11.Lotfipour-Saedi(1992 b) An Introduction to the
                Theory of Translation Iran Univer-
                sity Press.

12.Lotfipour-Saedi(forthcoming)Translation Principles
                vs.Translator Strategies to appear
                in META.

13.Mukarovsky,J.(1977).The Word and Verbal Art,Trans.
                Burbank,J.and Steiner,P.,New York
                Yale University Press.

14.Widdowson,H.G.(1975),Stylistics and the Teaching
                of Literature. London:Longmans
                Reprinted in 1984.

Symposium, New York, Oxford
University Press.

6. Halliday M.A.K. & Hasan, R.(1976) Cohesion in
English London: Longmans

7. Hasan,R.(1985), Linguistics, Language and Verbal
Art, Victoria: Deakin University
Press.

8. Lotfipour-Saedi,K (1982) Applying an Analysis of
Writer-Reader Discourse Processes
to a Pedagogy of Reading,
Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, Univer-
sity of Lancaster, U.K.

9. Lotfipour-Saedi,K(1990) Discourse Analysis and the
Problem of Translation Equivalence
in META 35/2 June 1990,PP.389-397

10. Lotfipour-Saedi (1992 a), Analysing Literary
Discourse: Implications for
Literary Translation in META
37/2 June 1992,PP.193-203

1.Butt,David(1988),Ideational meaning and the 'existen-
          tial fabric' of a poem in Fawcett,
          R.P. & Young, D.T.(eds.) New
          Developments in Systemic Linguistics
          Vol 2 Theory and Application Pinter
          Publishers PP 174-218

2.Cummings,M.&Simmons,R. (1983) The Language of
          Literature: A Stylistic intro-
          duction to the study of literature
          Pergamon Press

3.Garcia-Berrio,A.(1992)A theory of the Literary Text
          Walter de Bruyter,Berlin

4.Halliday,M.A.K.(1970)Language Structure and
          Language Function, in Lyons J(ed).
          New Horizons in Linguistics
          Penguin, PP 140-165

5.Halliday,M.A.K.(1971),Linguistic function and
          Literary style:an inquiry into
          the language of William Golding's
          The Inheritors' in Chatman,H.
          (ed.)1971 Literary Style: A

lexical choices through which he can
manipulate the semantic/ideational drift
in an 'unfamiliar' manner (cf. Butt 1988).
(G)In short, due to the unique nature of
each language system, a word-for-word,
pattern-for-pattern and device-for-device
replacement may not always yield an
acceptable translation equivalence. The
non-isomorphic relationship between
form and function across languages
causes problems for such a one-to-one
replacement. In facing such problems ,
as we have argued elsewhere (cf.Lotfi-
pour-Saedi; forthcoming,   ),the trans-
lator should operate strategically, i.e.
manoeuvre around each problem under the
specific conditions-both textual and
contextual.But this manoeuvring should
be conducted within the principles of
the translation equivalence in general
and the principles of literary discourse
in particular.

linguistic(sound, meaning and grammar)
devices.This does not imply that a de-
vice-for-device translation would lead
to the preservation of the SL variety.
Due to differences in the SL and TL
systems, such a device-for-device ren-
dition may not always lead to stylisti-
cally equivalent texts.For example, as
we have argued before(cf.Lotfipour-Saedi
1992 a)'double .negative'(as a grammati-
cal device) is a marked social variety
in English but an unmarked one in Farsi.
What the translator should thus do is
determine the SL variety first and then
think of appropriate TL devices(not ne-
cessarily parallel to those utilized in
SL text) to encode it.

