday and Hasan write that discourse structure refers to "the structure of some postulated unit higher than the sentence, for example the paragraph, or some larger entity such as episode or topic unit" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 10) and that it is generally well organized around a common topic (288). They also point out that every genre has its own discourse structure and that, while some people may feel that informal conversation, for example, has no structure, there is still an

organization around question-answer sequences, turn-taking and the use of conjunctions in linking what two parties want to say.

While Halliday and Hasan link the two sides of discourse analysis (spoken and written) by analyzing them side by side, Malcolm Coulthard's An Introduction to Discourse Analysis (1977) mainly examines oral discourse, for he feels that the study of conversation (which is what he terms "Discourse Analysis") is of vital importance to the study of the written text. He believes that communication is achieved on three levels -- phonology, syntax and discourse -- but feels that "within discourse nothing is certain: there are no agreed labels and few agreed structures" (p. 6). This book, then, aims first and foremost to define the size of units for discourse analysis with respect to the speech act. Coulthard concludes that conversation works in pairs of utterances, but does not clearly determine the parameters of discourse units. After treating the major question of the relationship between "grammaticality" and "meaningfulness" and the related topics of cohesion and coherence, Coulthard attempts to apply his rules to a play. He chooses to analyze Shakespeare's play, Othello, presumably since it is written in conversational form, but the analysis is very limited, dealing for the most part with the role of questions and answers within the text.

De Beaugrande and Dressler go much further in their analysis of discourse in Introduction to Text Linguistics (1981), which is dedicated to the written text and not conversation. They look at a variety of different text types and establish seven standards of

textuality (Cohesion, Coherence, Intentionality, Acceptability, Informativity, Situationality, Intertextuality), which ensure that a text has communicative meaning. Again, the study of discourse centres on communicating meaning.

In Brown and Yule's Discourse Analysis (1983), both spoken and written discourse are analyzed and the relationship between the two is examined. These authors look at the role of context, topic, theme and organization in the text. Their early definition of 'text' is very general -- the verbal record of a communicative event -- although, they later resort to Halliday and Hasan (1976) for a more thorough analysis of what constitutes a text, referring to the cohesion model outlined in the earlier work.

The French school of thought (and indeed all schools) has been very much influenced by the insights of Ferdinand de Saussure, who laid the foundations of modern structural linguistic theory. In Cours de linguistique générale (1916), Saussure outlines his ideas on *langue* and *parole*. While Rey-Debove writes that Saussure is referring to oral communication⁴, there is no doubt that this theory can be applied equally to the written medium. Thus, *langue* represents all of the language at any writer's disposal and *parole* represents the individual and unique text, the discourse. In French texts, the word *discours* is generally used for both oral and

⁴"l'expression saussurienne est 'langue-parole' mais on remplace *parole*, purement phonique (langue parlée) par *discours* chaque fois qu'il s'agit de langue parlée ou écrite. Langue et *discours* forment le langage..." Sémiotique, p. 49.

written communication. Barbara Folkart writes,

le discours est ce que produit le sujet parlant dans des conditions uniques lorsqu'il se sert de la matière fournie par la langue, les conventions rhétoriques et génériques, etc. pour exprimer (c'est à dire, pour actualiser et construire) un vouloir-dire. Il correspond à la parole saussurienne.

(1991: 440-441)

This definition is easily adapted to any written text. Thus, the discourse is the product of the writer in unique circumstances who uses the language, rhetorical and generic conventions to produce a message.

Pergnier also uses the terms *langue* and *parole*, while adding a third division: *idiome*. *La langue* still represents all possible language and *parole* still represents the one unique communication act, while *idiome* is situated somewhere in between the two poles, adding the dimension of rhetorical conventions to all possible language. Pergnier defines *idiome* as "la norme de la langue" (1980:302). That is, *idiome* represents the particular habits of a given linguistic community at a given time. Again, this ties in very well with the rhetorical conventions governing appropriateness, whereby specific vocabulary and syntax are acceptable in one community, but not necessarily in another. The social norms, morals, historical and geographical setting have just as much influence on a written discourse as on an oral speech act.

While many French scholars deal with the subject of discourse, it is perhaps Jean Delisle who most closely parallels Nida's treatment. He treats the discourse not on a unilingual level, but

in terms of translation. In his book, L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction (1984), he outlines the theory and practice for translating a text on the level of the discourse. Although Delisle's views on discourse are not necessarily typical of all French scholars, we have chosen to use his theory as a comparison point with that of Nida since his views deal with the written discourse from the point of view of translation.

Recently, there have been a number of books published which deal more specifically with the topic of translation and discourse. Roger Bell's book, Translation and Translating (1991), highlights the differences he sees between the terms **text** and **discourse**. He provides the following definitions:

Text: the formal product of selections of options from the THEME systems of the grammar; a unit which carries the *semantic sense* of the *proposition* (the propositional content and locutionary force of the speech act) through *sentences* which are linked by means of *cohesion*.

Discourse: a communicative event which draws on the meaning potential of the language (and other systems of communication) to carry *communicative value* (the illocutionary force) of speech acts through *utterances* which are linked by means of *coherence*.

(Bell, 1991: 163)

These two definitions highlight the two different tendencies in discourse analysis: analysis of the internal structure of a text and of its text linguistics, and the study of a text in its intertextual and social context. We will see that Nida attempts to

analyze a discourse on both levels.

Hatim and Mason also recognize the two branches of discourse analysis when they define text as a "set of mutually relevant communicative functions, structured in such a way as to achieve an overall rhetorical purpose" (1990: 243) and discourse as "modes of speaking and writing which involve participants in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity (e.g. racist discourse, officialese, etc)" (1990: 240). While Bell and Hatim and Mason share common ground when it comes to a definition of text and discourse, it is clear that there is still no general agreement on a definition of discourse or on its constituents.

1.5 NIDA'S CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE

As early as 1964, Nida recognized discourse as a unit for analysis, whether it be a paragraph, section, chapter or book (1964: 243). But by 1969, he began defining discourse as "a specimen of linguistic material displaying structural and semantic coherence, unity, and completeness, and conveying a message" (200). It is interesting to note that, at this early stage, Nida mentions the formal (structural) and semantic elements which he later claims are necessary for the coherence, unity, etc. of discourse. In all fairness, it was not until 1990 that Nida began writing very focussed articles around the issue of discourse and most of his earlier writings attempted to be as inclusive as possible. It is for this reason that the mention of discourse in the early works is both fragmentary and inconclusive. More recently, Nida writes that

discourse consists of any complete utterance (i.e. a text), has one or more sources, is either oral or written, and possesses intricate and elaborate structure (Unpubl3: 77). Nida does not make a clear distinction between the terms **discourse** and **text**, nor does he limit his definition of discourse to only one medium. The definition he provides is perhaps the broadest we have seen to this point. However, it is noteworthy that his analysis emphasizes written discourse and not spoken discourse.

1.6 CONCLUSION

Nida has contributed an enormous amount to the study of translation theory and Bible translation alike and his latest writings on discourse are no exception. With his background in both linguistics and translation, he is able to draw on both fields, which complement each other so well. Thus, we are exposed to ideas from both fields, with different points of view and different influences.

Not only does Nida draw on both linguistic and translation fields in his research, but he presents his ideas in a two-fold manner as well. Nida has always been concerned with balancing theory and practice: the linguistic aspects of language as opposed to the act of translation. For this reason, we have chosen to emulate his own well-established system of exposition, by presenting the theoretical aspects of this thesis first and concluding with an application chapter where we put the theory into practice.

2.0 DISCOURSE TYPOLOGY

The starting point of Nida's writing on discourse was his delineation of various discourse types. He believes that while the same discourse types are found in many languages, the formal features which create those types in each of the languages are often very different. Thus, if the translator is unaware of the type of discourse he is translating and does not find the equivalent formal features to create the same type of discourse in the target language, his translation will not carry the same impact to the target language receptor. Nida has discussed the different types of discourse in terms of translation in almost every major work since 1964.

In Toward a Science of Translating, Nida lists five types of discourse, although he does not mean these to be exclusive, since they are only given as examples of various discourse types that exist (1964, 211). He lists narrative, conversation, exposition, declamation, and poetry. Since 1964, there have been regroupings and changes in both his taxonomy and terminology, which are still not completely finalized. Table A clearly shows the progression from 1964 to 1991.

TABLE A

TYPES OF DISCOURSE
(continued on following page)

1964 ¹	1969	1979	1981	1991
	<u>PROSE</u> ²			
NARRATIVE	NARRATIVE	<u>NARRATIVE</u>	NARRATIVE	<u>NARRATIVE</u>
		LETTERS PARABLES MYTHS FOLKTALES ALLEGORIES NOVELS		LETTERS BIOGRAPHY HISTORY
	DESCRIPTION		DESCRIPTIVE	(DESCRIP- TIVE)
				GENEALO- GIES LAWS
		DIALOGUE	DIALOGUE	
CONVERSA- TION		CONVERSA- TION		CONVERSA- TION
		JOKES		
EXPOSITION	ARGUMENT		ARGUMENT	
		ESSAYS		
DECLAMA- TION				DIATRIBE
				APOCALYP- TIC

- ¹1964: Toward a Science of Translating
 1969: The Theory and Practice of Translation
 1979: "Translating Means Communicating"
 1981: Meaning Across Cultures
 1991: "Language as an Efficient Code"

² signifies that the item contains sub-categories in Nida's classification. () are for our own additions where no direct mention is made of the item, but it is implied.

**TABLE A
CONTINUED**

TYPES OF DISCOURSE

1964	1969	1979	1981	1991
POETRY	<u>POETRY</u>	<u>POETRY</u>		<u>POETRY</u>
	NARRATIVE	NARRATIVE		
	ARGUMENT	DIDACTIC		DIDACTIC
		LYRIC		LYRIC
		EPIC		EPIC

2.1 NARRATIVE

Narrative discourse is probably the most common form of writing that exists. A narrative discourse is simply a sequence of events in time, sometimes fashioned into the organization of a plot (Abrams, 1981: 61). These events may be either real events which happened in the past or imaginary events which take place in the mind of the narrator. Generally, the text is told in the first or third person. Typical examples of *narrative* discourse have been provided by Nida in 1979 and 1991 and are listed under the *narrative* heading in Table A. Throughout his writing, Nida maintains *narrative* as one of the major types of discourse. In fact, it is the only type which remains unchanged over the years.

2.2 DESCRIPTION

Description does not figure in Nida's 1964 typology of discourse types and this constitutes a void. Neither *narration*, *conversation*, *exposition*, *declamation* or *poetry* truly encompass the spatial representation found in *description*. This discourse type first appears in The Theory and Practice of Translation (1969), where Nida begins to solidify his terminology and put the discourse types into well-defined categories. Description remains a major discourse type through 1991 and Nida provides examples of *descriptive* discourse in his article "Language as an Efficient Code" with *genealogies* and *laws*. Both *genealogies* and *laws* are organized descriptions of entities, although *genealogies* also incorporate implications of rank and consequence (biological cause and effect).

2.3 CONVERSATION/DIALOGUE

An initial analysis of Nida's discourse typology led us to believe that *conversation* and *dialogue* were in fact the same discourse type. It appeared to be a simple shift in terminology: Nida had chosen to replace *conversation* with *dialogue* in 1981 and had then reverted back to his original taxonomy. However, after discovering the 1979 article, "Translating Means Communicating," where Nida listed both *conversation* and *dialogue* as separate discourse types, our arguments for the terminology shift were no longer valid.

The first appearance of *conversation* as a discourse type was in 1964 in Toward a Science of Translating, but by 1969 it had disappeared without replacement. Looking only at the 1964 work in comparison with the 1991 work, one might assume that this discourse type had remained relatively stable throughout Nida's writing; however this is not the case, as is seen through a more thorough investigation.

Dialogue first appeared in Nida's writing in 1979, in the article "Translating Means Communicating," and it was at this point that Nida first made the distinction between *conversation* and *dialogue*. It appears that while *conversation* and *dialogue* have many common features, there is one crucial distinction between the two. Mildred Larson writes that "the purpose [of dialogue discourse] is to recount events, usually in the past, as for narrative. The difference is that many of those events are **speech events**" (1984: 381). Therefore, it appears that while *dialogue* recounts speech events, it is very structured like a narrative. On the other hand *conversation*, which also represents oral discourse, communicates in a more haphazard fashion. In a recent letter (November 24, 1992), Nida highlighted yet another distinction he sees between *conversation* and *dialogue*. He writes that while *conversation* has structure, it does not generally have a particular theme. *Dialogue*, on the other hand, has a particular theme and is generally presented by two or more people with opposing viewpoints. It is this give and take of ideas, the opposition within the discourse itself, which distinguishes *dialogue* from *conversation*.

2.4 EXPOSITION/ARGUMENT/DECLAMATION

The *exposition* discourse type mentioned in 1964 seems to encompass the category *argument* in future writings, although the concepts may not be identical. While Nida does not provide any answer to what is meant by *exposition* in Toward a Science of Translating, it is most probable that he is writing about the type of discourse which presents facts or ideas. Mildred Larson defines *expository discourse* as a type of discourse which **explains** or **argues**, and consists of "information logically related about a theme" (1984: 372). The term *argument*, on the other hand, is clearly defined in Nida's Theory and Practice of Translation. He writes that *argument* is based on logical relations which, in turn, are discovered by reason, not observation (197). Both *exposition* and *argument* therefore seem to cover the concept of ideas being presented in a logical order, stemming from reason and not observation. In theory, this overlap allows one type to replace the other. Thus the 1964 type *exposition* gives way to the 1969 type *argument* which remains one of Nida's main discourse types through to at least 1981. It is interesting to note that Nida has chosen a less technical term (*argument*) to replace his original categorization (*exposition*), even though other modern linguists continue to use the term *exposition*.

In his first taxonomy (1964), Nida seems to distinguish between *exposition* and *declamation*. However, since *declamation* is usually in the form of a prepared speech presenting facts or ideas, it is really a sub-category of *exposition*. Therefore it is not

surprising that *declamation* disappears as a major category from Nida's writing shortly after 1964 to be subsumed in *exposition/argument*.

2.5 POETRY

The final discourse type, *poetry*, as outlined in Toward a Science of Translating, could, in its turn, encompass all of the other types which precede it. Indeed, while *poetry* is seen in 1969 as one major category which appears to stand alone, it is not long before Nida breaks down the category into the many diverse branches of *poetry* which exist. As seen in Nida's later sub-categorization, *poetry* can be *narrative, didactic, epic, or lyric*. Perhaps it is not necessary to divide discourse types into *poetry* and *prose*. Both *poetry* and *prose* fall under the umbrella of discourse and the major categories of Nida's discourse typology could apply equally to either *poetry* or *prose*. Since *poetry* does break down so easily into *lyric, epic, narrative* and *didactic*, which are very similar to other *prose* categories, Nida would not now make a separate discourse category of *poetry* (personal correspondence, November 24, 1992). The distinguishing features of *poetry* -- figurative language, concise writing and certain formal restrictions -- remain outside of the realm of a discourse taxonomy.

2.6 FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S DISCOURSE TYPOLOGY

As shown in Table A, the shifts in categorization of the various discourse types as Nida has seen them over the years are

numerous. Nida makes the initial distinction based on the type of language used (i.e. prose vs. poetic language) (1969: 132). The main superstructures of prose and poetic language are then subdivided into genres. Mildred Larson writes that the differences between types can be seen if one analyzes the writer's purpose in writing (1984: 365). Thus, if the writer wants to recount, he will use a narrative; if his purpose is to describe something, he will use a descriptive discourse, etc. However, rather than defining the author's purpose in writing, Nida bases his discourse typology on the various functions of language. He touches briefly on these functions in The Theory and Practice of Translation, listing the informative function, expressive function and imperative function, which are present to some extent in most texts. The informative function of language relates to getting information across and is most evident in a descriptive discourse, the expressive function is most evident in a narrative, and the imperative function is most frequently found in the argument to persuade the reader to adopt a certain attitude.

Basically the three main discourse types around which all others fluctuate are narrative, descriptive, and argument. The other discourse types included in the table are simply subtypes based on these three types. While Nida has added to these types in more recent years, some of the neatness and compactness of his earlier typology is lost. Instead of presenting a strict taxonomy, he gives a wide variety of possibilities. He has purposely avoided being specific because so many texts fall in

between categories. In fact, most texts contain elements of several different discourse types and the potential for different amalgamations is almost limitless. In Nida's most recent book, Language, Culture and Translating (1992), this point is clearly addressed. Nida writes that the number of discourse types are virtually limitless, and that, while there have been attempts to classify them (his included), no system is fully acceptable since there are so many types which cross boundaries and cannot be neatly classified (1992: 78).

2.7 NEUBERT AND NEWMARK ON DISCOURSE TYPES

It is exactly this point that Albrecht Neubert addresses in his book, Text and Translation (1985). Neubert is opposed to text typologies which list the various criteria composing a text, claiming that they are by no means precise or systematic enough to yield even a satisfactory descriptive or explanatory basis (1985: 129). He believes that text types cannot be defined by a series of criteria because the text types will always overlap. In his most recent book, Translation as Text, which he co-authored with Gregory Shreve, he writes that the common text classification system which separates texts into descriptive, narrative and argumentative texts, "emphasize[s] specific aspects of textuality at the expense of others" (1992: 133). Therefore, he would not be in agreement with Nida's classification of text types.

According to Neubert, text types are derived from social interaction and are rooted in the activities of the speaker,

writer, hearer or reader. He thus proposes that text types be based on experience or prototypical encounters.³ In other words, a text is more than the sum of its features, it is "a historically and socially conditioned mode of organising knowledge in spoken or written discourse" (1985: 127). Neubert gives the example of a newspaper article, where the surface markers of the article do not necessarily add up to form one and only one prototype which could be called the newspaper article. In other words, two very different articles might be recognizable as newspaper articles, even though they share few common markers. Markers such as telegraphic headlines and text, columns of writing, factual information may be more or less evident depending on the individual case; however, it is still recognizable as a newspaper article, since it will still contain a certain number of these markers.

While Neubert concedes that Nida's kind of text typology does aid the translator in recognizing certain markers which reflect text types, thereby enabling him to translate the text into a more or less equivalent text type in the target language, he criticizes it for being too limiting, and for not having enough precision to truly define each text type exactly. Nida, himself, explains that he has purposely tried to avoid such precision due to "hybrid" discourse types which do not fit into any one category.

³Neubert's concept of prototype remains vague: "Texts, then, are variant instances clustering around a holistic experience that has been shared over a time. This 'prolonged interactive experience' takes the character of prototypical encounters. This empirical prototypicality is then translated into the concept of the prototype text." (1985: 127)

The scholar Newmark is much closer in agreement with Nida's discourse typology. This is probably because Newmark also bases his discourse typology on the functions of language. He cites *informative, expressive and vocative functions* in Approaches to Translation as the basis for dividing texts (1981: 13). He concludes that with the *expressive* function, the discourse type will be a narrative, the *informative* function will produce a scientific or technical type textbook (i.e. descriptive), and the *vocative* function will produce persuasive or imperative literature (i.e. an argumentative text).

