Full length Research

Translation naturalness in literary works: English to Persian

Elaheh Fadaee

Vakil Abad Blvd. 6 Hashemieh 21 ST., Mashhad, Iran. E-mail: elaheh_Fadaee@yahoo.com. Tel: 00989151030299.

Naturalness as well as accuracy and clearness is one of the main features of evaluating translation of literary books. An acceptable translated book is the one which includes all these three factors. Based on the tendencies of translators to create good and natural translation pieces, and to show the necessity of this action, the researcher in this paper tries to study the naturalness flow of some literary short stories in Iran to reveal some strong and weak points of natural translations of some of these books. As such, two research questions are derived in this study: do the short stories meet natural translation? Does the attraction of these stories have relation with their naturalness? The most important reason for choosing these books is that the researcher found that although literary books in Iran have lots of fans especially among students of schools and private English institutions, these books which are written in a simple language and are the summary of some of the great literary books, such as The scarlet letter by Hawthorne, Little women by May Alcott, Dr. Zhivago by Pasternak, etc., show some lacks in translation naturalness. This article covers 4 parts as introduction including theories of naturalness, method, result and discussion, conclusion.

Key words: naturalness, translation, literary short stories

INTRODUCTION

Great translators have enumerated different purposes for attempts they have made to translate great writers' masterpieces. Generally speaking, most of them believe that if one finds himself competent enough to offer translations at par, he/she should not hesitate to do so because it is incumbent upon him/her as a social responsibility to reveal and undress treasures oneself has got access to.

A good translator emphasizes on the readership and the setting, and therefore on naturalness, ease of understanding and an appropriate register, when these factors are appropriate. When the main purpose of the text is to convey information and convince the reader, (like story books), a method of translation must be natural.

In this view, naturalness is both grammatical and lexical, and is a touchstone at every level of a text, from paragraph to word, from title to punctuation.

Accuracy of translation

Accuracy of translation means that a translated piece communicates the same meaning as the source language. Rahimi (2004: 55) says "a translation will be considered inaccurate if it contains the following cases:

i) Inadvertently omitting some pieces of information
ii) Adding information which is not really in the source text
iii) Committing mistakes during the analysis of the source text resulting in a different meaning".

Clearness of translation

Larson (2001: 49) defines clearness as following: "clearness in translation means that the translated piece can communicate to the people (target audience) who are to use it". He adds that "in clear translation the forms of the language used should be those which make the message of the source text as easy to understand as the source text itself was to understand" (Larson, 2001: 48). The translation lacks clarity if:

i) It does not communicate the people who are to use it.
ii) It does not use the form of language understandable for language speakers (Rahimi, 2004: 56).

These two features were not the focus of this article, although they were introduced.

THEORIES OF NATURALNESS

One of the main requirements in any translation work is that the translation (the finished product) must sound natural. Before mentioning the characteristics of the translation naturalness which are proposed by the great translation authorities and then mentioning the types of unnatural translations, it is necessary to distinguish between natural language, ordinary language and basic language. "Natural language is a language which is readable by everybody, however, it is formal. Ordinary language is the plain non-technical idiom used by Oxford philosopher's explanation. Basic language is somewhere between formal and informal, which is easily understood, and is constructed from languages that are most frequently used by common people" (Newmark, 1988: 87).

There is no universal naturalness. Naturalness depends on the relationship between the writer and the readership and the topic or situation. What is natural in one situation may be unnatural in another, but everyone has a natural, 'neutral' language where spoken and informal written language, more or less, coincide.

Tendency towards natural translation goes back to translation pieces of St. Jerome and his followers Luther (1530) and Dryden (1684) who favored 'colloquial and natural' renderings of the texts. From then on, great translators tried their best to create translation pieces which seemed natural as much as possible.

Tytler (1971), Belloc (1931), Bates (1943), Nida (1943), Jakobson (1959), Levy, Catford, Newmark (1988), and some contemporary translators have emphasized on natural translation a lot. Tytler (1797) is the proponent of the idea that to make a natural translation, a translator must be free in adding to or retrenching from the original text when it is being rendered into a target language.

According to Belloc (1931: 30), "Natural and good translation must... consciously attempt the spirit of the original at the expense of the letter. Now this is much the same as saying that the translator must be of original talent; he must himself create: he must have power of his own, not just offer a one-to-one translation".