(F)To achieve the same cognitive effect as
the SL text, the translator should attempt
to take care of the SL cohesive devices
grammatical, lexical, and conjunction(cf.
Halliday and Hasan 1976).As an example
in a piece of poetry or a fiction-prose,
the author may achieve a special cognitive
and semantic effect by opting for special

to be formally parallel to the SL ones.
what should be borne in mind in this ex-
ploratory search for special patterns is
that the 'equivalence-in-value' should be
sought for in terms of the equivalence
of the tripartite discoursal functions
we have discussed,namely the <u>degree of
indirection, the degree of indeterminacy</u>,
and dehabitualization.(see section 4
above). For example, translating figurative
language into a non-figurative one, meta-
phor into simile, idiomatic expression
into non-idiom, so on,will damage these
functions.

(F)The SL variety should be taken care of.
   Among the language varieties, the social
   variety(pertaining to the social class
   membership of the interlocutors), the
   'stylistic variety' (pertaining to the
   degree of intimacy between the addressor
   and addressee) and the'register'(per-
   taining to the features of the text-type
   or genre involved)are the most essentail
   ones for consideration .These varieties
   are, of course, manifested through the

non-parallel nature for establishing the
desired mental images.

(D)The special(Phonological,grammatical,
semantic) patterns employed in litera-
ture text, as we have argued before,are
indispensible for the special effect and
thus they should not be neglected by the
translator.But this does not, of course,
imply that the translator can translate
pattern-for-pattern.Firstly because, due
to differences in language systems,special
TL patterns parallel to the SL ones are
not always possible to be recreated.For
example, a rhyming pattern is mostly im-
possible to be placed in TL upon exactly
the same lexical location as in SL.
Secondly because the seemingly parallel
special patterns across languages may be
of quite or slightly different discoursal
value.What the translator should rather
do is to determine the discoursal value
of special patterns in the SL text and
then endeavour to explore the TL for the
special patterns of equivalent value.
Such patterns do not necessarily have

event or quoting an interaction, the
literary producer may leave certain log-
ical 'chains' uncompleted or even miss-
ing, requiring the reader to supply them
through his imaginative thinking.This
would contribute to the creative and in-
determinate nature of the literary
message. The translator should avoid
damaging this trend by supplying the
missing chains or by adding some textual
connectors such as 'as a result','because'.
Attempts as such on the part of the trans-
lator would be considered interventions
in the SL author's textual strategies and
'ways of saying.

(c)In translating literature what should
most of all be targeted at are the'mental
images' depicted by the SL author,not
the 'code' elements of the SL text. In
most literary genres, translation equi-
valence should be defined in terms of
the equivalence of the 'mental images not
the textual devices.Thus a translator
may have to replace the SL textual
elements by the TL elements of quite

ship in literature would render 'training' literary translators unconceivable. He should rather be edu-
.cated and such an education should revolve around topics covered briefly in different sections of this paper: What is translation, what is literature and how is it different from non-literature text?
In the light of such an education, some general guidelines on literary translation may be arrived at as follows.

> (A)The literary translator should most of
> all endeavour to preserve the SL way
> of saying in TL.As the way of saying
> assumes more importance in literature,
> and as in some literary texts, the
> special textual devices and patterns
> play the primary role in communicating
> the intended message, any mishandling
> of such devices by the translator will
> have unwanted effects on the intended
> discoursal value of the text.

> (B)The degree of indirection of the SL
> text should not be affected in the
> translation process.As an example, in
> depicting a scene, portraying a setting
> presenting an argument,describing an

In fact, one can argue that the special textual
strategies open up and initiate   extra discourse
comprehension processes along with the processes acti-
vated by the ordinary textual strategies, reinforcing,
reiterating and sometimes modifying the message
arrived at through the latter processes. As an example,
the literary producer, by introducing a metaphor
juxtaposes two lexical items and allows for their
underlying attributes to interact with one another
in the mind of the reader.Through such a simple
literary device, thus, the reader discourse process
is set in motion without the presence of a text(cf.
Widdowsion 1975) enabling him to negotiate a meaning
which (a) is indirectly arrived at, (b)is indeter-
minate in nature(as every reader may involve his
own presupposed set of the attributes in the in-
teraction process), (c) is more deeply processed ,
because the indirect and unfamiliar mode of text-
ualization leads the reader to process it more
attentively and deeply and (d) requires more pr
ing time and effort rendering it more enjoyabl
nature and hence of aethetically higher value
the reader.A concrete example would certain
necessary but would be impossible to offere
        require an actual discourse analys