Another aspect on which Newmark and Nida seem to be in close agreement is their treatment of the discourse types "conversation" and "dialogue". Although Newmark calls these two types speech and dialogue, he is nevertheless referring to the same phenomena. Newmark writes that the distinction between these two is based on the fact that speech "has virtually no punctuation, is diffuse and leaves semantic gaps filled by gesture and paralingual features" (1988: 58). This is very similar to Nida's view that conversation has little cohesion by way of theme and occurs when "two or more people simply ramble on about various things of interest" (personal communication, Nov 24, 1992).

2.8 CONCLUSION

It is clear that translation theoreticians are not all in agreement about how text typologies should be determined, nor what their major constituents should be. But it is equally clear that

the translator, when examining any form of discourse for the purpose of translation, will necessarily identify from the start the main discourse type itself. Nida's taxonomy, while not the only one, is reasonably complete enough to allow the translator to decide which type (or types) are found in the text under analysis. Determination of the main text type may in turn help the translator to focus his attention on features that are especially important to that type.⁴

Thus, the translator will be aware of the discourse type and will translate the text accordingly. If the same discourse type exists in the target language and if it is used for the same purposes, then, according to Nida, the translator should maintain the discourse type and the associated features. However, this is not always possible. In The Theory and Practice of Translation, Nida gives the example of the epic poem being used in classical Greek to describe a historical event (1969: 133). Of course, this would not be acceptable to the modern Western reader. Therefore, if the original discourse type is not used in the target language or is used to express very different sentiments, then the translator should look for another target language discourse type which could be used to express the ideas of the source text.

⁴For further analysis of the features which are important to a given discourse type, see Newmark's A Textbook of Translation, p.13, and sections 3.1-3.2 of this thesis.

3.0 RHETORICAL STRUCTURE

Whatever the type of discourse may be, it is generally arranged so that it has diversity and unity. Although there is an infinite number of discourse types if one takes into consideration all of the mix-and-match possibilities, the number of organizational principles for a discourse is very limited. Nida writes that these organizational principles cross over language boundaries in that while the surface structure of different languages is very diverse, the rhetorical structures are essentially universal (Unpubl1). In essence, it is these organizational principles which form the foundation for the discourse on the macrolevel. Regardless of the discourse type and the features that characterize it, all discourse must hold together cohesively and have some kind of progression in a more general sense. It is the cohesion and progression which give the text its unity and diversity. For without these two elements, we would simply have a string of unrelated sentences.

In Nida's current writing, he lists six features which organize the structure of a discourse¹ so that it does have cohesion and progression, and he divides these six into primary and secondary features (refer to Table B). This division is very current, since as recently as 1990, Nida listed all six features without distinction of category.

¹Nida uses the term "features of discourse" to refer to the elements on the macrolevel of the text which contribute to "rhetorical structure" They are not to be confused with "formal and semantic rhetorical features" which work on the microlevel of the text.

TABLE B
FEATURES OF DISCOURSE

1964 ²	1969	1984	1986
Five Features of Discourse Types	Eight Universals of Discourse	Progression/ Cohesion	Progression/ Cohesion
-temporal features	-temporal relations	-temporal organization	-series of related events
-spatial features	-spatial relations	-spatial organization	-spatially organized description
			-description by categories
	-logical relations	-logical relations	-logical progression/ consequence
		-dialogue	-dialogue
-formal and semantic carry-overs	-transitions between divisions		
-sequences of sentence and clause types	-identification of participants		
	-highlighting		
	-author involvement		
-markers of sequences	-mark beginning and end		

²1964: Toward a Science of Translating

1969: The Theory and Practice of Translation

1984: "Rhetoric and Styles: A Taxonomy of Structures and Functions"

1986: From One Language to Another

**TABLE B
CONTINUED**

FEATURES OF DISCOURSE

1988 ³	1990	1991/2
		<u>Primary features</u>
Time	Time	Time
Space	Space	Space
Categories	Class	Class
		<u>Secondary features</u>
	Rank	Rank
Consequence	Consequence	Consequence
Dialogue	Dialogic sequencing	Dialogic Sequencing

3.1 PRIMARY FEATURES

In three recent articles⁴ and his latest book, Language, Structure and Translating, Nida lists the primary features of discourse as Time, Space and Class. Time is the dominant factor for narratives such as histories and biographies, where sequences of related events take place chronologically. Basically the progression from one event to the next is the most important

³1988: "The Meaning of Rhetoric"
 1990: "The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communication"
 1991: "Basic Elements of Discourse Structure"
 1992: Language, Structure and Translating

⁴"Breakthroughs in Translation," "Basic Elements of Discourse Structures," and "The Paradoxes of Translating."

element of a narrative and thus, the text holds together by progressing sequentially from one episode to the next. Text appeal is achieved as the reader is drawn along by the unfolding of events and continues to read to discover the final event. Time is also the most important element in any instructions which tell how to perform a series of actions (Unpub3: 6). This could include everything from a recipe to "How-To" texts for building your own house.

Space is the feature used for describing an object in terms of design or appearance. This would include the description of everything from a person to a panorama. While the description does not really have to follow a given order, generally descriptions are given from top to bottom, left to right or vice versa. In this way, the writer ensures that nothing has been omitted.

The final primary feature, Class, co-ordinates the relations between objects or events using additives (and), alternatives (or), subtractives (but, except) or duplicatives (apposition, tautology) (Unpub 11). It should be noted that there is no innate judgment in these groupings; it is simply the representation of coordinate sets arranged in various ways. A grocery list is perhaps the best example of a text arranged by class, where items are arranged by general classes such as fruits/vegetables, dairy products, meats, etc.

The common element between all three of these features is that they all produce progression of some kind, whether it be progression in time, space or in logical relations. These factors

have little to do with the actual words and themes of the discourse; they merely form the structure of the discourse. In Nida's 1986 book, From One Language to Another, he actually puts many of these features of discourse under the main heading of Progression and Cohesion. While he classifies them first as forms of Progression, he later writes that

these types of progressions also imply cohesion, for the ways in which the events, descriptions, logical relations, and dependencies of form are organized not only mark the progression but also tie the elements of content together. (p. 83)

The elements which structure the discourse on the macrolevel must provide the text with the diversity and unity which generally come from such progression and cohesion.

3.2 SECONDARY FEATURES

The three secondary features of discourse -- rank, consequence and dialogic sequencing -- are perhaps not as common as the primary features; yet all three are used quite extensively in various types of writing.

Rank is actually an extension of the primary feature, Class. While Class objectively groups entities together, Rank goes one step further and organizes the elements into some kind of hierarchy. This ranking could be from high to low, important to trivial, valuable to worthless, positive to negative, etc.

The feature of Consequence involves a cause-effect type of dependency between elements. The first element must result in the

second element through some kind of link, such as reason, condition, purpose, result or concession. For example the sentence "I went to the store because I ran out of milk," clearly demonstrates the reason why I went to the store and the result of running out of milk. Similarly, in the sentence "I went to the store to buy some milk," we see the dependency due to purpose; and in the sentence, "If I get back in time, you can have some milk before you go out" we see the dependency of condition. The concept of concession is slightly more complicated. Here, the term concession refers to an admitted statement of fact and is used in conjunction with the term cause which refers to a force giving rise to a result or action. Concession is linked to contraexpectation, where there is a cause (the concession) which assumes an expected result, but the unexpected (contraexpectation) comes about. Let us analyze the following sentence:

**I went out in the rain without my coat and
I didn't catch a cold.**

The cause: I went out in the rain without my coat.

The expected effect: I would catch a cold.

The unexpected effect: I didn't catch a cold.

The implied expected result is that I would catch a cold if I went out in the rain without a coat, although such was not the case.

The final feature of a discourse according to Nida, dialogic sequencing, also requires a dependency between elements; however unlike the feature concession which deals with cause-effect links, dialogic sequencing refers to a dependency in terms of an assumed

interaction between two participants in the discourse. This category includes, for example, questions and answers or arguments pro and con. In From One Language to Another, Nida lists the two pairs "questions and answers" and "affirmations and negations" under the sub-heading "dialogue" in his discourse features and it is fairly clear that all of these sequences do occur in natural dialogue. Although the terminology has been slightly altered, this feature obviously would be the most important organizing principle of a dialogue.

3.3 EVOLUTION OF FEATURES OF DISCOURSE

As early as 1964 there are traces of Nida's current six features of discourse. In Toward a Science of Translating, Nida begins by listing five features of discourse: 1) temporal features; 2) spatial features; 3) formal and semantic carry-overs; 4) sequences of sentence and clause types; and 5) markers of sequences (See Table B). Two of these features -- temporal features and spatial features -- carry through Nida's work.

The remaining three features disappear eventually as discourse features, since they have more to do with cohesion on the level of syntax within the discourse than with cohesion of the discourse as a whole. For example, the feature "markers of sequences" deals specifically with conjunctions or special forms of verbs or pronominal forms within the sentence, while "formal and semantic 'carry-overs'" deals with the transitions between sentences or clauses. These features, which include situational markers (here,

there, now, then), referential markers (personal pronouns, relative pronouns, and deictics pointing forward [cataphoric] or backward [anaphoric]), transitional devices (moreover, furthermore, etc.) and hypotactic markers (when, because, if), all have the one common element of contributing to internal unity of the discourse. But they are usually evident only in specific cases within the discourse, and do not contribute to meaning on the level of discourse. In other words, these specific features have more to do with individual selections made on the microlevel than major themes of the macrolevel.

Although the features of "formal and semantic 'carry-overs'," "sequences of sentence and clause types" and "markers of sequences" do not seem to fit in with the generality of discourse structure, they do re-appear in later years when Nida focusses on selection and arrangement on the microlevel. In "Rhetoric and Styles", Nida writes that "cohesion in a discourse is reinforced by features on the microlevel of rhetoric" (1984: 291). The formal and semantic carry-overs, markers of sequences and sequences of sentence and clause types are representative of these rhetorical features on the microlevel.

By 1969, Nida has added the feature 'logical relations' to his features of discourse. 'Logical relations' includes relations such as cause and effect, where two propositions are linked together by logic. This term remains constant up until 1986, when it is changed, first only slightly to 'logical progression', and then more dramatically to 'consequence' from 1988 onwards.

The three final features in his 1969 listing are identification of participants (i.e. the pronouns and references used), highlighting (i.e. foregrounding and backgrounding certain participants or events) and author involvement (i.e. first-person autobiographical or third-person judgmental). These appear to be out of place among the discourse features. They should really be determined before the discourse is structured as one of the initial decisions along with discourse type, complexity etc. Identification of participants can be done in such a way as to give the reader a feeling for the author's judgment of that character, while not making any direct references will leave the reader in suspense (i.e. in a mystery novel). Deciding upon the type of author involvement will determine whether the discourse will be autobiographical or a straight narrative, and highlighting will determine which events and characters are most important within the discourse.

In "Rhetoric and Styles" (1984) and From One Language to Another (1986), Nida re-defines the features of discourse under the heading Progression/Cohesion, which are the aspects of discourse which create impact and appeal. However, the features themselves do correspond with Nida's 1990 and 1991 breakdown of discourse features presented in 3.1 and 3.2 above. Although the terminology has not been fixed at this point, the elements of the later categories are clearly present, with the exception of Rank, which, as noted earlier, is simply an extension of Class.

The clearest representation of discourse features emerges in

1990 when Nida establishes a basic, uncomplicated terminology. It is this simplicity itself which adds substance to the features of discourse. The reader is much more apt to understand and appreciate the concepts when they are presented in such a direct fashion. It is obviously unnecessary to present linguistic theory with awkward and complicated terminology. By choosing lucid terminology, Nida has made his writing accessible not only to linguists and scholars, but also to the translators and students he wishes to aid.

3.4 FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S DISCOURSE FEATURES

In principle all the features listed above are found in all discourse types. That is why, in 1969, Nida referred to them as "universals of discourse" (1969: 131). In practical terms, however, these aspects of the discourse on the macrolevel are prioritized in terms of the author's purpose and the text type or subtype chosen. For example, in a narrative, perhaps the most important element would be the order of events. Likewise in a set of instructions for putting together a piece of equipment, tasks must be presented in a certain sequence in order to ensure the success of the project. In a descriptive text, the discourse will circulate around the spatial aspect of the object and in a dialogue, the text will focus on pairs of arguments. Basically, the text can be arranged on the macrolevel based on any of Nida's discourse features.

It should be noted, however, that while there is a limited number of organizing features, again, most discourses are composed of any combination of these elements, and thus the possible combinations of features are quite extensive.

3.5 NIDA VS. NEWMARK ON RHETORICAL STRUCTURE

Nida's views on discourse structure can be compared with those of Peter Newmark, who concentrates more particularly on the element of cohesion in discourse structure. Indeed, cohesion is such an important aspect of discourse structure for Newmark that he initially treats "discourse analysis" solely from the aspect of text cohesion: in Approaches to Translation, the concept of discourse analysis and that of cohesion seem almost synonymous (1988a: 176-179). Like Nida, he outlines the various devices which can create cohesion, including theme and rheme, anaphoric and cataphoric reference, enumerations, opposition, redundancy, conjunctions, substitution, comparatives, initial negatives, punctuation, and rhetorical questions. It is interesting to note that many of these same devices appeared in Nida's Toward a Science of Translating, under the heading Five Features of Discourse (e.g. formal and semantic carry-overs, sequences of sentence and clause types and markers of sequences), although Nida later removed them from his Features of Discourse and put them with features that worked on the microlevel (see section 3.3).

Many of Newmark's original features of cohesion resurface in A Textbook of Translation (1988) as productive of structure or

mood, the two levels of text cohesion he later identified. Here, Newmark differentiates between **coherence**, which represents the unity of the text as a whole and **cohesion**, which exists as grammatical and lexical links between sentences (1988b: 54). This idea that text cohesion exists on both the macrolevel and the microlevel is not new to Nida. In 1984, Nida wrote that cohesion occurred on the level of 'thematic unity' and the 'unfolding of sequences' (propositions) (1984: 291). In the following chapter, we will examine Nida's views on cohesion on the microlevel and compare them with those of Newmark, but at this point, we will focus solely on the structure of the text as a whole. The similarities and especially the differences between Newmark's features of **coherence** and Nida's features of **rhetorical structure** can be examined in Table C.

TABLE C
NIDA VS. NEWMARK

NIDA	NEWMARK
Discourse Typology	Genre of Discourse
Features of Discourse	Structure of the Discourse
<u>Primary Features</u>	thesis/antithesis/synthesis
Time	intro/aspects & examples/
Space	conclusion
Class	setting/complication/
	resolution/evaluation
<u>Secondary Features</u>	argument/pros & cons/
Rank	conclusion
Consequence	build-up/climax/denouement
Dialogic Sequencing	

It is evident right away that Nida and Newmark have two very different foci when they write about cohesion on the macrolevel. Since Newmark is more concerned with cohesion on the microlevel, he gives only cursory headings for cohesion on the level of text, headings which encompass a large amount of unexpanded and unexplained information. He settles for providing examples of genres and structures, but gives no hint as to how they are constructed. We get the distinct impression that he would rather be writing about cohesion on the microlevel, but felt obliged to provide a token reference to textual cohesion. And as will be seen in the following chapter, Newmark does focus most of his attention on cohesion on the microlevel.

Nida on the other hand is much more concerned with the textual features contributing to cohesion of the discourse as a whole and his analysis in this area is much more thorough. He provides examples of discourse types (see Table A, p. 18) and then seeks to define what features contribute to the structures (Table B, p. 30).

Newmark examines cohesion within the text in order to establish to what extent the whole text can be seen as a unit of translation. However, while he agrees with other text linguists that many factors within the text as a whole create cohesion and that these factors may differ between languages, Newmark is opposed to the idea that the text can be translated as a unit. He still maintains that the correct unit of translation is the sentence (1991b: 106). Nida, like Newmark, is concerned with the individual

sentences in the text; however, he is more interested than Newmark with the text as a whole.

3.6 CONCLUSION

In order to produce a faithful translation, it is not enough to translate just the words of the source text, rhetorical structure must be taken into consideration. That is not to say that if a certain source language structure is not found in the target language then the translator should impose the source language structure on the target language. This leads to clumsy and awkward translations which are rarely read. However, since the features of discourse are basically universal, ideally such a case should not occur. Nida writes that although the surface structures of different languages are very different, their underlying structures are essentially the same (Unpubl: 2). For example, in The Theory and Practice of Translation, Nida lists the various tenses and temporal gradations used in most Indo-European languages (1969: 116). While not all languages have the same tenses, and some languages require a reordering of events to put them into chronological order, nevertheless all languages do have some type of temporal organization. Therefore, the features of *time, space, class, rank, consequence* and *dialogic sequencing* can usually be translated quite easily into the target language, once they have been determined in the source text, so long as the characteristic manner of marking these features in the target text is respected.

4.0 RHETORICAL FEATURES

While the previous chapter on the features of discourse dealt with text cohesion on the macrolevel, rhetorical features (also referred to as rhetorical devices and rhetorical techniques) deal with cohesion on the microlevel. At this level, Nida examines the links between words, sentences and paragraphs which give the text a sense of cohesion on the microlevel. According to him, "rhetorical devices of language may be defined as those features of language which are consciously manipulated in order to produce special effects" (1979d: 320). In view of translation, Nida explains that these rhetorical features appear to exist in all languages, so it is very important for the translator to recognize the features and transfer them accurately into the target language.

Nida has recently divided the rhetorical features into formal rhetorical features and semantic rhetorical features. In other words, these features deal with either the formal aspects of writing or the semantic component. The formal features are those properties of the text which deal with the order of words, sentences, paragraphs and graphic details solely from the surface aspect. That is, meaning plays no role in organization on the formal level. Semantic features, on the other hand, deal specifically with the meaning of the text. Any discourse may enhance its impact and appeal by using a variety of formal or semantic devices. While, in Nida's earlier writings, both formal and semantic devices were amalgamated under the heading *rhetorical devices*, for the purpose of analysis, the features listed in Tables

D and E have been divided into formal or semantic devices whether or not they were divided into these categories in the original work examined.

4.1 FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

Nida has always recognized the different formal devices which make up a discourse. While he is generally known as espousing a meaning-based approach to translation (sometimes at the expense of form), he still recognizes that the ideal translation would be a happy marriage of both aspects within the text.

Nida's first organized reference to the formal features of a text can be found in Theory and Practice of Translation (1969) as shown in Table D. However, given the fact that they are treated more fully and systematically in the most recent material at our disposal, we have traced the formal features in Nida's writing from 1991 back to 1969, and attempted to show the parallels in Nida's presentation between his most current writing and his earlier works. It is for this reason that the categorization as it appeared in the earlier works may seem to be somewhat out of order.