The translator must free herself/himself from resorting to mechanical restrictions the same way that the author, in writing a text, emancipates himself/herself from them (Belloc, 1931). Bates (1943: 121) says that; "If you want to translate a book naturally, you should know that, the translator's task is not confined to transferring of one sentence into a similar sentence in the target language, but that he/she is expected to search inconsistencies in the two languages, tackle them, and to overcome the deficiencies of his/her own language in respect of the unique characteristics found in the source language".

Nida (1943) sees a translator, who advocates natural translation, as a producer of a total overall effect with approximate tone. In this way, he insisted on the 'intention' of the text rather than the words used by the author and he understands what kind of audience the original author had in mind when writing.

According to Jakobson (1959: 15), "Natural translation is a whole message transference from one language into another rather than the transfusion of single separate-code units. What the translator dose is recording the entire message and transmitting it into the target language".

In natural translation, which is translation by an untrained individual, as Harris (1981: 254) defines it, "one cannot talk of the linguistic knowledge of the bilingual". For Newmark (1988), naturalness is essential in all communicative translation; whether one is translating an informative text, a notice or an advert. According to him, "a translator has to ensure that, a) the TT makes sense, and b) it reads naturally" (Newmark, 1988: 89).

Beekman and Callow (1974: 45) have offered another criterion for assigning the naturalness of translation. "Their definition is based on the term 'ease'. They say there is correlation between ease of understanding the meaning of a text and the level of naturalness which it has".

Gutt (1999) claims that a good translation should read like a target – language original, not like a translation, it usually expresses this idea that a translation should be so natural in its style that it is indistinguishable from an original in the target language.

Rahimy (2004: 58) defines naturalness and says: "it is important to use the natural form of the receptor language if the translation is to be effective and acceptable. Furthermore, the translation should not sound foreign or smell 'translation'; the translation is not natural if it lacks normal use of TL speakers and appropriate style".

Williams` (2005) study indicates the cultural significance in the act of natural translation. It indicates that a lack of cultural knowledge can cause misusage or misunderstanding of language, and the feature negatively affects the performance of translation.

There are some terms which are considered as equal substitution for natural translation; dynamic translation, idiomatic translation, meaning-based translation, closest natural translation, functional translation, thought-for-thought translation, covert translation and so on. All of these terms focus upon preservation of meaning, rather than form, when there is tension between the two.

Within Naturalness Theory, Mayerthaler (1981: 70) distinguishes "sem- and sym- naturalness. He emphasizes more on sem-naturalness which is simply called naturalness. The kind of naturalness is similar to traditional markedness: [alpha] markedness = -[alpha] naturalness".

In recent years, it is viewed that, in naturalness theory, all distinctions in language are viewed as scales. Entities on each scale differ in naturalness, the end points of

each scale being more natural and less natural, respectively.

The terms more natural and less natural make it possible to avoid the logically contradictory terms natural and unnatural; unnatural cannot seriously be predicated of anything in a 'natural' language (though the word occurs occasionally in theoretical writings).

"A fundamental tenet of naturalness theory is that all naturalness scales and values are founded in extra linguistic reality, the physical or cognitive substratum of language" (Dressler 2003: 45). Furthermore, there are another group of translation theorists who prefer to use statistical calculations to evaluate and test the amount of naturalness in translation. There are two formulas for testing translation readability which are practical in testing translation naturalness, too:

i. The Flesch- Kinkaid Grade level readability and naturalness formula.
ii. The Power- Summer- Kearl readability and naturalness formula.

Among these theories, 5 of them are selected to be the basis of this study which are Belloc`s (1931), Rahimi`s (2004), Tytler`s (1797), Nida`s (1943) and Newmark`s (1988) theories of naturalness:

1. Natural translation must not be a one-to-one or literal translation from any language (Belloc, 1931)
2. A natural translation is so, that the receptor language readers do not recognize it as translation at all (Rahimi, 2004)
3. In a natural translation, a translator is free in adding or retrenching from the original text when it is necessary (Tytler, 1797)
4. In natural translation a translator understands what kind of audience the original author had in mind when writing (Nida, 1943)
5. Natural translators adopt communicative translation more than semantic translation (Newmark, 1988)

Therefore, based on the afore-said theories of naturalness, the researcher wants to find out the amount of naturalness in some selected Iranian short stories. Here, a paragraph of one of the bilingual story, The Elephant Man is stated as an example to be studied on the basis of these 5 conditions:

My name is Dr Fredrick Treves.
I am a doctor at the London Hospital.
One day in 1884, I saw a picture in the window of a shop near the hospital.
I stopped in front of the shop and looked at the picture
At first I felt interested, then I felt angry, then afraid.