ship in literature would render 'training' literary
translators unconceivable. He should rather be edu-
.cated and such an education should revolve around
topics covered briefly in different sections of this
paper: What is translation, what is literature and
how is it different from non-literature text?
In the light of such an education, some general
guidelines on literary translation may be arrived
at as follows.

     (A)The literary translator should most of
         all endeavour to preserve the SL way
         of saying in TL.As the way of saying
         assumes more importance in literature,
         and as in some literary texts, the
         special textual devices and patterns
         play the primary role in communicating
         the intended message, any mishandling
         of such devices by the translator will
         have unwanted effects on the intended
         discoursal value of the text.

     (B)The degree of indirection of the SL
         text should not be affected in the
         translation process.As an example, in
         depicting a scene, portraying a setting
         presenting an argument,describing an

process as a whole and the literary translation in particular it cannot be learnt/taught. A course on literary translation can rather offer the apprentice translator some education consisting of a set of guidelines on the dimensions of TE, the necessity of preserving the 'way of saying' in literary trans-lation and the translator's task in this connection. One cannot teach/train the literary translator to behave in a specific way. Because firstly due to the possible differences in the SL and TL systems,the translator cannot be advised to behave in a predic-table manner on the basis of the SL repertoire of textual strategies.For example, he cannot be told to replace a certain SL symbol by a specific TL symbol as a symbol-for-symbol translation cannot always be acceptable. What is of prime significance for establishing TE in literary text is not only maintaining the SL special patterns in TL but also preserving the same discoursal effect.Parallel sym-bols across languages and in different cultural and textual environments may contract different dis-coursal values. Secondly, as we discussed before, different literary textual strategies may perform different discoursal functions in different texts; and this volatility of the form-function relation-

would be beyond the space limitations of this paper.
The literary textual strategies, due to their special
nature,would add special discoursal(cognitive,aesthetic,
imaginative, etc.) dimensions to the text involved,
and what cannot be rendered by ordinary textual de-
vices or would require a lot of textual effort to
achieve by such devices may be easily achieved by a
simple literary device such as a rhyming pattern or
a metaphor.Thus the special textual strategies em-
ployed in literature certainly have discoursal values
and in fact they assume more discoursal functions
than the ordinary strategies.

5.On the pedagogy of literary translation

Having characterized the difference between
literature and non-literature texts in terms of the
special mode of the 'way of saying' or the textual
strategies employed in the former and having es-
tablished the discoursal value of the literary
textual strategies and thus their indispensibility
to the discourse, we now turn to some considerations
on the pedagogy of literary translation.

As we noted before, the term 'pedagogy'has been
chosen because, due to the nature of the translation

In fact, one can argue that the special textual
strategies open up and initiate ، extra discourse
comprehension processes along with the processes acti-
vated by the ordinary textual strategies, reinforcing,
reiterating and sometimes modifying the message
arrived at through the latter processes. As an example,
the literary producer, by introducing a metaphor
juxtaposes two lexical items and allows for their
underlying attributes to interact with one another
in the mind of the reader.Through such a simple
literary device, thus, the reader discourse process
is set in motion without the presence of a text(cf.
Widdowsion 1975) enabling him to negotiate a meaning
which (a) is indirectly arrived at, (b)is indeter-
minate in nature(as every reader may involve his
own presupposed set of the attributes in the in-
teraction process), (c) is more deeply processed ,
because the indirect and unfamiliar mode of text-
ualization leads the reader to process it more
attentively and deeply and (d) requires more process-
ing time and effort rendering it more enjoyable in
nature and hence of aethetically higher value for
the reader.A concrete example would certainly be
necessary but would be impossible to offered as this
would require an actual discourse analysis, which

strategies, we may name: special graphological patterns,
rhyming, alliteration, pun, metaphor; allegory, simile,
structural parallelism, etc.