For example, in the 1969 column, *rhythm* and *assonance* are two features which deal with the phonetics of a discourse and would generally be grouped together. However, because of the order of elements in the later works, the features in Nida's earlier typologies have necessarily been reorganized.

As can be seen from Table D, the rhetorical features which have to do with the form of the discourse include everything from

repetition to purposeful ungrammaticality (anacoluthon). Perhaps the formal features are most evident in poetry with measured lines and unusual word orders, but formal rhetorical features are also evident in prose. Any well-written discourse will use parallelism or transition to make the discourse cohesive and it is common to find embedded parenthetical information even in scientific discourse. Most readers will recognize whether or not a text is well-written, but many would not be able to say why it is well-written. By pointing out the formal rhetorical features, Nida enables the translator to understand why the source text works as a text and shows him how to create an equally cohesive target text.

TABLE D

FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

1969 ¹	1979	1981
<u>Formal features for Special Effects</u>	<u>Rhetorical Devices</u>	<u>Basic Features of Form</u>
	-shifts in word order	
-rhythm	<u>Suprasegmental Sounds</u> -stress, length, tone	-measured lines
		-embedded direct discourse -parenthetical statements
-complex discourse structures structured through <u>parallels</u>		-chiasm
	<u>Graphic Devices</u> -capitalization -punctuation -indentation	
-assonance -alliteration -rhyme -onomatopoeia	<u>Segmental Sounds</u> -assonance -alliteration -rhyme -onomatopoeia	
-shift of class	-anacoluthon	

¹1969: The Theory and Practice of Translation
 1979: "Translating Means Communicating II"
 1981: Meaning Across Cultures

TABLE D
CONTINUED

FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

1982c ²	1982f	1984
	<u>Formal features of Poetry</u>	
-order of parts		-unusual word order
		-repetition
-rhythm	-rhythmic length of units	-measured units
	-parallelism	
		-anacoluthon
-onomatopoeia, alliteration, assonance, rhyme	<u>Sounds</u> -onomatopoeia, alliteration, assonance	-repetition of sounds

²1982c: "Rhetoric and the Translator"
1982f: "Poetry and the Bible Translator"
1984: "Rhetoric and Styles"

TABLE D
CONTINUED

FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

1986 ³	1988	1990
<u>Rhetorical Processes</u>		
-shifts in word order	-shifts in order	-ordering of elements
-repetition -compactness -connectives	-addition -compactness -connection	-repetition
-rhythm	-rhythm	-measurement
-embedded parenthetical information		-embedding
		-deletion/ condensation
		-transition
		-reference
		-anacoluthon

³1986: From One Language to Another
 1988: "The Meaning of Rhetoric"
 1990: "The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communication"

TABLE D
CONTINUED

FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

1991a ⁴	1991b	1991c
<u>Formal Devices</u>	<u>Formal Devices</u>	<u>Formal Rhetorical Features</u>
-shifts in order	-order of words	-unusual order
-repetition	-repetition	-emphatic repetition
-measured lines	-measured lines	-measured lines
-embedding	-embedding	
-condensation	-condensation	-condensation
	-parallelism	
		-transition
		-explicit reference for clarity
-anacoluthon		-anacoluthon

As Nida's own typology clearly shows, formal features can exist on numerous levels. On the level of sound, we see various devices such as assonance, alliteration, onomatopoeia, and rhyme, which are at the writer's disposal in order to create audible text cohesion. These devices are obviously more apparent with an oral

⁴1991a: "Breakthroughs in Translation"
 1991b: "The Paradoxes of Translating"
 1991c: "Language as an Efficient Code"

reading of the text than with a silent reading. It is at this level that many poems come to life. Take for example the lines,

...Awaiting the sensation of a short, sharp shock
From a cheap and chippy chopper on a big black block.

The alliteration really brings the poem to life when it is read audibly.

The next level represented in Table D is that of graphics. Nida includes such elements as capitalization, punctuation and indentation as relating to the formal features of a discourse. Generally speaking, usual use of capitals, punctuation and indentation are not used to create impact on the reader, but they do promote cohesion. When the writer decides to add to, delete or change around the standard presentation, the reader usually notices that the author has gone to unusual trouble to change the graphic elements in the text and begins to look for the common pattern. Thus, the reader becomes aware of the cohesion on the graphic level.

Moving to a larger unit, the word, Nida includes the features of word repetition and anacoluthon (this can also be used on the sentence level or even on the level of discourse). The term anacoluthon refers to purposeful ungrammaticality to create an effect. While the translator may be tempted to produce a grammatically correct translation, this feature may greatly contribute to the impact of the text.

After the lexical level, features can be organized on the level of syntax. At this stage, formal features may include unusual word order, parallelism, chiasm, which is an inverted form

of parallelism, anacoluthon and rhythm. It is at this level that the transitions between clauses are most apparent. Through similar or inverted clauses, the reader's awareness of one specific element will be heightened. Take for example, the chiasmus in Shelley's Defence of Poetry:

Poetry is the record of the best and happiest moments
of the happiest and best minds.

By switching around the order of *best* and *happiest* in the second half of the sentence, Shelley draws extra attention to the links between poetry and the mind. It is interesting to note that Nida puts *parallelism* and *chiasm* in both formal features and semantic features. Apparently, he believes that these two features can have an impact on both form and meaning. Anacoluthon may also be used on the formal level, to give the impression that the writing is stream of consciousness or that it was written under the influence of deep emotion.

Formal features are not to be confused with the features on the macrolevel which pertain to the entire discourse (see Table B). On the former level Nida covers formal elements which may spread over one or more paragraphs, but are not features of the discourse as a whole. They include parallel structures within the discourse and embedded parenthetical information.

4.1.1 EVOLUTION OF NIDA'S FORMAL FEATURES

It is obvious from Table D that Nida has been thinking about the formal features of discourse for a great many years. One of the most obvious evolutions in his groupings as seen in Table D is

the gradual move away from features on the sound and graphic levels to eventually focus in on the formal features on the syntactic level and paragraph level. Even the lexical level is just barely represented in the *emphatic repetition* of the 1991 taxonomy. It is clear that Nida's earlier writings concentrated quite intently on the morpheme and it is probably for this reason that they focused on the effect that words alone could have in a discourse. As Nida's thoughts eventually turned to syntax, it is not surprising that his rhetorical features would follow this trend and his focus would shift to formal features dealing more specifically with the sentence. As a logical progression from this, once Nida began to focus on the discourse as a whole, he adapted his existing feature typologies, giving greater importance to features at this level; however, Nida recognized the importance of formal features on the level of discourse as early as 1981. In Meaning Across Cultures, Nida points out that the structures themselves carry meaning and emphasis. Therefore, from a translation point of view, the structure should be taken into account. He cites the ungrammatical parts of Paul's letters as reflecting Paul's spontaneous thought patterns. Although the translator may want to polish up the grammar, the anacoluthon must be retained in order to give the target text the same emphasis (1981: 44).

The one factor which remains constant throughout this evolution is the purpose of formal features: they are always intended to make the text more cohesive on the microlevel. He may look at the formal features from a variety of standpoints as he

progresses in his thinking, but his constant aim is to analyze which features have an effect on textual cohesion. Cohesive texts have been around since time immemorial, so it is not surprising that the concept of cohesion was covered in much of Nida's early writing as well as in current articles. As can be seen in Table D, Nida has examined a wide variety of formal devices which have appeared and disappeared in his writing over the years with little predictability, other than the general evolution of emphasis from lexical to syntactic to discourse noted above.

As shown in the last four columns of Table D, Nida has basically formalized his categories of formal rhetorical features over time, and in his recent writings there is very little discrepancy. The key features of repetition, measured lines, embedding, condensation, shifts in word order and anacoluthon appear in most of his post-1988 articles dealing with discourse.

By 1990, Nida had separated his categorization of rhetorical techniques. In "The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communications" Nida writes that $\text{Rhetorical Techniques} = \text{Formal Techniques} + \text{Semantic Techniques}$. Nida frequently uses equations to show relationships between concepts in order to help the student or working translator remember key ideas. Since Nida has created an equation, it can be assumed that this will be a basic premise in his writing from this point forward.

4.2 SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES

On the opposing side from formal features are therefore

semantic features, also termed semantic techniques, which are those features which affect the content of the discourse rather than the form. We use the term *opposing* since translation theoreticians have argued endlessly over the years as to which focus (form or content) is of most importance in the translation process. While Nida has always clearly stated that any text is made up of both form and content, he has also indicated that meaning must be given priority over form in Bible translation (1969: 13). Interestingly enough, however, although formal and semantic features were amalgamated in Nida's earlier writing, there is a surprising lack of semantic features included. As Table E shows, the first mention of any extended list of semantic features appears as late as 1979. This is not to say that semantic features were not mentioned in earlier writings. However, there does not seem to be any grouping together of these features and they appear sporadically throughout the works.

TABLE E

SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES

1979 ⁵	1981	1982c
Parallelism Chiasm	Parallelism	Parallelism/Chiasm
Irony	Irony	Irony
Hyperbole	Hyperbole/ Overstatement	Hyperbole
Litotes	Litotes/Under- statement	Litote
Figurative expressions	Figurative Language	Figurative language
	Personification	
	Rhetorical Questions	

⁵1979: "Translating Means Communicating"
 1981: Meaning Across Cultures
 1982c: "Rhetoric and the Translator"

TABLE E
CONTINUED

SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES

1982f ⁶	1984	1986
-Chiasm		-Similarities and Contrasts
-Irony	-Irony	-Irony
-Exaggeration		-Hyperbole
-Understatement		-Litotes
-Figurative Language	-Figurative Expressions	-Figurative Language
	-Paradox	-Paradoxes
		-Differences of Degrees
		-Plays on the Meaning of Words
	-Omission	

⁶1982f: "Poetry and the Bible Translator"
 1984: "Rhetoric and Styles"
 1986: From One Language to Another

**TABLE E
CONTINUED**

SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES

1988 ⁷	1990	1991
-Parallelism and Chiasm	-Similarity and Contrast	-Parallelism and Chiasm
		-Irony
		-Hyperbole
		-Litotes
	-Figurative Expression	-Figurative Language
	-Shifts in Grammatical Function	-Shifts in Grammatical Function
	-Polar Contrasts in Meaning	-Paradox
	-Shifts in Degree (gradation)	
-Shifts in Meaning	-Plays on Meanings of Words	-Plays on Meanings of Words
	-Sound Symbolism	
	-Obscurity, Ambiguity	-Obscurity, Ambiguity
	-Indirection	-Indirection
	-Specificity, Generality	-Specific for Generic
	-Semotactic anomalies	

⁷1988: "The Meaning of Rhetoric"
 1990: "The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communication"
 1991: "Breakthroughs in Translation"

Nida's first organized reference to semantic features (parallelism, chiasm, irony, hyperbole, litotes, and figurative expressions) is found in the 1979 article, "Translating Means Communicating". Here we find a solid basis for his future developments in the area of semantic features. A short list of semantic features can also be found in Meaning Across Cultures (1981) in combination with the formal features. This listing adds two features which were not present in the 1979 listing: *personification* and *rhetorical questions*. With the exception of *personification*, which is actually a sub-category of *figurative language*, all of the other features are present through to Nida's most current articles. The fact that these features have stayed in Nida's work, when Nida is continually evolving, points to the fact that these elements are at the heart of semantic features of discourse. The feature *parallelism* is replaced in 1986 by a category called *similarity and contrasts* which obviously encompasses *parallelism* and adds its inversion, *chiasm*, although these features seem to have more to do with the form of the text than the content. By 1991, Nida has reverted back to his original terminology, *parallelism*. *Irony*, *hyperbole* (overstatement), *litotes* (understatement), and *figurative language* are crucial elements of semantic techniques and appear throughout Nida's writing. Although the 1981 feature *rhetorical questions* may seem out of place when linked with the later feature *shifts in grammatical function*, there is nevertheless a very strong link. While rhetorical questions may be widely used in one language, when

they are translated into another language, they are often translated as emphatic statements. This represents a shift in grammatical function. Since Nida deals extensively with Bible translation, many of his examples are taken from that source. Rhetorical questions are a very common form in the Greek New Testament; yet to today's English-speaking reader, the literal translation of these rhetorical questions would strike a false note and occasionally lead to serious misunderstanding of the text. Therefore, in many instances, translators change the form of rhetorical questions and replace them with strong declarations. Thus the message is guarded and the target language reader responds in a like manner. This represents a key shift in grammatical function and is cited in many of Nida's books and articles.

4.3 FINAL COMMENTS ON NIDA'S RHETORICAL FEATURES

When Nida discusses rhetorical features, he does so in terms of processes. By this, we mean he starts with the feature in question and analyzes how that feature works in the text to create cohesion or impact etc. In fact, Nida's first draft of Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words (1946) focussed on "process" and then shifted to item and arrangement. Since that time, Nida has again shifted away from item and arrangement and has realized that language is a process. It is not the item itself but the relationship between items that is important. This process

provides the semiotic significance⁸. That is, each feature represents a code which must be accurately re-encoded in the target language.

Nida has been greatly influenced in this area by the work of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), who was in turn influenced by John Locke. Locke coined the term 'semiotics' in Essay Concerning Humane Understanding in 1690 and delineated the general science of signs. Peirce took over Locke's term 'semiotic' and redefined it as the 'doctrine of signs.' In his theory, Peirce outlines the concept of the sign, the referent and the interpretant based on the system of signs and the interpreter's dialogic interaction with a text (Nida: Unpubl). The interpretant is the element which brings together the sign and the referent, and is what current linguists and semioticians now refer to as 'code'. Nida uses this theory as the foundation for his current insights into 'language as code.' All texts have different levels of meaning which are joined in the code (or in this case, in the rhetorical feature). In practical terms, the translator has to initially determine the various meanings of the feature and then reproduce all of the levels of meaning in a target language feature.

The general field of semiotics has been divided into three sub-fields. The first sub-field is semantics, which is the study of the relation between a linguistic unit and the object to which it refers. The second sub-field is that of syntactics. Syntactics

⁸Semiotics is defined by David Crystal as "the scientific study of the properties of signalling systems, whether natural or artificial" (Crystal, 1991: 312).

examines the way these linguistic units relate to each other. Finally, pragmatics is the study of how the meaning of these units depends upon the user. Nida's classification of rhetorical features seems to spread out over all three sub-fields of semantics, syntactics and pragmatics, although Nida does not make a distinction between semantics and pragmatics. For example, figurative expressions deal with how words relate to meaning on the level of semantics; explicit reference and emphatic repetition are examples of how linguistic units relate to each other; and the features of exaggeration and omission depend upon the individual user.

4.4 NIDA VS NEWMARK ON RHETORICAL FEATURES

For Peter Newmark, discourse analysis consists of "cohesion -- the features that bind sentences to each other grammatically and lexically -- and coherence -- which is the notional and logical unity of the text" (1988b:54). We have already noted the parallels between Newmark's *coherence* and Nida's *features of discourse* (section 3.5). Here we will examine the similarities between Newmark's *cohesion*, and what Nida has called *formal features* (Table D, p. 46) Newmark deals far more extensively with cohesion on the microlevel than he does with coherence on the macrolevel. He examines cohesion between sentences by analyzing such elements as referential synonyms, repetition, enumerators, transitions and sound effects. Table F outlines the parallels which can be seen between the writing of Newmark and Nida on microlevel cohesion.

TABLE F
NIDA VS. NEWMARK

NIDA	NEWMARK (1988)
	<u>Cohesion</u>
*addition (formal feature) *similarities/contrasts (semantic feature 1986)	Connectives *addition *contradiction *contrast *result
	Referential Synonyms *lexical *pronominal *general
	Enumerators
Graphic Devices (formal feature, 1991)	Punctuation
Segmental Sounds (formal feature '69-'84)	Sound Effects
Emphatic repetition (formal feature, 1991)	Repetition
Transition (formal feature, '90-'91)	Transitions

It is interesting to note that many of the same features exist in both theoreticians' writing. With the exceptions of referential synonyms and enumerators, which Nida listed as forms of "formal and semantic carry-overs" in Toward a Science of Translating (1964) and which appear in Table B as features of the discourse as a whole, the two taxonomies find equivalent features at every level. Nevertheless, since Newmark restricts textual cohesion to the microlevel, his overall view of cohesion is much more limited than that espoused by Nida.

4.5 NIDA VS DELISLE ON RHETORICAL FEATURES

Significant similarities also exist between the writing of Nida and that of Jean Delisle on the question of rhetorical features. Jean Delisle writes about **textual organicity** in his book L'Analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction (1984). This **textual organicity** deals with the links between elements of information, which provide a form of progression from one element to the next. Delisle further explains that these links are inherently dependent on the discourse type: it is therefore not enough for a translator to merely translate each isolated element in the text, but he must also translate the coherent structure which gives life to the discourse as a whole (1984: 120). We see in this theory many similarities with Nida's view that the translator must reproduce the formal rhetorical features which give coherence to the discourse type in question.

Delisle lists four examples of internal structural changes which are linked to **textual organicity** and, as can be seen in Table G, they are remarkably similar to the **rhetorical processes** outlined in Nida's 1986 work, From One Language to Another.

TABLE G
NIDA VS DELISLE

NIDA 1986 ⁹	DELISLE 1984
<u>Rhetorical Processes</u>	<u>Textual Organicity</u>
-shifts in word order	-redistribution of elements of information
-repetition	
-compactness	-concentration
-connectives	-use of transitions to link utterances
-embedded parenthetical information	-explicitation
	-implication

Delisle writes that while different languages (namely English and French) employ different devices to produce a coherent text, nevertheless, coherence is equally sought after in all well written texts (1984: 198). While Nida analyzes different discourse types and concludes that the translator must reproduce the discourse type, using the target language's corresponding formal and semantic features, Delisle goes one step further and analyzes specifically how some English features differ from the equivalent French features.

The similarity in Nida's and Delisle's views on rhetorical features stems no doubt from their common purpose, which is to help

⁹1986: From One Language to Another
1984: L'Analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction

student- and working-translators to produce better translations. Both Nida and Delisle have recognized the problem that some translators have had when they did not take the discourse as a whole into consideration in their translation. And both recognize that translating word for word or even sentence for sentence will result in a stilted and dislocated text. Both, therefore, strive to give translators the necessary tools for producing a flowing and cohesive text.

4.6 NEUBERT ON LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COHESION

Neubert sees cohesion as existing on two distinct levels: the lexical level and the grammatical level. While grammatical cohesion corresponds readily to Nida's classification of formal rhetorical features, lexical cohesion crosses the boundaries of formal and semantic features. Neubert coins the term **textonymy** to refer to the various relations (semantic dependencies) rooted in the lexicon. In Table H, his classification of lexically and grammatically cohesive features is compared with that of Nida's rhetorical features.