It was a horrible, ugly picture (The Elephant Man, chapter 1, p.3)

In this paragraph of The Elephant Man, it is observed that the translator rendered word by word exactly, so he did not obey conditions 1 and 2 because when the addressee reads this text, he recognizes that it is a translation. It violated condition 5 too as it is a more semantic translation rather than communicative one, because he focused more on the writer's style not reader's interests. Condition 3 is also violated as the translator did not add or remove any words or phrases. Therefore, this kind of rendering shows that the translator did not consider his/her addresses and violated condition 4.

METHODS

In order to study naturalness factor in translation of Bilingual-Educational story books in elementary and intermediate levels, 30 Bilingual-Educational story books (English to Persian) were selected randomly out of 139 books, which are published and also available in book stores of Iran, to survey the feature of naturalness in translation of these books.

According to the Iran National Library, 718 Bilingual Educational story books (English to Persian) have received publication codes until 5 September, 2009, but just 139 story books out of this number have been published and also available in book stores of Iran.

The researcher randomly selected 30 books out of 139 to start the study, and studied each of these books carefully to evaluate the translator's effort to reach natural translation. The researcher selected just 30 books out of 139 because each translator of these books has translated at least 3 to 4 of these books. It means that, studying one of the books of each translator would show the amount of naturalness translation in his or her work.

The selected books were Cranford, The Elephant Man by Vicary Tim, translated by Monir Sadate Seyyed kordestanchi and published in Vazhe (2007); Dracula by Bram Stoker, translated by Jamshid Skandani, and published in Sales (1997); The mill on the floss by George Eliot, translated by Pezhman Hoosemi Nezhad, and published in Vazhe (2003); Princess Diana by Cherri Gilkrist, translated by Minoo Ghafari, and published in Vazhe (2003); White fang by Robin Waterfield, translated by Ramin Razavi, and published in Jade Abrisham (1998); Sherlock Holmes by Arthur Conan Doyle, translated by Reza Taghavi, and published in Azar Sabalan (2008); Far from the madding crowd by Jennifer Bassett, translated by Kamran Bahmani, and published in Vazhe (2006); Martin Luther king by Allen Maclain, translated by Marjan Hosseini, and published in Goyeshe Noo (2007); The rain man by Lioner Flisher, translated by Ghasem Kabiri, and published in Ghoghnoos (1990); Dr. Zhivago by Boris Leonidovich Pasternak, translated by Kamran Bahmani, and published in Vazhe (2003); The road ahead by Bill Gates, translated by Hormoz Habibi, and published in Heram (1996), Money to burn by John Scott, translated by Mehri Alizade, and published in Vazhe (2006); Little women by Luizami Alkoot, translated by Shahindokhte Raeeszade, and published in Elmi-Farhangi (1995); The scarlet letter by Terry Dibble, published in Behzad (2003); Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare, translated by Mohammad Sadegh Shariat, and published in Gouyesh No (2008); Who moved my cheese? by John Spenser, translated by Mohammad Riyazi, and published in Abtin (2001); Sweet Hemlock, translated by Zohre Zahedi, and published in Andishe Alam (2003); The call of wild by Jack London, translated by Khosro Shayeste, and published in Sepideh (1991); The last leaf by O` Henri, translated by Habib Atashi, and published in Jangal(2002); Project Omega, The breathing method by Stephen King, translated by Javad Yosuf Beig, and published in Shahre Khorshid (2007); Of mice and men by John E. Stein Beck, translated by Parviz Daryoush, and published in Asatir (1989);

Table 1. Book 1: Cranford.

	+N.S	-N.S	M.(+N)	M.(-N)
C1	335	256	0.56	0.44
C2	351	240	0.59	0.41
C3	241	350	0.40	0.60
C4	368	223	0.62	0.38
C5	361	230	0.61	0.39

+N.S: high naturalness; -N.S: low naturalness; C: conditions; M. (+N): mean of more/high natural sentences; M. (-N): mean of less/low natural sentences; $\sum$: total sentences of the book; T.Sc: total score of the book; Formula: M= $\sum$ X / N, M= C / $\sum$; $\sum$: 591; T.Sc: 2.78.