   In this characterization, we would like to emphasize
the importance of the textual strategies, i.e.the form.
The literary producer achieves the desired literary
effect through the form or the special textual strate-
gies:

   ....Strictly speaking, the text is ....a
   communicative entity which does not deplete its
   own capacities for communication, meaning or form
   at the most immanent surface level of its verbal,
                                            level
   material complexity. Operative at this surface is
   what I prefer calling the textual scheme or
   material textual scheme. Acting on the textual
   scheme are components of a different conceptual,
   emotional and, especially, imaginary order,the
   independent nature of which naturally transcends
   the text's linguistic materiality. Yet these
   immaterial and non-immanent components of the
   text could not exist independently from its
   linguistic scheme.
   (Garcia-Berrio 1992:26 Original emphasis)

with our characterization of the non-literature-text
as the embodiment of a set of discoursal and textual
strategies (cf.Lotfipour-Saedi 1982), we have charac-
terized the literature-text as embodying a set of
extra special discoursal and textual strategies which
are super-imposed upon the former and in so doing
contribute to the literary effect of the text (cf.
Lotfipour-Saedi 1992 a). By the 'literary discoursal
strategies', we mean the special pre-textual decisions
adopted by the literary producer; and by the literary
textual strategies, we mean the special textual choices
from among the textual options not normally employed
in the ordinary language use.Among the literary dis-
coursal strategies we have named 'indirection','in-
determinacy' and 'dehabitualization'.By 'indirection'
we mean the degree of non-correspondence between the
'writer-meaning' and 'the text-meaning'; by'indeter-
minacy',we mean the degree to which the writer-mean-
ing is made indeterminate and the reader is given
more options in interpreting the text-meaning;and by
'dehabitualization' we mean the decisions on the part
of the writer to render the process of verbal inter-
action less familiar and less habitual. These special
discoursal strategies are presented to the reader
through special textual strategies. Among such textual

tribute to the semantic direction(Hasan
1985) and the ideational drift(Butt 1988)
of the text.

By a careful consideration of the interactional
effect of all these factors, one may determine the
degree to which a text is more literary than the
other. A specific text may abound in,e.g.,rhyming
patterns, metaphors, but if they are used merely for
the sake of including some special patterns and are
not discoursally motivated, they would hardly con-
tribute to the literary value of the text.

4.Discoursal value of the literary patterns:

According to the traditional approaches to
language, 'meaning' and not the form in which it is
conveyed is of central significance in verbal in-
teraction.But in modern trends, 'the way something
is said is as important as what is said'(cf.Halliday
1970).This 'way of saying' assumes more.importance
in literature, and in fact the degree of the impor-
tance of the'form' or 'way of saying' in a text can
directly be correlated with the degree of its
literariness: the more important the role of the
'form' in a text, the more literary that text.Along

modes, Hasan (1985) uses 'special patterning of lang-
uage patterns to refer to the special language in
literature.Thus 'literariness' as a textual feature
is more a matter of degrees and can mainly be gauged
in terms of the interactional function of all the
following factors:

(a)the number of special patterns:i.e.the
more the number of such patterns employed
in a text, the more its potentiality
to cause special literary effect on the
reader.

(b)the type of the special patterns:Not all
special language patterns can be seen
as having equal and identical aesthetic
effect.For example,'metaphor','rhyming'
and 'simile' can be argued to require
different degrees of cognitive involve-
ment on the part of the discourse re-
ceiver.