TABLE H
NIDA VS NEUBERT

NIDA (1990)	NEUBERT (1985)
<u>Formal Rhetorical Features</u>	<u>Grammatical Cohesion</u>
-reference	-reference
	-substitution
-deletion/condensation	-ellipsis
-transition	-conjunction
	<u>Lexical Cohesion</u>
	-collocation
-repetition	-reiteration *repetition of word *synonym/near synonym *hyponym/subordinate term
<u>Semantic Rhetorical Features</u>	-textonymy
-similarity	*synonymy *complementarity
	*hyponymy *metonymy *metaphor
-figurative language	
-contrast	*antonymy *converseness *homonymy
-shifts in degree (gradation)	*gradation *thematic progression *lexical fields *word families *associative networks

It is in fact Neubert's term textonymy which most closely corresponds to Nida's classification of semantic rhetorical

features. Neubert provides more specific breakdowns of the semantic features than does Nida. For example, Nida outlines general features of similarity, contrast and figurative language, but Neubert expands this classification. For example, he provides two forms of similarity: synonymy and complementarity. Likewise, figurative language is represented by metonymy and metaphor, and contrast is represented by antonymy, converseness and homonymy. Neubert lists more subtypes than Nida, but the major categories represented still correspond with those of Nida.

4.7 CONCLUSION

In terms of translation, if the source and target language cultures and literary traditions are very similar, there will be many formal and semantic features which can be easily translated. This is the case of English and French. Since these two languages use similar structures in writing, most of the formal features of a text in French can therefore be maintained in an English translation, as can be seen in the application chapter of this thesis (section 6.0). Since both languages have similar literary traditions, the semantic features of a French text are also fairly readily rendered in English.

The difficulties arise, however, when the source and target languages and cultures are very different. In these cases, it is often impossible to translate the formal and semantic features of the source text. Instead, the translator has to endeavour to find equivalent features if they exist. For formal features, Nida

proposes that the translator look to the target language's literary tradition and use a feature which is used in the same situation. For example, while direct and indirect discourse are used in most languages, the usage may vary greatly between languages and the translator must be aware of this while translating (1981: 37). Likewise, semantic features (such as metaphors) can often be rendered with a cultural equivalent. For example, the clause in Acts 7:54 "they gnashed at him with their teeth" may be rendered in Yao as "they had itchy teeth" which means that they were anxious to destroy him (1981: 55-56). In the case where there is no equivalent, Nida's advice is that the translator attempt to translate the meaning first and then add a translator's note to make the reader aware that the source language text contains rhetorical features which could not be accurately translated, and explain the purpose of the said feature.

5.0 RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

The primary rhetorical functions outlined by Nida are all introduced into a text using either rhetorical structures or rhetorical features. Therefore, the study of rhetorical functions is a natural progression from the previous chapters on rhetorical structures and rhetorical features.

Nida's rhetorical functions are not to be confused with the functions of language as delineated by Jakobson. While Nida does outline what he calls "functions of discourse", which are similar to and based on Jakobson's classification of functions of language, they are distinct from his rhetorical functions ("Rhetoric and Styles: A Taxonomy of Structures and Functions," 1984).

Rhetorical functions are the elements of the text as a whole which make the text effective, that is, make the text effectively relate to the receptor. These functions include elements such as novelty, relevance, coherence, cohesion, and wholeness, which are generally classified as sub-categories of two major categories impact and appeal.

Table I summarizes Nida's classification of rhetorical functions from the earliest mentions of it in 1969 through to his most recent writings on the subject in 1991.

TABLE I
RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

1969 ¹	1984	1986
	<u>Effectiveness</u>	<u>Major Functions of Rhetoric</u>
<u>Impact</u>	<u>Impact</u>	<u>Impact</u>
Novelty Variety	Novelty	Novelty
	Proximity	Relevance
		Emphasis
		Focus
		Appropriateness
	<u>Appeal</u> Aesthetic Features	Aesthetic Appeal
Completeness		<u>Wholeness</u> Completeness Unity
Unity		
		Cohesion
	Relevance of Content	
Coherence		<u>Coherence</u> -world-view of the participants in discourse -setting -intertextuality

¹1969: Language Structure and Translation (1975) and The Theory and Practice of Translation
 1984: "Rhetoric and Styles: A Taxonomy of Structures and Functions"
 1986: From One Language to Another

TABLE I
(CONT)

RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

1988 ²	1990	1991
<u>Impact</u>	<u>Impact</u>	<u>Focus on Target Audience</u>
Novelty	Novelty	Novelty
Relevance	Relevance	Relevance
	Realism	
<u>Appeal</u>	<u>Appeal</u>	<u>Focus on External Context</u>
Appropriateness (relationship of form to content)	Appropriateness	Appropriateness of FORM & CONTENT for the practical circumstances surrounding the discourse
Aesthetic Form Symbolism		
Relevance of Thematic Content		<u>Focus on Text</u>
<u>Wholeness</u> -unity -completeness	Wholeness Proportion Coherence	Wholeness
		Progression
	Cohesion Prominence	Cohesion
		Timing
		<u>Focus on Internal Context</u>
	Clarity	Coherence

²1988: "The Meaning of Rhetoric"
 1990: "The Role of Rhetoric"
 1991: "Breakthroughs in Translation"

5.1 IMPACT AND APPEAL

All of the formal and semantic rhetorical features outlined in chapter 4 must be chosen with the goal of achieving maximum impact and appeal in the discourse. The translator must try to maintain the same impact and appeal with the target language receptor as was achieved by the source language writer with the source language receptor. That is, the text must both "hit" the receptor and "draw" him (1990: 146). In essence this is the foundation of Nida's theory of dynamic equivalence. Since Nida views impact and appeal as the primary functions of rhetoric, with all of the other functions working together to contribute to these two elements, we will use these two categories as the starting point for our analysis. Nida outlines how impact and appeal can be achieved as early as 1969, and in his most recent writings on this subject, he emphasizes that the type of impact and appeal will change according to the focus of the discourse.

5.2 IMPACT

One of Nida's basic premises in recent writing is that *impact* is achieved through *novelty*, *relevance (proximity)* and *realism* (see Table I, 1984 & 1990 columns). Although the concept of *impact* is touched upon in many of Nida's earlier writings, the threefold breakdown into *novelty*, *relevance* and *realism* does not appear until 1990. And while *novelty* and *relevance* appear in all of Nida's taxonomies in one form or another, *realism* only appears in the 1990 article.

5.2.1 NOVELTY

Novelty is the one sub-category which has remained constant in Nida's taxonomy from 1969 through to the present. *Novelty* is achieved by giving the reader something that is unpredictable or unexpected. This can be achieved in two distinct ways. Firstly, the writer may provide information which is unfamiliar to the receptor, thereby introducing unexpected content. This is found almost universally in education where a teacher introduces new information to a class. However, there is a second way of achieving *novelty*. The writer could present familiar information to the receptor, but still keep his attention by presenting it in a different manner, thereby introducing unexpected form. For example, a teacher could present familiar grammatical rules to a class through humorous poetry or song. This is where formal devices such as shifts in word order or repetition of a strange sound are used. Regardless of the writer/translator's focus, whether it be on the content or the form, both techniques are equally effective in getting the receptor's attention.

In an article published in 1969 in Language Structure and Translation (1975), Nida writes that for the analysis of the formal structure or the style of the text, one must ask the following question: "Is there sufficient variety in the sequencing to sustain interest and provide *impact* [our italics] appropriate to the content?" (1975: 90). The implication is that *impact* is created through variation of sequences (see Table I, 1969 column). This could be seen as *novelty* in a text, although the links between

novelty and variety are not evident anywhere else in Nida's writing.

5.2.2 RELEVANCE/PROXIMITY

The second way that the writer/translator can achieve impact on the receptor is through textual relevance. Nida uses the term *relevance* in two distinct ways. In terms of *impact*, *relevance* refers to the physical or psychological proximity of the reader to the events in the text. In fact, the first appearance of this element in Nida's theory occurred in 1984 under the heading *proximity*. The second way that Nida uses the term *relevance* has to do with the *appeal* of the text and will be further discussed in a later section.

Relevance is often a difficult element to "translate". The physical proximity of the text to the receptor, which includes both temporal and spatial proximity, can rarely be reproduced. A source text such as a newspaper article may have been written in the same town as an event took place, only a day after the event. The translated text, however, is necessarily going to be further temporally from the event (i.e. simply the practicalities of translation and publication will lengthen the time between the event and the text) and in all likelihood, will be published in an area farther away from where the event took place. In terms of psychological proximity, receptors from vastly different cultures will not necessarily have the same psychological experience. What is relevant in one culture may thus seem trivial in another.

5.2.3 REALISM

Basically, *realism* makes the text acceptable to the receptor in terms of his being able to picture the events. The concept of *realism* can be seen in earlier and later categories of *appropriateness*, although *appropriateness* is classified under appeal from 1988 onwards. If the form and content of a text are appropriate for the practical circumstances surrounding the discourse, then the text will be realistic (cf Table I, 1991 column).

5.3 APPEAL

The concept of *appeal* is what makes the text enjoyable to read. In Nida's 1990 classification, *appeal* is achieved through 1) wholeness, proportion and coherence; 2) *appropriateness*, cohesion and prominence; and 3) clarity (1990: 146). The taxonomy thus established allows Nida to categorize the elements in terms of classes. Thus, the first class involves *content* for the most part, the second class deals with the *form* of the text and the third class deals with the *balance between the content and form*.

Throughout Nida's work, he has recognized that *wholeness*, *coherence*, *cohesion*, and *appropriateness* are essential elements to a well-written discourse. He also introduces the functions *aesthetic features* and *relevance of content* in 1984 and they, too, remain fairly constant in his writing from this point on. As seen in Table I, there is very little change in concept from 1969 to 1991.

5.3.1 WHOLENESS/COMPLETENESS/UNITY

The rhetorical function *wholeness* is made up of *completeness* and *unity* which have been presented as individual rhetorical functions since 1969, although in 1986 Nida officially grouped them under the subheading of *wholeness*. There is a slight difference between *unity* and *completeness*. *Unity* in a text is achieved when the beginning and the end of the text fit together, while *completeness* is achieved when all the necessary information is contained in the text. This does not mean, however, that superfluous information should be included in the text in an effort to give every possible piece of information. On the contrary, a discourse supposes that the reader is familiar with certain experiences and leaves much information implicit in the text. Instead of contributing to the *wholeness* of the text, the presence of superfluous information will only draw the reader's attention away from the unity of the text.

5.3.2 PROPORTION

The function of *proportion*, which Nida groups with *wholeness* in the sub-class involving content of the discourse, is a very subjective function. In fact, it can easily be manipulated by the writer/translator according to what the individual deems to be the objective of the text. Basically, *proportion* is the level of importance given to each element of a text, generally manifested in the quantity of the text allotted to that specific element. For example, a technical document intended for a learned audience will

have a substantially higher proportion of technical data than humorous anecdotes. Contrarily, a similar article could be adapted for a much wider audience by increasing the proportion of humorous anecdotes and decreasing the amount of technical data.

5.3.3 COHERENCE AND COHESION

Nida's rhetorical functions of *coherence* and *cohesion*, which do not correspond exactly to Newmark's categories of the same name (cf p. 40-41), will be dealt with together here in order to clarify the differences between them. *Cohesion* deals with how the structural units of the discourse are connected and *coherence* deals with how the ideas fit together. Basically, the text should hold together as a text using formal rhetorical devices and be understandable through the use of semantic rhetorical devices. The formal and semantic elements are inseparable in any discourse.

Cohesion is not marked just by the transitions between clauses, sentences and paragraphs. Rather it can be realized by all of the formal rhetorical features which are at work on the level of discourse. Rhetorical features which contribute manifestly to *cohesion* include temporal progression, spatial contiguity, rank, logical consequence and dialogic patterning (1990: 148), although many other features could also create links between textual units.

Nida writes that *coherence* exists on three separate levels (1986:81-2). First of all, there is *coherence* between the text and the world view of the participants in the discourse; then there is

coherence between the text and the setting where the communication takes place; and finally there is *coherence* between the text and other similar texts (intertextuality). In terms of Bible translation, the participants of the original text had a much different world view and setting than the receptors of current translations. The translator then has the unenviable task of trying to make the text coherent to the modern reader while preserving the authenticity of the original manuscript. Although Nida has written about all three types of coherence, his main focus is on coherence with the world of the text. For example, Nida gives the example of Jesus sitting down to teach, which signified at the time that He was assuming the position of a Rabbi (1986: 65). Since the modern-day reader would not have the same world view and understanding of this custom, Nida suggests supplementing the text with a footnote in this case to clarify the situation.

5.3.4 APPROPRIATENESS

Appropriateness matches the formal elements of discourse to the nature of the content. *Appropriateness* first appears in Nida's taxonomy in From One Language to Another (1986) where he outlines biblical examples of *appropriateness* of genre, vocabulary and grammatical structure (1986: 81). By 1988, Nida has classified *appropriateness* as a function contributing to the appeal of the text. He defines it as the element which relates "form to content and to the setting of the communication event," (1988: 163). It is easy to see how form should relate to content -- it would be

ridiculous to pass legislative laws using comic strips -- but the form should also relate to the setting. What this means is that different discourse forms are appropriate to different settings. For example, it would not be appropriate to use an elevated genre, vocabulary or grammatical structure in a kindergarten class, neither would it be appropriate to use simplified genres, vocabulary or grammatical structures in a doctorate level seminar.

5.3.5 PROMINENCE

Prominence, which Nida classifies as a function relating to the form of the discourse, involves the use of unusual emphasis and foregrounding to bring an element to the foreground and keep it there until it is put back in the background and replaced by another element. *Prominence* is generally achieved by using formal rhetorical features to emphasize a certain point. The use of *repetition*, *unusual order* and *parallelism* are just a few examples of the formal rhetorical features that could emphasize a certain point in the text.

5.3.6 AESTHETIC FEATURES

Although the function *aesthetic features* does not appear in Nida's 1990 taxonomy, it does appear in his writing throughout the years in one form or another. The *aesthetic features* of a text are probably most apparent in poetry, although they are by no means excluded from prose. Basically, *aesthetic features* include the

sounds which are appropriate to the content of the discourse, the level of language and rhythm. Like *cohesion*, *aesthetic features* rely heavily on formal rhetorical features such as parallelism, repetition, and compactness.

5.3.7 THEMATIC RELEVANCE

In contrast with Nida's use of the term *relevance* with regard to the impact of a text on the receptor, *thematic relevance* deals with whether the content will be useful to the reader. In other words, a text will be appealing to someone in terms of content only if they see a use for the information contained therein either now or in the foreseeable future. This function, although present in some form or other in Nida's works over the years, first appeared "officially" only in 1984 (see Table I) as *relevance of content*. It was then termed *relevance of thematic content* in 1988. Presumably, the addition of *thematic* in the term was to avoid possible confusion with the *relevance* Nida classified under functions creating *impact* in the text (see 6.2.2).

5.4 HOW IMPACT AND APPEAL RELATE TO FOCUS

Most recently, in the article "Breakthroughs in Translation," (1991) Nida has further developed the classification of *impact* and *appeal*. He maintains that the elements (formal and semantic features) which create *impact* and *appeal* will change depending upon the focus of the text. Thus when the focus is on the target audience, *novelty* and *relevance* will be most important. When the

focus is on the source text itself, the most important elements will be *wholeness*, *cohesion*, and *progression*. A focus on internal context (i.e. on the real or imagined world within the text) would make the *coherence* of ideas the most important element. And when external context (i.e. the practical use of the text) is the focus, *appropriateness* is the most crucial element.

5.5 NIDA VS. NEUBERT ON RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

Of course, Nida is not alone in the analysis of rhetorical functions. Albrecht Neubert has also done considerable work on text linguistics and touches on many of the same functions as outlined by Nida, although he does not employ the term "rhetorical functions". For example, one of the elements in Nida's taxonomy under *impact* is *novelty*, referring to new information in the text. This corresponds to the element *newness* in Neubert's Text and Translation, which designates the new items in a text which create impact. While both Nida and Neubert insist on the importance of *novelty* in the creation of an effective text, both also stress the fact that it is one function out of many which work together to create an effective text. Neubert writes, "Whereas *newness* [our italics] can indeed hold attention [...] a number of items put together do not necessarily constitute a text" (1985: 81). Obviously, while recognizing *newness* as a rhetorical function, he wants to make sure that the reader does not misunderstand it to be the **only** function.

Neubert goes on to list other rhetorical functions such as *coherence* and *cohesion*. Neubert writes that while *coherence* and *cohesion* are interdependent, they should not be blurred together. This is a direct criticism of Halliday and Hasan's book, Cohesion in English, in which he feels that the two concepts have been meshed together and both labelled as cohesion. Therefore he is very careful, as is Nida, to make the distinction between the two elements. For Neubert, *coherence* is the "tracing of a consistent line of information" (1985: 82), which clearly relates to the semantic content of the text; this explanation parallels Nida's definition that coherence deals with how the ideas fit together in terms of content (cf. his threefold classification in 6.3). Neubert's view of *cohesion* as a function existing on the formal level of the text corresponds also to Nida's. Neubert, like Nida, makes the distinction between *cohesion* within individual sentences, which he calls "structure," and *cohesion* on the level of discourse, which he calls "texture". Neubert sees the interdependence between *coherence* and *cohesion* in the following way:

Cohesion rests then on coherence: it affects the surface of texts, coherence is their underlying conceptual basis. (1985: 95)

While both Nida and Neubert see *intertextuality* as contributing to the rhetorical function of a text, Nida classifies it as one form of *coherence*, that is *coherence* between the text and other similar texts, whereas Neubert sees it as an element of the unity of the text. He writes that, "Intertextuality [...] provides for unity in diversity..." (1985: 118). Neubert treats

intertextuality in great detail in Text and Translation, since it provides the empirical basis for a text typology, which he strongly advocates. Toward this end, he writes that *intertextuality* is made up of a number of predetermined conventions which constitute a **text type** (1985: 121). These variations of *intertextuality* form the foundation of his text typology. Despite such minor differences, however, Neubert and Nida share many views on what the latter has termed "rhetorical functions."

5.6 NIDA VS. DE BEAUGRANDE AND DRESSLER ON RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

While the precise influence of de Beaugrande and Dressler on Nida is difficult to determine, they are regularly mentioned in bibliographies following Nida's works. On the other hand, de Beaugrande and Dressler also cite Nida in their bibliographies. So there is little doubt that these authors share common concerns.

In the introduction of Introduction to Text Linguistics (1981), de Beaugrande and Dressler outline seven standards of textuality, many of which bear close resemblance to Nida's rhetorical functions. Table J outlines the seven standards:

TABLE J
 DE BEAUGRANDE AND DRESSLER
 SEVEN STANDARDS OF TEXTUALITY

<u>Introduction to Text Linguistics</u>
Cohesion
Coherence
Intentionality
Acceptability
Informativity
Situationality
Intertextuality

These seven standards were originally outlined in order to provide an explanation for what constitutes a text. De Beaugrande and Dressler realized that the words and sentences in a discourse do not define the text, but that there are other elements necessary to transform a text into a "communicative occurrence" (1981: 3).