Table 2. Book 2: The elephant man.

	+N.S	-N.S	M.(+N)	M.(-N)
C1	288	226	0.56	0.44
C2	311	203	0.60	0.40
C3	300	214	0.58	0.42
C4	333	181	0.64	0.36
C5	325	189	0.63	0.37

+N.S: high naturalness; -N.S: low naturalness; C: conditions; M. (+N): mean of more/high natural sentences; M. (-N): mean of less/low natural sentences; $\sum$: 514; T.Sc: 3.01.

Tears of paradise by Dante Aligiri, translated by Vahid Kiyan, and published in Andishe Alam (2005); Jane Eyre by Sharlote Boronttee, translated by Mahdi Afshar, and published in Dabir (2007); Love or money? by Rowena Akinyemi, translated by Abbas Rahi, and published in Mashhad (2001); Stealing the hills by Josephine Feeney, translated by Jamshid Tadayon, and published in Jalil (2002); A box full of kisses, translated by Hamid Reza Ghanadpoor, and published in Ilaf (2009; Robin Hood by Howard Payel, translated by Sedighe Ibrahimi, and published in Panjere (2004).

Persian translations of the afore-said books with English ones were compared and contrasted with each other considering the characteristics of natural translation proposed by the great translation theorists and also some popular translators, with the use of questionnaire as a check list.

To gather data, one of the research short stories is selected randomly. Then this book is studied carefully to be examined on the basis of condition number 1 (from the questionnaire) with all of the sentences of this book (sentence by sentence). If each of the translated sentences of this book had the condition number 1, it would award a score of 1 to that sentence. If not, that sentence would get a score of 0. All other sentences of this book are checked with these 5 conditions. When the researcher checked all translated sentences of the short story with all 5 conditions of the questionnaire, she separately calculated the scores of the translated sentences of the book for each condition. So, she got 5 scores for this book (one score for each condition). With the other 29 remaining short stories, the same examination is done. The sample of tables for 2 books comes as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

According to Table 1, more than half of the translated sentences of this book do not meet the condition 3 and nearly half of the translated sentences do not meet the conditions 1 and 2.

Considering T.Sc: 2.78 (out of 5), it can be said that the translator of this book has created low natural translated pieces, because the translation of this book do not have even half of the necessary conditions to be known as a natural translated book.

According to Table 2, nearly half of the translated sentences of this book do not meet the conditions 1 and 3. Considering T.Sc: 3.01 (out of 5), it can be said that the translator of this book has created high natural translated pieces and this translation is more natural than the translation of book 1.

The instrument of obtaining data is a questionnaire containing some characteristics of the high natural translation which are proposed by great theorists and also some popular translators. In order to enhance the validity of the research, 35 participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire. To fulfill this purpose, 8 short story books were selected out of 30 ones and divided these 8 books to two groups. Each group consisted of 4 books. For each group, 4 passages with their translated counterparts were randomly selected (each passage from each book). To start the project in the first week, participants were asked to answer the questionnaire after studying the selected translated passages of short story books of group 1. These sentences were written on the papers with two options: 1 or 0. Participants who were the English Translation students of Bandar Abbas University in M.A. program were supposed to read 4 English passages with their Persian translated counterparts which were extracted from 4 Bilingual-Educational short story books. For each passage, they were supposed to report 1 score according to the 5 conditions of questionnaire (it meant that they were supposed to award one score to each passage after checking conditions 1 to 5 of the questionnaire). 2 weeks later, the same participants were asked to evaluate the second group short story books with the same questionnaire. This time, the participants were familiar with the procedure and did the same task with a new group of passages and reported the results as they did before. The answers are summarized in Table 3.

According to these data, passages from books number 1, 2, 6 and 8 were (+Natural), because all of them met more than 3 necessary conditions to be known as highly natural translated texts. Passages from books num. 3, 4, 5 and 7 were (–Natural), because none of them met 3 or more necessary conditions to be known as high natural translated texts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Naturalness theory is viewed as a relative subject. In new natural theory, we have terms as, more natural, or less natural. The term more natural and less natural might seem to imply the existence of standards of comparison: x is more or less natural than y (Dressler, 2003: 461).