(c)the degree to which the special patterns
employed are thematically motivated:i.e.
related to the theme of the discourse

(d)the degree of coordination among the
various patterns employed in a text, ie
the degree to which all the patterns con-

and Cummings & Simmons 1983). But the presence of
such overt patterns cannot be considered as a suff-
icient and necessary requirement for the creation of
literature.There might be texts abounding in such
patterns yet without any literary value.In this con-
nection, it is argued that for the special language
patterns to be of literary effect, they should meet
two conditions:(a) they should be consistent and(b)
they should be thematically motivated.Hasan(1985:95)
explains the notion of consistency in terms of 'the
stability of its semantic direction' and ' the
stability of its textual location'.About the notion
of thematic motivation, it is argued that the
special language patterns employed in a literary text
should be related to and motivated by the theme of
the text, otherwise they cannot be considered as
contributing to the literary effect of the text in-
volved(cf.Halliday 1971).There might also be texts
of literary nature which would not overtly display
any overt special patterns. In this regard, we can
say that if a text is considered 'literary' and as
such it is believed to create special literary
effect, such an effect can only be the function of
the language and the 'special mode' of its uliliza-
tion.To account for these covert and nonconventional

the translation equivalence is the function of a dy-
namic interaction of all these dimensions of the
discourse process.But due to the unique nature of
each language system, not all the discoursal dimen-
sions can be equally taken care of in translating
all text-types between all languages and thus one or
more dimensions may be compromised.The decisions on
which dimensions should be foregrounded at the ex-
pense of the others are made on the basis of certain
factors of the translation situation such as trans-
lation text-type, translation goals   and trans-
lation audience.

3.Literature vs. Non-Literature-text

Literature text,as we have argued before(Lotfi-
pour-Saedi 1992b) is different from non-literature
primarily in terms of the 'special effect' it produc-
es on the reader.But this special effect is not an
inherent property for literature; it rather is brought
about by special mode of utilizing the language re-
sources (cf.Mukarovsky 1977).This 'special mode' has
been characterized in terms of special patterns:
Phonological,(e.g rhyming, alliteration)graphologi-
cal, structural (e.g.structural parallelism) and
semantic (e.g.metaphor, irony)(cf.Widdowson 1975

'message' or 'effect'? Different approaches to
translation highlight one of these dimensions at the
expense of the others or they are merely concerned
with a very limited scope of meaning in language
and define TE only in terms 'meaning' ignoring all
the other dimensions.But according to the discoursal
approach to the characterization of interpersonal
verbal transactions, 'meaning' is not an inherent
and static property of the language elements to be
carried by them and exchanged by the communicators
through them. It is rather something which is dy-
namically negotiated by the interlocutors, and among
many contextual and co-textual factors contributing
to this 'discourse process',the language elements
are considered only one factor. The notion of'trans-
lation equivalence' should, thus, be defined accord-
ingly, taking care of all of the factors which con-
tribute to the materialization of the communicative
value of a 'text' or any linguistic form.Attempts
have already been made towards the characterization
of the dimensions of TE within the discoursal frame-
work(cf.Lotfipour-Saedi 1990 and 1992 a).Seven
different dimensions have been proposed for this
purpose as follows: vocabulary, structure,texture,
degree of indirection,language variety,cognitive
effect and aesthetic effect.It has been argued that

on the various dimensions of the awareness required
on the part of the literary translator. For this pur-
pose, its various sections would focus on the follow-
ing questions:

> (a)What is meant by translation equivalence
> in general?

> (b)How is literature-text different from
> non-literature?

> (c)How do the special patterns in literature
> contribute to the literary effect, ie.
> what is the discoursal value of the
> special textual strategies employed in
> literature

> (d)How can the special literary patterns
> be rendered in translation.

We shall now try to elaborate on each of these
questions below.

2.Trying to characterize translation equivalence

If the translation is a matter of establishing
equivalence between the SL and TL texts, how can
such an equivalence be characterized? In other words,
is the translation equivalence to be viewed in terms
of the equivalence in 'form', 'meaning' 'function',