The first standard of textuality, *cohesion*, refers to the surface text and how it holds together formally, normally through the use of grammatical links. De Beaugrande and Dressler use the term in the same way as Nida, to refer to the formal features which tie the text together. Likewise, the use of *coherence* in Introduction to Text Linguistics is the same as Nida's use of the term, although Nida employed the term as early as 1969. De Beaugrande and Dressler write that *coherence* is achieved through concepts and relations which exist under the surface of the text,

thus linking the knowledge a reader has about the world around him/her and the text-presented knowledge (1981: 4-6). This corresponds to Nida's first level of coherence, which deals with the relationship between the text and the world view of the participants in the discourse (1986: 81). *Cohesion* and *coherence* are presented together in de Beaugrande and Dressler's work, since they both work on the level of the text.

From this point, they move on to analyze the effects of the text-producer and text-user on a text. The two standards of textuality which work on these levels are *intentionality* and *acceptability*. *Intentionality* refers to the text producer's (the writer/translator's) goal in writing the text. If it is to get information across, the text should also conform to the standards of *cohesion* and *coherence*, although such is not always the case. *Acceptability* deals with whether the text is acceptable to the text user, that is, is the reader willing to participate in the discourse and accept the producer's goal (*intentionality*)? It is obvious that these two elements are inextricably linked together through the participation of the producer and the user of the discourse. These two elements are not included in Nida's examination of rhetorical functions, where he sticks much closer to the text as a stand-alone entity, although he does take them into consideration in his analysis of purposes of translation (1969: 24-7). The one element of Nida's that comes closest to de Beaugrande and Dressler's standard of *acceptability* is *relevance*, since a

reader will be more likely to accept the text if it is relevant to him/her.

De Beaugrande and Dressler's fifth standard of textuality, *informativity* corresponds to one aspect of Nida's rhetorical function *novelty*. De Beaugrande and Dressler write that the standard of *informativity* deals with known vs. unknown information and that this aspect of textuality makes a text more interesting to the reader. Likewise, Nida uses the term *novelty* to refer to new information which grabs the attention of the reader, thus contributing to *impact*. However, Nida also includes new ways of presenting known information as another aspect of *novelty*. This secondary aspect is not found in de Beaugrande and Dressler's standards of textuality.

Situationality represents the factors which make a text relevant to the situation (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 9). For Nida, this represents only a secondary class of coherence, where the text must be coherent to the setting (Table I, 1986 column). The slight difference in approach can perhaps be explained by the fact that the book Introduction to Text Linguistics focusses on the unilingual text, whereas Nida's work focusses on both the original and translated text. Since textual elements cannot have an exact replica through translation and it is rare for the translator to achieve *coherence* to the original setting, Nida may not have given as much attention to *situationality* as does de Beaugrande and Dressler.

De Beaugrande and Dressler's final standard of textuality, *intertextuality*, is also considered by Nida as merely a type of coherence, perhaps for the same reason as outlined in the previous paragraph. In a unilingual text, it is easy to see the intertextuality between the text and other similar texts, but as was the case with *situationality*, when a text is translated, much of the intertextuality is lost unless the parallel texts have also been translated and are widely read.

These seven standards of textuality are the foundation of de Beaugrande and Dressler's work on text linguistics. As indicated above, there are many obvious parallels between their work and that of Nida, although, since the former take a unilingual approach to text linguistics, there are also some divergences. The similarities and differences between the work of Nida and de Beaugrande and Dressler are summarized in Table K.

TABLE K
 NIDA VS DE BEAUGRANDE & DRESSLER
 RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

<u>From One Language to Another</u> ³	<u>Introduction to Text Linguistics</u>
Coherence (text vs world-view)	Coherence
Cohesion	Cohesion
	Intentionality
(Relevance)	Acceptability
Novelty (information)	Informativity
Coherence (setting)	Situationality
Coherence (intertextuality)	Intertextuality

It appears that Nida has taken the basics of unilingual text linguistics and has adapted them to the translation milieu. The result is a practical approach to text translation.

5.7 CONCLUSION

Like rhetorical structures, rhetorical functions cross over all language boundaries. No matter what language is used, a text will always contain functions which create impact and appeal. Since the field of discourse and translation has been developed,

³From One Language to Another, Jan de Waard and Eugene A. Nida, 1986.

Introduction to Text Linguistics, Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler, 1981.

translators have become more aware than ever of the universals of communication which exist, separate from individual languages. This is good news for the translator who realizes that all languages have some form of novelty, relevance, coherence, cohesion and wholeness. This can be seen in the case of direct vs. indirect discourse, which is evident to some extent in most languages, as outlined in the previous chapter as a formal rhetorical feature. Within a text, the direct or indirect discourse contributes to the cohesion of the text as a whole. Once the functions have been determined in the source text, it is the translator's job to ensure that the functions exist in the target language, using the necessary rhetorical structure or specific rhetorical features which will create the same impact and appeal in the target text.

6.0 APPLICATION

In keeping with Nida's aim to link theoretical information with practical application, we have selected a short text to analyze and translate according to Nida's theory of discourse analysis (see Appendix C). This will further demonstrate the usefulness of Nida's theory of discourse analysis for the task of translation.

In order to stay close to the general theme surrounding Nida's work -- Biblical translation -- we have selected a religious text. Although the text is relatively short, it contains enough of the elements outlined in the previous chapters to make it a worthwhile endeavour.

This text, "Telle est notre foi," was included in a monthly publication called Prions en église, which is a publication used for Catholic Mass. This particular text was written for the Mass held the evening before Easter Sunday. Although the text does not constitute an entire sermon, it is devotional in nature and contains many aspects similar to those found in a sermon. In terms of discourse types, the text is an exposition. It logically presents ideas and arguments around the Easter theme. It is obvious even from a cursory reading that it has been organized according to reason and not observation.

6.1 FEATURES OF DISCOURSE

On the macrolevel of the discourse, there are a variety of

features at work in this text¹. Firstly, the temporal features are those which organize the sequence of events. For example, the second part of the text includes a brief flashback into Old Testament history and presents these past events in a chronological fashion. This allows the reader to see the development of God's faithfulness throughout biblical history. Although we will analyze the role of verb tenses further in the following section on formal rhetorical features, it is important to note here that the verb tenses play a significant role in the temporal development of this text.

Consequence also plays a key role in any type of exposition. In this text, the role of cause and effect is highlighted by contraexpectation. A series of situations are presented which lead the reader to expect punishment as a consequence, but instead the opposite is found. For example:

the cause: Ils avaient souillé le pays de leur conduite...
Their deeds defiled the land...

the expected effect: God would punish them.

the unexpected effect: God blessed them..."il les a rassemblés, il les a ramenés, il a versé sur eux une eau pure."
[He] gathered them together, drew them to Him and poured purifying water upon them.

Temporality and consequence are the two features of discourse that are the most apparent in the text and must be maintained in the translation.

¹See Chapter 3 and Table B for a review of the Features of Discourse.

6.2 FORMAL RHETORICAL FEATURES

On the microlevel of the text, there are many formal rhetorical features at work. As stated above, the verb tenses in this text play a very important role in its overall development. There are two parallel time lines in this text. An analysis of the verbs will reveal a general movement from the present narrative to the future, with a secondary movement developed by an excursion back into the past, which also uses two time frames.

PARALLEL TIME STRUCTURES

Principle Time-line present --> future

Secondary Time-line past perfect --> present perfect

This time progression not only contributes to the overall progression of the text but also coincides with the development of the dark to light imagery which we will analyze further in the subsequent section. The present and past perfect verb tenses are used along with the lexicon to represent oppression. This is clearly evident in the first section of the text. Verbs such as "il fait noir", "se cache", "se tait", "se blottit" and "étouffe" show the oppression of the present situation. As the narrator delves further back into history, we are presented with other verbs such as "avaient détourné", "s'étaient laissés écraser", "s'étaient noyés", "avaient souillé" etc. However, as the time line progresses, the verbs take a step into the future and take on a

decidedly more hopeful outlook. Just as the future tense is 'future' to the present tense, so the present perfect is 'future' in relation to the past perfect. Therefore, the secondary time line contains more optimistic present perfect tenses such as "s'est souvenu", "s'est fait proche", "a rassemblés", "a ramenés" and so on. Likewise, in the final section of the text, verbs like "se fera vivante", "sera célébré", "se souviendra" and "agira" give the impression of life, celebration, hope and action.

Other formal features such as capitalization and punctuation play a minor role in the text. The words "Vivant" and "Parole" are capitalized to signify that they refer to Jesus Christ, second person of the Trinity. Although these words appear separately in this text, it is interesting to note that Jesus is also referred to as the Living Word, with both words used together.

The punctuation of the text is relatively straightforward: it consists mainly of periods. There are few commas because sentences are short. However there are some suspension points and exclamations marks which do contribute to the overall discourse. The suspension points are used in the middle section of the text to signify a shift in thought -- which, in this case, marks a contraexpectation. The exclamation marks are used to add to the impact of the final section and symbolize the joy and excitement that comes from faith in God.

Repetition also plays an important role in this text, on both the level of the lexicon and the level of syntax. In the lexicon, we find, most notably, the phrase "Dieu s'est souvenu" which is

repeated six times, as well as other forms of the verb "souvenir" appearing throughout the text. This highlights the fact that the evening before Easter is a time of reflection, a time to look back and see how God has been faithful through the ages. Based on past experience, the author then makes the logical assumption that since "Dieu s'est souvenu" has held true in the past, it is natural that "Dieu se souviendra" for all future cases.

This type of logical progression is typical of many expositions. The author attempts to show the precedents and then formulate a hypothesis for future cases. In fact, this entire text is interspersed with a series of paired logical propositions, showing humanity's behaviour vs. God's mercy (e.g. "They were crushed by the testing of their faith... but God remembered Abraham" and "They wanted to return to the safety of slavery... and God remembered His triumph over the armies of Pharaoh"). This represents syntactic repetition. The majority of the sentences are short and suggest movement as they carry the reader along to the final word of the text which is the crux of the entire text. The case has been presented and, on the formal level, the entire text has urged us on through time progression and logic until we reach the pinnacle of the text: faith.

6.3 SEMANTIC RHETORICAL FEATURES

On the semantic level of the text, the same progression from oppression and darkness to freedom, light and faith is evident in the choice of words. In the following list, the words in the left

column have to do with oppression and darkness. They represent the sinful state of God's people. But the words in the right column are much brighter and hopeful, representing God's grace.

tombeau	lumière
noir	célébré
se cache	foi
ténèbres	vivant
mort	
brutale	
se tait	
blottit	
étouffe	merveilles
la fin	promesse
mauvais chemins	c'était très bon
détourné	triomphe
écraser	
l'esclavage	

Not only is the coexistence of this vocabulary very important to the gospel message contained in this text, but the distribution of the vocabulary of darkness and oppression in relation to that of the vocabulary of light and freedom is very effective. The first paragraph is full of words of darkness and oppression; the second paragraph, which is transitional, contains only a few scattered words of darkness and light. The third paragraph, which contrasts the oppression of the Jews with the freedom offered by God, represents a deliberate oscillation between the vocabulary characteristic of the former and that typical of the latter. The final paragraph contains only the vocabulary of hope. This distribution of the vocabulary reinforces the logical progression

of the text and contributes to the overall theme of the discourse: freedom from oppression through faith.

There are also a number of figurative expressions used in the text, including personification of the universe and humanity and several metaphors. The metaphors used are standardized because they are found in the Bible and are thus widely known. The two metaphors "les ténèbres de la mort" and "les ténèbres de la peur et du désespoir" add imagery to the text, which makes it more appealing to the reader. However, the most important metaphors in the text, *l'eau* and *les paroles*, have more significance than merely making the text appealing. These two metaphors, which are repeated constantly, also contribute to the overall message of the text, since both are important religious metaphors. *L'eau* is mentioned four times in the text: "les eaux de ce monde"; "Dieu...s'est fait proche dans l'eau"; "il [Dieu]...a versé sur eux une eau pure"; and "une eau sera versée". Although the waters of this earth lead to the death of Pharaoh and his armies, God's water represents new birth and purification. The second metaphor, *les paroles* is also used four times in this text. As with *l'eau*, which had two distinct references (one to the water of the earth and one to God's water), we see the difference between the words of this earth which are "sans avenir" and the word (note the singular usage) of God. In the Bible, *la parole*, signifies communication and *la Parole* refers to Jesus Christ who came to earth to communicate God's plan to mankind. Fortunately, both metaphors can easily be translated

into English, since they exist in the English Bible as well as in the French Bible and are widely understood.

6.4 RHETORICAL FUNCTIONS

All of the formal and semantic rhetorical features would not, in themselves, make the text work together as a text. This is where the rhetorical functions come in. For example, the original text was *appropriate* to people because it was published for a specific occasion: Easter. Just as the disciples gathered together to remember God's faithfulness, so Christians gather together at Easter. Christians of today are paralleled with Jesus' disciples: both groups have gone through the same process of gathering together to reflect. While it is now past Easter and the *appropriateness* has diminished to some extent, the text is still *appropriate* because the message is still valid. As we have seen in the previous subsections, the text is *cohesive* through temporal progression and transitions. It finds its *unity* in that everything in the text, from beginning to end, pertains to faith. The text is also *complete* in that all the necessary information is included. In order to present his case that God is faithful, the author has introduced the foundation of our faith (Jesus Christ), presented records of past cases which have set the precedent for God's faithfulness and finally concluded that God will be faithful today and in the future. While this makes the text *complete*, there is no superfluous information contained in the text. Since the text is written for a Catholic Easter Mass, it assumes that the

congregation has a basic understanding of the Bible and the references to Old Testament stories are not elaborated upon. Its progression is clear from past to present. There are really two separate time frames: Jesus' death and resurrection, as presented in the New Testament history and Old Testament prophecy. It is these Biblical references which contribute to the coherence of the text. If we refer back to the section on Rhetorical Functions, we find that coherence can be achieved through intertextuality. There is elaborate usage of intertextuality in this text. Firstly, the overall order of events in this text comes directly from the Holy Saturday Mass. For example, the Mass begins after dark on Saturday, which is represented at the beginning of the text by darkness. The series of readings in the Holy Saturday Mass begins with a reading about creation, followed by the Red Sea crossing, the liturgy of baptism and the gospel of the resurrection. All of these readings are represented in the same order in this text. Starting with the first three chapters of the book of Genesis, we see reference to Adam and Eve, "ils avaient détourné la création de sa promesse... et Dieu s'est souvenu qu'un jour <<c'était très bon>>". This is followed by a reference to Abraham whose faith was tested in Genesis 22:1-18, and then Moses taking the people of Israel out of Egypt and the subsequent death of the armies of Pharaoh. The most important intertextuality of course, is the reference to Jesus' ministry on earth, death and resurrection. All of these references contribute to the text by introducing an extended field of information. The reader is undoubtedly aware of

the other texts and his/her reading of this text is enhanced by the information retrieved from his/her memory on past readings of the Bible. The text, "Telle est notre foi!" seems to be short on paper, but the intertextuality contributes to making it much fuller than appears at first sight.

6.5 COMMENTED TRANSLATION

As this analysis has clearly shown, there are many factors at work in even a short text which contribute to its unity and coherence. All of these elements should be examined closely during the translation process to ensure that the translation will be every bit as effective as the original text.

A final translation of this text along with its draft version is presented below. The final translation can also be found in Appendix C.

TRANSLATION SHOWING FIRST AND FINAL DRAFTS

	SOURCE TEXT	FIRST DRAFT	FINAL TRANSLATION
1	Telle est notre	This is our faith!	This is Our Faith!
2	foi!		
3	Jésus a été	Jesus has been	Jesus has been
4	mis au tombeau. Il	put in the tomb.	put in the tomb.
5	fait noir sur la	It is dark over all	Darkness covers the
6	terre. L'univers	the land. The	land. The universe
7	se cache dans les	universe hides	hides in the shadow
8	ténèbres de la	behind the shadows	of death. An

1 mort. D'une mort of death. An unjust death so
2 injuste et combien unjust death so brutal that all
3 brutale qui brutal that puts hope is called into
4 interroge toute all hope into question. Humanity
5 e s p é r a n c e . question. Humanity is silent. It has
6 L'humanité se tait. is quiet. She has said everything.
7 Elle a tout dit. said everything. It huddles in the
8 Elle se blottit She huddles in the dark. It
9 dans le noir. Elle dark. She suffocates without
10 étouffe sans même suffocates without even realizing it.
11 s'en rendre compte. even realizing it. But a few
12 Mais quelques But a few disciples are still
13 disciples veillent disciples are still keeping vigil.
14 encore. Ils up. Vaguely, they Vaguely, they know
15 savent, ceux-ci, know that it is not that it is not
16 comme vaguement, possible that the possible that the
17 qu'il n'est pas cross could be the cross was the end.
18 possible que la end. They They remember. In
19 croix soit la fin remember. In the the past, their
20 de tout. Ils se past, their elders talked about
21 souviennent. Dans ancestors told it. At night,
22 le passé, leurs them. At night, around a fire. The
23 ancêtres leur ont around a fire. The stories had
24 raconté. Le soir, stories had enthralled the
25 autour d'un feu. captivated the children. The
26 Les récits avaient children. The events they told of

1 captivé les petits.
2 Les événements
3 avaient donné foi
4 aux faibles. Les
5 paroles se
6 transmettaient de
7 génération en
8 génération afin
9 qu'on se souvienne.
10 Qu'on se souvienne
11 des merveilles de
12 Dieu. De
13 l'impossible.

14 Ils avaient
15 choisi des mauvais
16 chemins... mais
17 Dieu s'est souvenu!
18 Ils avaient
19 détourné la
20 création de sa
21 promesse... et Dieu
22 s'est souvenu qu'un
23 jour <<c'était très
24 bon>>. Ils
25 s'étaient laissés
26 écraser par

events had given
faith to the weak.
The words were
passed on from
generation to
generation so that
they would
remember. That
they would remember
the wonders of God.
The impossible.

They had
chosen the wrong
paths... but God
remembered!
They had misused
the promised
creation... and God
remembered that one
day "it was very
good." They had
been crushed by the
test of faith...
but God remembered

had given faith to
the faint-hearted.
The words were
passed on from
generation to
generation so that
they would
remember. Remember
the wonders of God.
The impossible.

The people
chose wrong
paths... but God
remembered! They
abused His promised
creation... and God
remembered that one
day "it was very
good." They were
crushed by the
testing of their
faith... but God

1	l'épreuve de la	Abraham.	They	remembered Abraham.
2	foi... mais Dieu	had wanted to	They	wanted to
3	s'est souvenu	return to the	return	to the
4	d'Abraham. Ils	security of	s a f e t y	o f
5	avaient voulu	slavery... and God	slavery... and God	
6	retrouver la	remembered His	remembered His	
7	sécurité de	triumph over	victory over the	
8	l'esclavage... et	Pharaoh and his	armies of Pharaoh.	
9	Dieu s'est souvenu	armies. They had	The people	
10	de son triomphe sur	drowned in the	drowned in the	
11	Pharaon et ses	waters of the world	waters of this	
12	armées. Ils	and the words	world and in vain	
13	s'étaient noyés	without future...	words... but God	
14	dans les eaux de ce	but God remembered	remembered and drew	
15	monde et les	and came close in	near to them in the	
16	paroles sans	the water and the	Water and the Word.	
17	avenir... mais Dieu	Word. They had	Their deeds defiled	
18	s'est souvenu et	defiled the land	the land... but God	
19	s'est fait proche	w i t h t h e i r	remembered and	
20	dans l'eau et la	conduct... but God	gathered them	
21	Parole. Ils	remembered and He	together, drew them	
22	avaient souillé le	gathered them	to Him and poured	
23	pays de leur	together, brought	purifying water	
24	conduite... mais	them back and	upon them.	
25	Dieu s'est souvenu	poured a pure water		
26	et il les a	over them.		

1 rassemblés, il les
2 a ramenés, il a
3 versé sur eux une
4 eau pure.
5 Et ce soir, en
6 cette veillée si
7 sainte, les
8 chrétiens et les
9 chrétiennes
10 quittent les
11 ténèbres de la peur
12 et du désespoir.
13 Ils se rassemblent
14 alors que tout
15 dort. Une lumière
16 les attire. Un cri
17 les attend. Une
18 parole se fera
19 vivante. Une eau
20 sera versée. Un
21 mystère sera
22 célébré. Un Vivant
23 se fera proche. Et
24 Dieu se souviendra.
25 Et Dieu agira sur
26 sa promesse, encore

And tonight,
on this holy eve,
Christians come out
of the shadows of
fear and despair.
They gather
together while
everyone is
sleeping. A light
draws them. A cry
awaits them. A
word brings them to
life. A water will
be poured out. A
mystery will be
celebrated. A
Living being will
come close. And
God will remember.
And God will still
keep his promise
today! This is our
faith!

And tonight,
on this holy eve,
Christians come out
of the shadows of
fear and despair.
They gather
together while all
is asleep. A
light draws them.
A cry awaits them.
A word shall come
to life. Water
will be poured out.
A mystery will be
celebrated. The
Living One will
draw near. And God
will remember. And
God will still
fulfill his promise
even today! This
is our faith!

1 aujourd'hui! Telle
2 est notre foi!

You will notice that we have maintained the same temporal features as were found in the original text. Although this cannot be done with all language pairs (hence Nida suggests arranging the text according to the absolute time sequence to avoid possible confusion [1969: 104-105])², French and English are close enough in terms of temporal relations that this is entirely possible. Thus, we have preserved the two separate time lines and the equivalent verb tenses for each time progression. In English, there is very little use of the pluperfect, especially in Biblical texts, so we have used the simple past.

The other formal features mentioned in the analysis are also readily translated. Due to the existence of the Bible in both French and English, many formal and semantic features have become standardized in both languages. Take, for example, the capitalization of "Vivant" and "Parole". In the English New International Version of the Bible, we find reference to "the Living One" (Rev. 1:18) and the "Word" (John 1:1). As in the

²Larson writes that in most Papua New Guinea languages, the chronological order of events must be retained. For example, the sentence 'He died without having any children' must be translated as 'Not having any children, he died. For further information see Larson, 1984: 282-283 and Diebler and Taylor, "Translation Problems" New Guinea Area Languages and Language Study, 3:1059-83. 1977.

French text, both terms refer to Jesus Christ and thus, they are easily transferable.

We have also maintained the original punctuation. Although suspension points are more commonly used in French than in English (often an English text will be reworded to avoid this punctuation, or a dash will be used instead), they signify a shift of thought in both languages. Thus, in maintaining the suspension points, we are attempting to maintain the same effect on the reader, whereas if we had reworded the translation to avoid them, the sense of thought shifting and anticipation of contraexpectation would be diminished.

We noted, in the analysis section, the importance of repetition in this text, both on the level of the lexicon and on the level of syntax. In the lexicon, we have maintained the repetition of the word "remember" and the phrase "God remembered". On the level of syntax, the same structure can also be retained in the English version. Most of the English sentences are short, with paired logical propositions, and lead toward the final word of the text: faith.

On the semantic level of the text, the choice of words was very important in order to maintain the progression from oppression and darkness to freedom, light and faith. The following list shows the words from the source text with our equivalent.

tombeau	tomb
noir	darkness
se cache	hides
ténèbres	shadow
mort	death
brutale	brutal
se tait	is silent
blottit	huddles

la fin
étouffe
mauvais chemins
détourné
écraser
l'esclavage

the end
suffocates
wrong paths
abused
crushed
slavery

lumière
célébré
foi
Vivant
merveilles
promesse
c'était très bon
triomphe

light
celebrated
faith
Living One
wonders
promise
it was very good
victory

The same progression from darkness to light exists in the translated text as did in the original text. This leads the reader to hope in the future.

Individual word choices were very important for translating this text. The importance of the word 'se souvenir' in French has already been pointed out. Initially, there were three possibilities for translating souvenir: to recall, to recollect and to remember. The first possibility, 'to recall', is properly used when the memory is stimulated by association (Fowler 1965: 509). Since there is no apparent association to stimulate God's memory to recall His promises -- there only exist a number of situations which would more likely make Him forget His promises to us -- this possibility does not quite fit. Likewise, 'to recollect' does not properly fit into the text, since 'to recollect' implies that one had to search in the memory to bring something to mind. It is unlikely that the author would use such a word for God, who is presented as being omniscient and omnipotent. Therefore, we are left with the term 'to remember' which is as free from external

connotations as possible and simply implies that the facts were present in God's memory.

Our original translation of "foi aux faibles" was "faith to the weak", which accurately renders the semantic content of the phrase. However, upon further examination, we noticed that there was some alliteration in the French phrase and chose to change the word 'weak' to correspond to the pattern. Two words immediately came to mind: faint-hearted and feeble. In the original text, 'faibles' is referring, not to those who are physically weak, but to those whose faith was weak; who lacked courage. The English term 'feeble' does not encompass this type of weakness, but the term 'faint-hearted' implies a lack of courage. Therefore, we chose the word 'faint-hearted' for this text.

Many other words were chosen in reference to Biblical terminology. Thus 'souillé' was translated as 'defiled' (Rev. 14: 4; Dan. 1:8), and 'versée' was translated as 'poured out' (Ps. 22:14). 'Une eau pure' was translated originally as 'pure water' (Heb. 10: 22), however that implies that **only** water was used, while the text is referring to the results of the water which is 'purifying'. The word 'détourné' can be translated as 'misappropriated' which means to use something for oneself without authority (Gage). However, the word seemed too cumbersome in the sentence, so we looked for other alternatives. Both 'misused' and 'abused' are suitable alternatives, but we chose 'abused' since it is the more active verb and, like the verb 'defiled', which is used

further on in the translation, means that the people actively treated the land badly.

When it comes to figurative expressions, we find that although personification is generally easier to translate than metaphors, the metaphors used in this text are fairly standardized in French and English and we could therefore maintain the same reference with no change in meaning. Thus "les ténèbres de la mort" becomes "the shadow of death" and "les ténèbres de la peur et du désespoir" becomes "the shadows of fear and despair." The important images of water and the word are also readily used in English religious texts, making the transfer quite simple.

Rhetorical functions which work in this text included *appropriateness* which, as mentioned before, is still evident since the message is still valid. But there is no doubt that the translated text is now more distant in time from the event referred to: Easter.

The translation is able to maintain cohesion through its temporal progression and transitions as was the case in the source text. And its unity stays the same with the references to faith all the way through the text. The time frames progress in the same manner and the intertextuality has remained intact. Obviously, the English reader also has access to the same Bible stories referred to in the French text.

While doing the initial translation of this text, we were already aware of the rhetorical structure, features and functions at work within this particular text. However, in reviewing the

translation to make sure that all of the necessary elements had been maintained, there were still a number of significant changes to be made. However, by using Nida's procedure for analyzing the unified discourse, the initial translation already has much of the impact and appeal of the source text, for his theory has made us more aware of the elements at work in the discourse, both on the micro- and macro-level. We hope that the revised translation produces the same effect on the target language reader as was achieved on the source language reader, for that remains Nida's primary goal.

7.0 CONCLUSION

It is quite obvious that the study of discourse is currently a major concept in Nida's translation theory. The evolution of his discourse typology, and the development of his theory on rhetorical structures, rhetorical features and rhetorical functions which find their origins as early as 1964, have now become the focal point of Nida's research. This development parallels Nida's general movement from morphology to syntax to discourse, since he has continually been aware of the need to address larger issues.

While Nida has not necessarily treated all aspects of discourse, the comparisons between his ideas and those of Delisle, Newmark, Neubert, and de Beaugrande and Dressler certainly show that his theory is very broad and encompasses most issues which are in current debate. In fact, there is very little new information in the most current books on discourse and translation that have not already been treated directly or indirectly by Nida.

Probably the most important aspect of Nida's discourse theory is its applicability to the translation milieu. Nida's study of discourse was inspired, not by theoretical goals, but by his desire to help the translator translate more effectively. This was his initial goal, and as a result, his articles always include both the theoretical element which is the foundation of his discourse theory, and also practical applications for the translator.

Nida's development of discourse theory is far from finished. He continues to explore the realm of language universals and semiotics, to analyze how they might fit into the practice of

translation. Although this is somewhat outside of the realm of this thesis, it is worth noting the development of Nida's theory in this area. In addition to the words in the discourse itself, Nida claims that all oral and written discourses are accompanied by bundles of codes accompanying the verbal signs. These codes which accompany the verbal signs, he divides into paralinguistic and extralinguistic subcodes. These external contexts also constitute a code which adds to the meaning of the message. Paralinguistic subcodes refer to the verbal manner in which a message is given, including such factors as intonation, pitch, loudness, voice quality and quantity. They all either reinforce or alter the verbal subcode. That is, you can say "I love that" in a way to mean that you either love or hate the item, but the words themselves remain the same. Extralinguistic subcodes refer to the factors outside of the verbal presentation. These include communicating agents such as gestures, eye contact, stance, distance, movement and tenseness; medium of presentation such as quality of paper, spelling, and font; the setting of the presentation such as the type of ceremony, location, importance of the occasion, and time; and the cultural background, which can include previous knowledge of the speaker or subject, beliefs, values, or cultural presuppositions of a given culture.

Thus, Nida clearly shows that understanding the whole message involves much more than the morphology, syntax or semantic content on the paper. While this thesis deals specifically with the words of a discourse, there is much room left for further study of Nida's

research in the area of semiotics and in paralinguistic and extralinguistic subcodes, which help to flesh out his theory of discourse.

APPENDIX A

Eugene A. Nida -- A Brief Biography

Eugene Albert Nida was born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma on November 11, 1914. From an early age, Nida was fascinated with technical terms and, after discovering that many scientific terms were based on Latin, he began to study the language. He began his post-secondary education at the University of California in Los Angeles, majoring in Greek, and graduated in 1936. Following his graduation, Nida spent a summer session at the Summer Institute of Linguistics, which led to his returning there to teach morphology and syntax each summer from 1937 to 1953. He began his Master's degree in Greek New Testament at the University of Southern California and graduated in 1939. In 1941, Nida began work on his Ph.D. at the University of Michigan and, two years later, completed his doctoral thesis, A Synopsis of English Syntax (Nida, 1943). In that same year, Nida was ordained as a Christian minister by the Southern California Association of the Northern Baptist Convention, joined the staff of the American Bible Society, and married his wife Althea Lucille Sprague. In 1944, Nida was appointed Associate Secretary for Versions with the American Bible Society, and later became Executive Secretary for Translations in 1946. During the following years, Nida spent much of his time travelling for the American Bible Society (ABS) and working with missionary translators on linguistic problems. In fact, Nida travelled between seven and eight months a year for about 35 years and worked in more than 85 countries on more than 200 languages. In 1949, the

United Bible Society (founded in 1946) approved the publication of *The Bible Translator* with Nida as editor, and it is through this quarterly journal that many of Nida's articles pertaining specifically to Bible translation have been published. In addition, Nida was also very involved in writing for and supporting another journal, *Practical Anthropology* from 1955 to 1972. This journal focused mainly on cross-cultural communication, especially communication of the gospel.

The sheer volume of Nida's writing is phenomenal, especially considering that he spent so much time travelling and teaching. Since 1943 when Nida wrote his doctoral thesis, he has written 40 books and over 200 articles covering numerous and diverse linguistic and translational foci. His acceptance of a wide variety of linguistic theories has led him to be labelled an eclectic, and a glance through his bibliography will show that Nida is definitely not trapped in the notion that there is only one possible way of doing things.

Although Nida has never accepted an offer of professorship, he has taught many summer courses at the Summer Institute of Linguistics, given seminars and training programs for translators all around the world, and lectured at conferences and universities alike. He has guided the organization of several major Bible translations and revisions (e.g. the revision of the Reina-Valera Spanish Bible between 1950 and 1960) and the preparation of a large number of *Translator's Handbooks* on the various books of the Bible. In 1970, he was appointed UBS Translations Research Coordinator.

In more recent years, Nida has reduced the amount of travelling he does; yet he still manages to fit in a few lectures here and there and continues to publish his latest conclusions on translation theory.

APPENDIX B

Bibliography of Eugene A. Nida's Writings

BOOKS

- Nida, Eugene A. Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. 1946. (2nd ed., 1949).
- . Learning a Foreign Language. New York: Friendship Press. 1950. (revised ed., 1957).
- . God's Word in Man's Language. New York: Harper & Row. 1952.
- . Customs and Cultures. New York: Harper & Row. 1954.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William A. Smalley. Introducing Animism. New York: Friendship Press. 1959.
- Nida, Eugene A. A Synopsis of English Syntax. Norman, OK: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 1960a. (2nd rev. ed., The Hague: Mouton, 1966).
- . Message and Mission. New York: Harper & Row. 1960b. (Paperback edition, 1972. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library).
- Nida, Eugene A. and Robert G. Bratcher. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1961a.
- Nida, Eugene A. Bible Translating: An Analysis of Principles and Procedures (rev. ed.). New York: American Bible Society. 1961b. (first ed., 1947).
- . Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1964.
- . Religion Across Cultures. New York: Harper & Row. 1968. (Reprinted in 1979 by William Carey Library).
- . Communication of the Gospel in Latin America. Cuernavaca, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación. 1969a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1969b.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Barclay M. Newman. A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles. London: United Bible

Societies. 1972.

- Nida, Eugene A. and Barclay M. Newman. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans. London: United Bible Societies. 1973a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Jan de Waard. A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Ruth. London: United Bible Societies. 1973b.
- Nida, Eugene A. Understanding Latin Americans. South Pasadena, CA.: William Carey Library. 1974. (Previously published as Communication of the Gospel in Latin America; see 1969a).
- Nida, Eugene A. and Paul Ellingworth. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies. 1975a.
- Nida, Eugene A. Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures. The Hague: Mouton. 1975b. (presently being revised).
- . Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions. (New edition with 1975 preface.) South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library. 1975c. (currently being revised).
- . Exploring Semantic Structures. Munich: Wilhelm Fink. 1975d.
- . Language Structure and Translation: Essays Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 1975e.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Daniel C. Arichea. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Galatians. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies. 1976.
- Nida, Eugene A. and I-Jin Loh. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Philippians. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies. 1977a.
- Nida, Eugene A. Good News for Everyone. Waco, TX: Word Books. 1977b.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Robert G. Bratcher. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Colossians and Philemon. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies. 1977c.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Brynmor F. Price. A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Jonah. New York: United Bible Societies. 1978.

- Nida, Eugene A. and Barclay M. Newman. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John. New York: United Bible Societies. 1980a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Daniel C. Arichea. A Translator's Handbook on the First Letter from Peter. New York: United Bible Societies. 1980b
- Nida, Eugene A. and William D. Reyrburn. Meaning Across Cultures. Maryknoll: Orbis Books. 1981.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Robert G. Bratcher. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians. New York: United Bible Societies. 1982a.
- Nida, Eugene A. Translating Meaning. San Dimas, CA: English Language Institute. 1982b.
- . Sign, Sense, and Translation. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria. 1983a.
- Nida, Eugene A., J.P. Louw, A.H. Synman, and J.v.W. Cronje. Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa. 1983b.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Paul Ellingworth. A Translator's Handbook on The Letter to the Hebrews. New York: United Bible Societies. 1983c.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Jan de Waard. From One Language to Another. Nashville: Thomas Nelson. 1986a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Johannes P. Louw. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains. New York: United Bible Societies. 1988.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Johannes P. Louw. Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1992.
- Nida, Eugene A. Language, Culture and Translating. China: University of Shanghai. 1992.

ARTICLES

- Nida, Eugene A. "Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems." *Word*. vol 1. pp 194-208. 1945.
- . "Field techniques in descriptive linguistics." *International Journal of American Linguistics*. vol 13. pp 138-146. 1947.

- . "The analysis of grammatical constituents." Language. vol 24. pp 168-177. 1948a.
- . "The identification of morphemes." Language. vol 24. pp 414-441. 1948b.
- . "Approaching reading through the native language." Language Learning. vol 2. pp 16-20. 1949.
- . "Difficult words and phrases." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 25-29, 72-74, 116-121, 158-162. 1950a.
- . "Equivalentents of the genitive in other languages." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 70-71. 1950b.
- . "New help on old problems." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 2-6. 1950c.
- . "Orthographic problems in Yipounou." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 110-116. 1950d.
- . "Questions and answers." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 34-37, 63-67. 1950e.
- . "The most common errors in translating." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 51-56. 1950f.
- Nida, Eugene A. and C. Moises Romero. "The pronominal series in Maya (Yucatan)." International Journal of American Linguistics. vol 16. pp 193-197. 1950g.
- Nida, Eugene A. "The translator's problems." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 41-50. 1950h.
- . "Training the translation helper." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 56-62. 1950i.
- . "Translation or paraphrase." The Bible Translator. vol 1. pp 97-106. 1950j.
- . "A system for the description of semantic elements." Word. vol 7. pp 1-14. 1951a.
- . "New help on old problems." International Review of Missions. vol 40. pp 190-196. 1951b.
- . "Problems of revision." The Bible Translator. vol 2. pp 3-17. 1951c.
- . "Proofreading." The Bible Translator. vol 2. pp 18-24. 1951d.

- . "Questions and answers." The Bible Translator. vol 2. pp 93-95, 133-137. 1951e.
- . "Report on the Reina-Valera Spanish revision." The Bible Translator. vol 2. pp 168-177. 1951f.
- . "A new methodology in Biblical exegesis." The Bible Translator. vol 3. pp 97-111. 1952a.
- . "Questions and answers." The Bible Translator. vol 3. pp 87-89, 131-134. 1952b.
- . "Selective listening." Language Learning. vol 4. pp 92-101. 1952c.
- . "Practical limitations to a phonemic alphabet." The Bible Translator. vol 5. pp 35-39, 58-62. 1954a.
- . "What is a primitive language?" The Bible Translator. vol 5. pp 106-112. 1954b.
- . "A changing Africa." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 23. pp 3-7. 1955a.
- . "Cross-cultural communication of the Christian message." Practical Anthropology. vol 2. pp 36-42. 1955b.
- . "Identification, a major problem of modern missions." Practical Anthropology. vol 2. pp 90-95. 1955c.
- . "Problems in translating the Scriptures into Shilluk, Anuak and Nuer." The Bible Translator. vol 6. pp 55-63. 1955d.
- . "Review of Bible Translating." (New York: American Bible Society, 1947). The Bible Translator. vol 6. p. 179. 1955e.
- . "Review of God's Word in Man's Language." (New York: Harper & Row, 1952) The Bible Translator. vol 6. p. 179. 1955f.
- . "Tribal and trade languages." African Studies. vol 14. pp 155-158. 1955g.
- . "Bible translation in Latin America." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 29. pp 21-24. 1957a.
- . "Language culture and theology." Gordon Review. vol 3. pp 151-167. 1957b.

- , "Mariology in Latin America." Practical Anthropology. vol 4. pp 69-82. 1957c.
- , "Meaning and translation." The Bible Translator. vol 8. pp 97-108. 1957d.
- , "Motivation in second language learning." Language Learning. vol. 7 (3-4). pp 11-16. 1957e.
- , "Religion and anthropology." Practical Anthropology. vol 4. pp 63-64. 1957f.
- , "The role of language in contemporary Africa." Practical Anthropology. vol 4. pp 122-137. 1957g.
- , "The Roman Catholic, Communist, and Protestant approach to social structure." Practical Anthropology. vol 4. pp 209-219. 1957h.
- , "Working out a cooperative answer (In reply to "Should we attend Indian ceremonials?")." Practical Anthropology. vol 4. pp 59-62. 1957i.
- , "Analysis of meaning and dictionary making." International Journal of American Linguistics. vol 24. pp 279-292. 1958a.
- , "Marginal helps for the reader." The Bible Translator. vol 9. pp 1-21. 1958b.
- , "Some contemporary translations in French." The Bible Translator. vol 9. p. 151. 1958c.
- , "Some psychological problems in second language learning." Language Learning. vol 8 (1-2). pp 7-15. 1958d.
- , "The relationship of social structure to the problems of evangelism in Latin America." Practical Anthropology. vol 5. pp 101-123. 1958e.
- , "Are we really monotheists?" Practical Anthropology. vol 6. pp 49-54. 1959a.
- , "Drunkenness in indigenous religious rites." Practical Anthropology. vol 6. pp 20-23. 1959b.
- , "Illustrations for 'primitive' peoples." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 38. pp 65-72. 1959c.
- , "Indians of the Americas face the future. (Address given at Triennial Conference of the National

Fellowship of Indian Workers at Estes Park, CO, July 1958)." National Fellowship of Indian Workers, News Letter, no. 71, Spring. pp 1-3. 1959d.

----- . "Principles of translation as exemplified by Bible translating." On Translation. ed. Reuben A. Brower. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp 11-31. 1959e.

----- . "Review of A.C. Bouquet, The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions." Practical Anthropology. vol 6. pp 283-285. 1959f.

Nida, Eugene A. and Ann Beardslee. "The missionary role in 'marriage palavers.'" Practical Anthropology. vol 6. pp 231-234. 1959g.

Nida, Eugene A. "The role of cultural anthropology in Christina missions." Practical Anthropology. vol 6. pp 110-116. 1959h.

----- . "Translation and word frequency." The Bible Translator. vol 10. pp 107-110. 1959i.

----- . "Do tribal languages have a future?" The Bible Translator. vol 11. pp 116-123. 1960a.

----- . "Psychological relationships in the communication of the Christian faith." (New York: Missionary Research Library.) Occasional Bulletin. vol 11. pp 1-18. 1960b.

----- . "Religion: communication with the supernatural." Practical Anthropology. vol 7. pp 97-112. 1960c.

----- . "The Bible translator's use of receptor-language texts." The Bible Translator. vol 11. pp 82-86. 1960d.

----- . "The translation of 'leprosy'." The Bible Translator. vol 11. pp 80-81. 1960e.

----- . "The ugly missionary." Practical Anthropology. vol 7. pp 74-78. 1960f.

----- . "Christo-paganism." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 1-15. 1961a.

----- . "Communication of the Gospel to Latin America." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 145-156. 1961b.

----- . "Kerygma and culture. Underlying problems in the

- communication of the Gospel in Spanish-speaking Latin America." Lutheran World. vol 8. pp 269-280. 1961c.
- . "New help for translators." The Bible Translator. vol 12. pp 49-60. 1961d.
- . "New translations in the new world." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 47. pp 103-107. 1961e.
- . "Reina-Valera Spanish revision of 1960." The Bible Translator. vol 12. pp 107-119. 1961f.
- . "Review of Henry A. Murray, ed., Myth and Mythmaking." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 140-141. 1961g.
- . "Review of Kenneth Cragg, Sandals at the Mosque." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. p. 139. 1961h.
- . "Review of The New English Bible: New Testament." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 46. pp 65-66. 1961i.
- . "Review of Vance Packard, The Status Seekers." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 141-143. 1961j.
- . "Some problems of semantic structure and translational equivalence." A William Cameron Townsend en el XXV Aniversario del I.L.V. Mexico. ed Benjamin Elson. D.F.: Instituto Linguistico de Verano. pp 313-325. 1961k.
- . "Tearing the thought curtains." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 281-282. 1961l.
- . "The indigenous churches in Latin America." Practical Anthropology. vol 8. pp 97-105, 110. 1961m.
- . "The relevance of Bible translating." Babel. vol 7. pp 51-52. 1961n.
- . "Typography: elements and principles." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 46. pp 52-55. 1961o.
- . "Akamba initiation rites and culture themes." Practical Anthropology. vol 9. pp 145-150, 153-155. 1962a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Fred C.C. Peng. "An alternate analysis of Akamba themes." Practical Anthropology. vol 9. pp 151-153. 1962b.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Diglot Scriptures." The Bible Translator. vol 13. pp 1-16. 1962c.

- . "Linguistic and translation consultants." Bulletin of United Bible Societies. vol 51. pp 99-103. 1962d.
- . "Opportunities in the field of Bible translating." The Bible Translator. vol 13. pp 193-200. 1962e.
- . "Review of Harry R. Boer, Pentecost and Missions." Practical Anthropology. vol 9. pp 188-190. 1962f.
- . "Semantic components." Babel. vol 8. pp 175-181. 1962g.
- . "Bible translating and the science of linguistics." Babel. vol 9. pp 99-104. 1963a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William L. Wonderly. "Cultural differences and the communication of Christian values." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. pp 241-258. 1963b.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Linguistic and semantic structure." Studies in Languages and Linguistics. Festschrift in honor of Charles C. Fries. ed. Albert H. Marckwardt. Ann Arbor, MI: English Language Institute, University of Michigan Press. pp 13-33. 1963c.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William L. Wonderly. "Linguistics and Christian missions." The Bible Translator. vol 15. pp 51-69, 107-116, 154-166. 1963d.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Reading in existentialism (reply to Donald M. Vesey)." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. p. 279. 1963e.
- . "Review of Ed Loffeld and John Wils, eds., Scientia missionum Ancilla." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. pp 283-285. 1963f.
- . "Review of Johannes Blauw, The Missionary Nature of the Church." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. pp 237-238. 1963g.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William L. Wonderly. "Selection, preparation, and function of leaders in Indian fields." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. pp 6-16. 1963h.
- Nida, Eugene A. "The church and its ministries (reply to the question)." Practical Anthropology. vol 10. pp 233-236. 1963i.
- . "The translation of religious texts." Babel. vol 9. pp 3-5. 1963j.

- Nida, Eugene A. and Henry Torres. "Cultural independence and response to the message." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 11. pp 235-238. 1964a.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Probleme beim Übersetzen der Bible." *Die Bibel in der Welt*, Bd. 7. (Jahrbuch des Verbandes der Evangelischen bibelgesellschaften in Deutschland, hg. von Robert Steiner.) 1964b.
- . "Review of Louis J. Luzbetak, S.V.D., *The Church and Cultures: An Applied Anthropology for the Religious Worker.*" *Practical Anthropology*. vol 11. pp 285-288. 1964c.
- . "Review of W. Stanley Rycroft and Myrtle M. Clemmer, *A Factual Study of Latin America.*" *Practical Anthropology*. vol 11. pp. 189-191. 1964d.
- . "A system of semantics." *Studies in Descriptive and Applied Linguistics*. ed. Mamoru Shimizu. (Bulletin of the Summer Institute in Linguistics, vol 3, August 1965.) Tokyo: International Christian University. pp 3-16. 1965a.
- . "Culture and church growth." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 12. pp 22-37. 1965b.
- . "Review of John A. Mackay, *Ecumenics: The Science of the Church Universal.*" *Practical Anthropology*. vol 12. pp 237-239. 1965c.
- . "Translating the Bible into life." *Christianity Today*. vol 10. pp 189-191. 1965d.
- . "African influence in the religious life of Latin America." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 13. pp 133-138. 1966a.
- . "Bible translation in today's world." *Bulletin of United Bible Societies*. vol 65. pp 22-27. 1966b.
- . "Language husks or spiritual food?" *Interlit*. vol 4(2). pp 1, 11, 12. 1966c.
- . "Missionaries and anthropologists." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 13. pp 273-277, 287. 1966e.
- . "Review of Wayne Tosh, *Syntactic Translation.*" *Language*. vol 42. pp 851-854. 1966f.
- . "Bible translation--fascinating!" *Royal Service*, May. 1967a.

- . "Difficulties in translating Hebrews 1 into Southern Lengua." The Bible Translator. vol 18. pp 117-122. 1967b.
- . "Readjustment--an even greater problem." Practical Anthropology. vol 14. pp 114-117. 1967c.
- . "Robert Morrison, pioneer translator in China." The Fields, February. p. 5. 1967d. (From 1952b., God's Word in Man's Language, pp 97-99.)
- . "Sociological dimensions of literacy and literature; Linguistic dimensions of literacy and literature." World Literacy Manual. eds. Floyd Shacklock et al. New York. 1967e.
- . "Translating the New Testament into Haitian Creole." The Bible Translator. vol 18. pp 27-30. 1967f.
- . "William Carey, Wycliffe of the East." The Fields, April, p. 6. 1967g. (From 1952b., God's Word in Man's Language, pp 99-101.)
- . "Bound by the Scriptures." The Fields, April, pp 8-9. 1968a. (From 1952b., God's Word in Man's Language, pp 87-89.)
- . "From gods' to ghosts." World Vision, April, pp 10-13. 1968b. (From 1968e., Religion Across Cultures, pp 20-32).
- . "From medieval to modern man." Practical Anthropology. vol 15. pp 170-176. 1968c. (From 1968e., Religion Across Cultures, pp 48-57.)
- . "Lord open the king's eyes." The Fields, May, pp 8-9. 1968d. (From 1952b., God's Word in Man's Language, pp 89-93).
- . "Translation: a science, a skill and an art (manuscript in English)." Published in Swedish as "Oversattning som vetenskap, som teknik och som konst." Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift. Argang 44. pp 204-221. 1968e.
- . "Afrikanische einflusse auf das religiose Leben in Lateinamerika." Explosives Lateinamerika: Der Protestantismus inmitten der sozialen Revolution. ed. Theo Tschuy. Berlin: Lettner Verlag. pp 39-44. 1969a.
- . "Die pfingsckirchen in Lateinamerika." Explosives

- Lateinamerika: Der Protestantismus inmitten der sozialen Revolution. ed. Theo Tschuy. Berlin: Lettner Verlag. 1969b. pp 90-96.
- . "Science of translation." *Language*. vol 45. pp 483-498. 1969c.
- . "Formal correspondence in translation." *The Bible Translator*. vol 21. pp 105-113. 1970a.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Harold W. Fehderau. "Indigenous pidgins and koinés." *International Journal of American Linguistics*. vol 36. pp 14-155. 1970b.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Semantic components in translation theory." *Le langage et l'homme*, June 1970, pp 42-46. Bruxelles: Institute Libre Marie Haps. 1970c.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William Wonderly. "Communication roles of languages in multilingual societies." Language Use and Social Change. ed. W.H. Whiteley. Published for the International African Institute. Oxford: University Press. pp 57-74. 1971a.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Language and communication." No Man is Alien: Essays on the Unity of Mankind. ed. J. Robert Nelso. The Netherlands: E.J. Brill. pp 183-202. 1971b.
- . "New religions for old: a study of culture change." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 18. pp 241-253. 1971c.
- . "Our mission: to introduce men to Jesus Christ." *The Church Herald*, November 5. pp 10, 11, 21, 22. 1971d.
- . "Review of Joseph Paternost, From English to Slovenian: Problems in Translation Equivalence." *General Linguistics*. vol 11. pp 131-132. 1971e.
- . "Sociopsychological problems in language mastery and retention." The Psychology of Second Language Learning. eds. Paul Pimsleur and Terence Quinn. Papers from the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: University Press. pp 59-65. 1971f.
- . "Communication and translation." *The Bible Translator*. vol 23. pp 309-316. 1972a.
- . "Implications of contemporary linguistics for Biblical scholarship." *Journal of Biblical Literature*. vol 91. pp 73-89. 1972b.

- . "Linguistic models for religious behavior." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 19. pp 13-26. 1972c.
- . "Linguistic theories and Bible translating." *The Bible Translator*. vol 23. pp 301-308. 1972d.
- . "Linguists and translators." *The Bible Translator*. vol 23. pp 225-233. 1972e.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. "Semantic structures." *Studies in Linguistics*. ed. M. Estellie Smith. In Honor of George L. Trager. The Hague: Mouton. pp 122-141. 1972f.
- Nida, Eugene A. "The fifth point of the compass." *Practical Anthropology*. vol 19. pp 274-279. 1972g.
- . "Varieties of language." *The Bible Translator*. vol 23. pp 316-322. 1972h.
- . "Why translate the Bible into 'new languages'?" *The Bible Translator*. vol 23. pp 412-417. 1972i.
- . "Bible translating in today's world." *The Bible is for All (Lectures given at The International Biblical-Pastoral Seminar, July 1971, Rocca di Papa)*. ed. Joseph Rhymer. London: Collins (on behalf of The World Catholic Federation for the Biblical Apostolate). pp 54-74. 1973a.
- . "Sprach und Kommunikation." *Un Einheit und Heil der Menschheit (Festschrift for Willem A. visser't Hooft)*. eds. J. Robert Nelson and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Otto Lembeck. pp 181-200. 1973b.
- . "A new epoch in the Bible Societies." *Bulletin of United Bible Societies*. vol 96. pp 8-9. 1974a.
- . "Bible translating." *Aspekte der Theoretischen, Sprachenpaarbezogenen und Angewandten Übersetzungswissenschaft II*. eds. Wolfram Wilss and Gisela Thome. (Lecture given at the University of Saarlandes, West Germany, June 1973.) Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag. pp 1-32. 1974b.
- . "From Hebrew and Greek into English." *What Bible Can You Trust?* ed. William J. Fallis. Nashville, TN: Broadman. pp 17-34. 1974c. (Previously published as chapter 4 in *God's Word in Man's Language*; see 1952b.)
- . "Review of Georges Mounin, *La Linguistique du XX^e*"

Siècle. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1972.) The Bible Translator. vol 25. pp 360-361. 1974d.

- . "Semantic structure and translating." Aspekte der Theoretischen, Sprachenpaarbezogenen und Angewandten Übersetzungswissenschaft II. eds. Wolfram Wilss and Gisela Thome. (Lecture given at the University of Saarlandes, West Germany, June 1973.) Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag. pp 33-63. 1974e.
- . "The book of life." How to Understand the Bible. eds. Ralph Herring, Frank Staff, et al. Nashville, TN: Broadman. pp 13-25. 1974f.
- . "Translation." Current Trends in Linguistics. vol 12. ed. Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton. 1974g. pp 1045-1068.
- . "What are literacy selections?" The Bible Translator. vol 25. pp 201-206. 1974h.
- . "Words and Thoughts." The Bible Translator. vol 25. pp 339-343. 1974i.
- . "Componential analysis of meaning: an introduction to semantic structures." Approaches to Semiotic Series. vol 57. ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton. 1975a.
- . "Easy access to the word of God." American Bible Society Record. vol 120. pp 3-6. 1975b.
- . "Language and psychology." The Bible Translator. vol 26. pp 308-313. 1975c.
- . "Review of P.H. Matthews, Morphology: An Introduction to the Theory of Word-Structure." Language Sciences. vol 36. pp 35-36. 1975d.
- . "Scientific insights to be gained from Bible translating." The Bible Translator. vol 26. pp 142-145. 1975e.
- . "Semantic structure and translating." The Bible Translator. vol 26. pp 120-132. 1975f.
- . "A framework for the analysis and evaluation of theories of translation." Translation Applications and Research. ed. Richard W. Brislin. New York: Gardner Press. pp 47-91. 1976a.

- . "Helps that really help." The Bible Translator. vol 27. pp 434-437. 1976b.
- . "Semantic relations between nuclear structures, Jazayery, Mohammed Ali." Linguistic and Literary Studies (in Honor of Archibald A. Hill). eds. Edgar C. Plome and Werner Winter. Theoretical Linguistics. vol 1. Lisse, The Netherlands: The Peter de Ridder Press. pp 219-225. 1976c.
- . "Issues and insights in bible translating." Theology, News & Notes. March. pp 3-5, 19. 1977a.
- . "Review of Georges Mounin, Linguistique et Traduction." The Bible Translator. vol 28. pp 155-157. 1977b.
- Nida, Eugene A., Johannes Louw and Rondal Smith. "Semantic domains and componential analysis of meaning." Issues in Linguistic Theory. ed. Richard W. Cole. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press. pp 139-168. 1977c.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Translating means communicating." Linguistics and Anthropology. ed. Uriel Saviile-Troike. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. pp 213-229. 1977d.
- . "The nature of dynamic equivalence in translating." Babel. vol 23 (3). pp 99-103. 1977e.
- . "Review of M.A.K. Halliday, Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language." Linguistics. vol 204. pp 86-89. 1978a.
- . "Review of Johannes Scheffer, The Progressive in English." Linguistics. vol 204. pp 89-90. 1978b.
- . "Review of David C. Bennett, Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions." Linguistics. vol 204. pp 90-92. 1978c.
- . "The setting of communication: a largely overlooked factor in translation." Babel. vol 24(3/4). pp 114-117. 1978d.
- . "Now or never." The Arctic News, Fall. 1979a.
- . "The other message." Occasional Bulletin, October. pp 110-112. 1979b.

- . "Translating means communicating: a sociolinguistic theory of translation I." *The Bible Translator*. vol 30. pp 101-107. 1979c.
- . "Translating means communicating: a sociolinguistic theory of translation II." *The Bible Translator*. vol 30. pp 318-325. 1979d.
- . "New meanings for old." *The Bible Translator*. vol 31. pp 224-228. 1980a.
- . "Problems of Biblical exegesis in the Third World." Text-Wort-Glaube (Dedicated to Kurt Aland). ed. Martin Brecht. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp 159-165. 1980b.
- . "The contribution of linguistics to the theory and practice of translating." Linguistic Studies (Festschrift in Honor of Berthe Siertsema). eds. D.J. van Alfemade, A. Feitsma, W.J. Meys, P. van Reenan, and J.J. Spa. Netherlands: Rodopi. pp 353-361. 1980c.
- . "The selection of a translation team." *The Bible Translator*. vol 31. pp 434-437. 1980d.
- . "Review of Albert Buckwalter, *Vocabulario Toba* (Argentina: Private Publication. Casilla de Correo 53, 1980). *International Journal of American Linguistics*. vol 51. pp 240-243. 1980e.
- . "Bible translation for the Eighties." *International Review of Missions*. vol 70(279). pp 130-139. 1981a.
- . "'Harder reading' in textual criticism: an application of the second law of thermodynamics." *The Bible Translator*. vol 32. pp 101-107. 1981b.
- . "Informants or colleagues?" A Festschrift for Native Speakers. ed. Florian Coulmans. Netherlands: Mouton. pp 169-174. 1981c.
- . "Languages are for communicating: some second thoughts on practical implications for linguistics." *Language Science*. vol 3(1). pp 1-11. 1981d.
- . "Meaning vs. reference: a touchstone of lexicography." *Language Science*. vol 3(1). pp 51-57. 1981e.
- . "Practical limitations to a phonemic alphabet." *The Bible Translator*. vol 32. pp 204-209. 1981f.

- . "Problems of cultural differences in translating the Old Testament." Melages Dominique Barthelemy, Etudes Bibliques Offertes à l'occasion de Son 60 Anniversaire. eds. Peirre Casetti, Othmar Keel and Adrian Schenker. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Gottingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht. pp 297-307. 1981g.
- . "Semantic reinterpretation of primary religious vocabulary." Theolinguistics. Studiereeks Tijdschrift: New Series, no. 8. ed. J.P. van Noppen. pp 283-294. 1981h.
- . "The New Testament Greek text in the Third World." New Testament Textual Criticism. eds. Eldon Jay Epp, and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clareton Press. 1981i. pp 375-380.
- . "Traduccion y communication." Teoria y Practica de la Traduccion primer encuentro internacional de traductores. Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Catolica de Chile. 1981j.
- . "Traduccion y estilo." Teoria y Practica de la Traduccion primer encuentro internacional de traductores. Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Catolica de Chile. pp 25-31. 1981k.
- . "Translators are born not made." The Bible Translator. vol 32. pp 401-415. 1981l.
- . "'Why are foreigners so queer?' A sociolinguistic approach to cultural pluralism." International Bulletin. vol 5(3). pp 102-106. 1981m.
- . "Establishing translation principles and procedures." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 208-213. 1982a.
- . "Fewer words and simpler grammars." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 134-137. 1982b.
- . "Rhetoric and the translator." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 324-328. 1982c.
- . "Quality in translation." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 329-332. 1982d.
- . "New words for old meanings." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 424-430. 1982e.
- . "Poetry and the Bible Translator." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 435-438. 1982f.

- . "Translating legal terms in the Bible." Langage du Droit et Traduction: Essais de Jurilinguistique (The Language of the Law and Translation: Essays on Jurilinguistics). ed. Jean-Claude G mar. D partement de linguistique et philologie de l'Universit  de Montr al. Coedition published by Linguat ch and Conseil de la langue francaise; Quebec, Canada. pp 261-269. 1982g.
- . "Review of Aryeh Newman, Mapping Translation Equivalence (Leuven, Belgium: Academic Publishing Co., 1980)." Applied Linguistics. vol 4(4). pp 79-81. 1983a.
- . "Style in Bible translating." Mittelpunkt Bibel: Ulrich fick zum 60 Geburtstag. ed. Siegfried Meurer. Stuttgart: German Bible Society. pp 70-78. 1983b.
- . "Rhetoric and Styles: A Taxonomy of Structures and Functions." Language Sciences. vol 6. pp 287-305. 1984.
- . "Translating Means Translating Meaning - A sociosemiotic approach to translating." Tenth World Congress of FIT Vienna. ed. Hildegard Buhler. Wilhelm Braumuller. 1985. pp 119-125.
- . "Sociolinguistics and Translating." The Fergusonian Impact, vol 1: From Phonology to Society. eds. Joshua A. Fishman et al. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. pp 471-477. 1986a.
- . "A Functional Approach to Problems of Translating." Foreign Language Teaching and Research Journal. China. pp 25-31. 1986b.
- . "Social Linguistics and Translating." Sociolinguistics and Communication. ed. Johannes P. Louw. London, New York: United Bible Societies, UBS Monograph Series, no. 1. pp. 1-49. 1986c.
- . "Stretching Language." Meta: Translator's Journal. vol 32(1). March 1987. pp 42-45. 1987a.
- . "Special problems in translating religious texts." Special Problems in Translating Religious Texts. ed. Ann Wescott. Kanasa City, MO: Mid-America Chapter of the American Translators Association. pp 1-8. 1988a.
- . "The meaning of rhetoric." Essays on the English Language and Applied Linguistics. ed. Gerhard Nickel et al. Julius Groos: Heidelberg. pp 156-164. 1988b.

- . "Intelligibility and acceptability in Bible translation." The Bible Translator. vol 39. pp 301-308. 1988c.
- . "Editing Translated Texts." Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship. eds. D.C. Greetham and W. Speed Hill. vol 4. pp 13-27. 1989a.
- . "Theories of translation." Foreign Languages. vol 6. pp 2-13. 1989b.
- . "Not what, but how: A cross-cultural study of discourse." Northeast Conference on Legal Interpretation and Translation. ed. Angela M. Aguirre. Wayne, NJ: The Consortium of Educators in Legal Interpretation and Translation at Jersey City State College. pp 59-64. 1989c.
- . "The role of rhetoric in verbal communication." Language & Communication. vol 10(1). pp 37-46. 1990.
- . "Textual criticism and entropy." Tradition of the text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in celebration of his seventieth birthday. eds Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitats Verlag. pp 122-128. 1991a.
- . "My linguistic odyssey." First person singular II. Autobiographies by North American Scholars in the Language Sciences. ed. Konrad Koerner. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. vol 61. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 1991b.
- . "A personal triad." Wege in der Sprachwissenschaft: vierundvierzig autobiographische Berichte; Festschrift fur Mario Wandruska. eds. Hans-Martin Gauger and Wolfgang Pockel. Tübingen: Narr. pp 176-182. 1991c.

APPENDIX C
APPLICATION SOURCE TEXT

Telle est notre foi!

Jésus a été mis au tombeau. Il fait noir sur la terre. L'univers se cache dans les ténèbres de la mort. D'une mort injuste et combien brutale qui interroge toute espérance. L'humanité se tait. Elle a tout dit. Elle se blottit dans le noir. Elle étouffe sans même s'en rendre compte.

Mais quelques disciples veillent encore. Ils savent, ceux-ci, comme vaguement, qu'il n'est pas possible que la croix soit la fin de tout. Ils se souviennent. Dans le passé, leurs ancêtres leur ont raconté. Le soir, autour d'un feu. Les récits avaient captivé les petits. Les événements avaient donné foi aux faibles. Les paroles se transmettaient de génération en génération afin qu'on se souvienne. Qu'on se souvienne des merveilles de Dieu. De l'impossible.

Ils avaient choisi des mauvais chemins... mais Dieu s'est souvenu! Ils avaient détourné la création de sa promesse... et Dieu s'est souvenu qu'un jour <<c'était très bon>>. Ils s'étaient laissés écraser par l'épreuve de la foi... mais Dieu s'est souvenu d'Abraham. Ils avaient voulu retrouver la sécurité de l'esclavage... et Dieu s'est souvenu de son triomphe sur Pharaon et ses armées. Ils s'étaient noyés dans les eaux de ce monde et les paroles sans avenir... mais Dieu s'est souvenu et s'est fait proche dans l'eau et la Parole. Ils avaient souillé le pays de leur

conduite... mais Dieu s'est souvenu et il les a rassemblés, il les a ramenés, il a versé sur eux une eau pure.

Et ce soir, en cette veillée si sainte, les chrétiens et les chrétiennes quittent les ténèbres de la peur et du désespoir. Ils se rassemblent alors que tout dort. Une lumière les attire. Un cri les attend. Une parole se fera vivante. Une eau sera versée. Un mystère sera célébré. Un Vivant se fera proche. Et Dieu se souviendra. Et Dieu agira sur sa promesse, encore aujourd'hui! Telle est notre foi!

Auteur: Claude Blanchette
De "Prions en Église" Triduum Pascal 1993, Montreal: Novalis.
Dans la nuit du 10 au 11 avril 1993. Veillée pascale. p. 55.

TRANSLATION

This is our faith!

Jesus has been put in the tomb. Darkness covers the land. The universe hides in the shadow of death. An unjust death so brutal that all hope is called into question. Humanity is silent. It has said everything. It huddles in the dark. It suffocates without even realizing it.

But a few disciples are still keeping vigil. Vaguely, they know that it is not possible that the cross was the end. They remember. In the past, their elders talked about it. At night, around a fire. The stories had enthralled the children. The events they told of had given faith to the faint-hearted. The words were passed on from generation to generation so that they would remember. Remember the wonders of God. The impossible.

The people chose wrong paths... but God remembered! They abused His promised creation... and God remembered that one day "it was very good." They were crushed by the testing of their faith... but God remembered Abraham. They wanted to return to the safety of slavery... and God remembered His victory over the armies of Pharaoh.

The people drowned in the waters of this world and in vain words... but God remembered and drew near to them in the Water and the Word. Their deeds defiled the land... but God remembered and gathered them together, drew them to Him and poured purifying water upon them.

And tonight, on this holy eve, Christians come out of the shadows of fear and despair. They gather together while all is asleep. A light draws them. A cry awaits them. A word shall come to life. Water will be poured out. A mystery will be celebrated. The Living One will draw near. And God will remember. And God will still fulfill his promise even today! This is our faith!

GLOSSARY

Anacoluthon	(plural <i>anacolutha</i>) Purposeful ungrammaticality. Beginning a sentence with one grammatical structure and then switching to another.
Anaphora	The use of an item to refer back to another item in the same sentence or text. (Hatim & Mason, 1989: 239)
Appeal	Appeal is the rhetorical function which "draws" the receptor to the text by means of coherence, cohesion, textual unity etc.
Apposition	Placing side by side two expressions which refer to the same thing in different ways (Nida, 1964: 197)
Appropriateness	The suitability of the language used in a discourse to its context.
Argument	A type of discourse organized around a number of events, which are related by logic.
Chiasm	A sequence of two phrases or clauses which are parallel in syntax, but with a reverse order of the corresponding words. (Abrams 1981: 162)
Coherence	The aspect of the text which deals with whether it holds together in terms of semantics or concepts.
Cohesion	The aspect of the text which deals with whether it holds together in terms of grammar and lexical structure.
Description	A type of discourse organized around an object.
Discourse	A unit of language larger than a sentence, generally displaying formal and semantic coherence, unity and completeness and conveying a message. Also called text. (Nida, 1964: 200)

Disposition	Coined by Aristotle, this term refers to the organization of arguments in a discourse.
Effectiveness	Achieving the communicative goal on the receptor.
Ellipsis	Purposeful omission of certain information in a discourse, leaving it implicit or ambiguous.
Formal features	The elements of a discourse which contribute to its structure in terms of words, grammar, syntax etc.
Hypotactic Markers	The grammatical links between a principle clause and a dependent clause.
Impact	Impact is one of the two primary rhetorical functions, and grabs the receptor's attention by "hitting" them with new, relevant or realistic information.
Intertextuality	The dependence of one text upon another.
Invention	Term used by Aristotle to define the one part of rhetorical discourse which dealt with the research of arguments and proofs.
Narrative	A type of discourse organized around a sequence of events.
Novelty	Novelty in a text is a rhetorical function which produces impact on the receptor by introducing unexpected form or content to the text.
Phonology	The part of a language which deals with the sounds and pronunciation.
Proximity	See Relevance.
Realism	Realism is a rhetorical function which enables the receptor to visualize the events.

Relevance	Relevance in a text is a rhetorical function which produces impact through the physical or psychological proximity of the receptor to the text.
Semantic features	The elements in a discourse which create impact in terms of concepts and meaning.
Semiotics	The scientific study of signs.
Style	As used by Aristotle, this refers to the choice of words, figures and rhythms in a text which would best communicate the given material.
Syntax	The order of words in a sentence.
Tautology	An expression where the same components are repeated twice with no justification in terms of structure or communication. (Nida 1964: 208)
Trivium	Middle Ages field of study including rhetoric, grammar and logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Nida's Work

BOOKS

- Nida, Eugene A. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1969.
- Nida, Eugene A. Language Structure and Translation: Essays Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 1975.
- Nida, Eugene A. and William D. Reyrburn. Meaning Across Cultures. Maryknoll: Orbis Books. 1981.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Jan de Waard. From One Language to Another. Nashville: Thomas Nelson. 1986.
- Nida, Eugene A. Language, Culture, and Translating. China: University of Shanghai. 1992.

ARTICLES

- Nida, Eugene A. "Communication and translation." The Bible Translator. vol 23. pp 309-316. 1972.
- "Translating means communicating: a sociolinguistic theory of translation I." The Bible Translator. vol 30. pp 101-107. 1979a.
- "Translating means communicating: a sociolinguistic theory of translation II." The Bible Translator. vol 30. pp 318-325. 1979b.
- "Rhetoric and the translator." The Bible Translator. vol 32. pp 324-328. 1982a.
- "Poetry and the Bible Translator." The Bible Translator. vol 33. pp 435-438. 1982b.
- "Rhetoric and Styles: A Taxonomy of Structures and Functions." Language Sciences. vol 6. pp 287-305. 1984.

- "The Meaning of Rhetoric." Essays on the English Language and Applied Linguistics. Julius Groos: Heidelberg. pp 156-164. 1988.
- "Not what, but how: A cross-cultural study of discourse." Northeast Conference on Legal Interpretation and Translation. Wayne, NJ: The Consortium of Educators in Legal Interpretation and Translation at Jersey City State College. pp 59-64. 1989.
- "The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communications." Language & Communication 10,1. pp 37-46. 1990.
- "My Linguistic Odyssey." In: Konrad Koerner, ed., First person singular II. Autobiographies by North American Scholars in the Language Sciences. Volume 61 of Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 1991a.
- "A Personal Triad." Wege in der Sprachwissenschaft: vierundvierzig autobiographische Berichte; Festschrift fur Mario Wandruska. Tubingen: Narr. pp 176-182. 1991b.
- "Breakthroughs in Translation." Presented October 11, 1991, in Philadelphia at the Symposium for the 175th Anniversary of the Founding of the American Bible Society. 1991c.
- "Language as an Efficient Code." Unpublished manuscript5.
- "Basic Elements of Discourse Structure." Unpublished manuscript6.
- "Isomorphic Relations and Translational Equivalence." Unpublished manuscript9.
- "The Paradoxes of Translating." Unpublished manuscript11.

Other Works

- Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 4th edition. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1981.
- Beaugrande R. de. Text, Discourse and Process. London: Longman Inc. 1980.
- Beaugrande R. de and Dressler. Introduction to Text Linguistics. New York: Longman Inc. 1981.
- Bell, Roger T. Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice. New York: Longman Inc. 1991.
- Brisset, Annie. MA Thesis, University of Ottawa, 1980.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Essex: Longman Group Ltd. 1977.
- Crystal, David. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 3rd edition. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers. 1991.
- Delisle, Jean. L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction. Ottawa: Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa. 1984.
- Dubois, Jean et al. Dictionnaire de linguistique. Librairie Larousse. 1975.
- Eco, Umberto. A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press. 1979.
- Folkart, Barbara. Le conflit des énonciations. Traduction et discours rapporté. Quebec: Les Éditions Balzac. 1991.
- Fowler, H. W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. New York: Oxford University Press. 1965.
- Grimes, Joseph E. The Thread of Discourse. The Hague: Mouton & Co. 1972.
- Halliday and Hasan. Cohesion in English. London: Longman Group Limited. 1976.
- Halliday, M.A.K. Language as Social Semiotic. Baltimore, Maryland: University Park Press. 1978.

- Harris, Zellig S. "Discourse Analysis" Language 28: 1-30, 474-494.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. Discourse and the translator. New York: Longman Inc. 1989.
- Hofstadter, Douglas R. Goedel, Escher, Bach: An eternal golden braid. New York: Vintage Books. 1980.
- International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics. Oxford Press. 1992
- Jakobson, Roman. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics" in Style in Language. ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge MA: MIT Press. 1960.
- "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry" in Lingua 21: 597-609. 1968.
- Main Trends in the Science of Language. New York: Harper and Row. 1970.
- Langer, Suzanne. Philosophy in a New Key: A study in the symbolism of reason, rite and art. New York: New American Library. 1951.
- Larose, Robert. Théories Contemporaines de la Traduction. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec. 1987.
- Larson, Mildred L. Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc. 1984.
- Neubert, Albrecht. Text and Translation. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie Leipzig. 1985.
- Neubert, Albrecht and Gregory M. Schreve. Translation as Text. Ohio: The Kent State University Press. 1992.
- Newmark, Peter. Approaches to Translation. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1988a.
- A Textbook of Translation. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, 1988b.
- About Translation. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1991a.
- "The Curse of Dogma in Translation Studies." Lebende Sprachen. #3. 1991b.

- Pergnier, Maurice. Les fondements sociolinguistiques de la traduction. Paris: Honoré Champion. 1980.
- Rey-Debove, Josette. Sémiotique. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1979.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. Course in General Linguistics. Tran. Roy Harris. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd. 1983.
- Stubbs, Michael. Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1983.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul. "SCFA Revisited." Meta. 28: 4, 1983. pp 417-427.
- Wilss, Wolfram. The Science of Translation. Stuttgart: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen. 1982.