The terms more natural and less natural make it possible to avoid the logically contradictory terms natural and unnatural. Unnatural cannot seriously be predicted of anything in a natural language (though the word occurs occasionally in theoretical writings) at the same time the predicates of more natural and less natural emphasize the ideas that naturalness is relative (Dressler, 2003: 462). So, the researcher has used the terms of less/low naturalness and more/high naturalness based on 5 conditions:

1. Natural translation must not be a one-to-one or literal translation from any language (Belloc, 1931)
2. A natural translation is so, that the receptor language readers do not recognize it as translation at all (Rahimi,

Table 3. Participant's response.

Pc.	B.1	B.2	B.3	B.4	B.5	B.6	B.7	B.8
1	4	5	1	3	3	4	1	3
2	5	4	2	2	1	3	1	4
3	4	3	2	1	2	3	2	3
4	4	4	3	1	2	3	2	4
5	3	5	2	2	2	4	2	4
6	4	4	2	2	2	4	1	4
7	3	3	1	2	2	4	1	4
8	4	4	3	2	3	4	1	3
9	4	3	2	1	1	4	2	3
10	3	4	2	2	2	4	2	2
11	4	4	2	3	3	2	3	4
12	3	4	2	1	2	3	2	4
13	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	4
14	4	4	2	2	1	4	1	3
15	4	3	2	1	1	4	2	4
16	3	4	2	2	2	4	2	4
17	3	4	2	2	2	4	2	3
18	4	4	3	1	2	4	1	4
19	4	3	1	2	1	3	1	4
20	4	3	2	3	3	4	1	3
21	4	4	3	1	1	4	1	2
22	4	3	1	2	1	4	2	4
23	5	4	1	2	2	4	2	4
24	4	3	1	3	2	4	1	3
25	3	4	1	2	2	4	3	4
26	4	4	2	1	2	4	2	4
27	4	5	2	1	1	4	3	4
28	4	4	1	1	2	4	1	4
29	5	4	2	3	2	4	1	4
30	4	5	2	2	2	3	2	3
31	4	4	1	2	3	4	2	3
32	4	4	1	2	2	4	1	4
33	4	4	3	1	3	4	1	4
34	4	3	2	2	2	4	2	4
35	4	4	1	2	2	4	1	4
M	3.89	3.83	1.83	1.83	1.94	3.74	1.66	3.460

Pc: participants; B: books; M: mean ($\sum X / N$).

2004)
3. In a natural translation, a translator is free in adding or retrenching from the original text when it is necessary (Tytler, 1797)
4. In natural translation a translator understands what kind of audience the original author had in mind when writing (Nida, 1943)
5. Natural translators adopt communicative translation more than semantic translation (Newmark, 1988)

The researcher studied the results of Table 1 qualitatively and based on theories of popular translators about the natural translation, reflected in questionnaire. For the second time, the researcher chose Table 2 to study the results quantitatively and based on the statistical results obtained from formulas of naturalness testing.

In the third step, the researcher compares and contrasts the results of these two groups (for all of 30 books, separately). Finally, she reported the results of the study about naturalness in translation of story books through tables.

Among the 30 evaluated books, 14 (43.75%) do not meet 3 or more than 3 necessary conditions to be known as natural translation pieces. The first results of analysis

Table 4. Translation naturalness calculation.

	F	Rf	P. Rf (%)
C1	15	0.4687	46.87
C2	13	0.4062	40.62
C3	15	0.46.87	46.87
C4	8	0.25	25
C5	10	0.3125	31.25

F, Frequency; Rf, Relative frequency P.Rf, percentage of relative frequency

of low natural translation (calculation of frequency, relative frequency, percentage of relative frequency of neglected conditions) are summarized in Table 4.

This table shows that among 30 books, 28 books do not have conditions 1 and 3, 13 do not have condition 2, 10 do not have condition 5 and 8 do not have condition 4. Table 4 shows that nearly half of the books did not meet 3 or more conditions of naturalness. Table 3 shows that among 8 books, just half of them meet 3 or more conditions and have naturalness. So, it configures the researcher's data, too.

Conclusions

In this article, translation naturalness of some literary books was evaluated. After analyzing the obtained results of the present study, it is found that some essential conditions in translation procedures were neglecting which leads to create low natural translated pieces. There are two research questions:

1. Do the short stories meet natural translation?
2. Does the attraction of these stories have relation with their naturalness?

In order to have a high natural translation, a translator would observe the afore-said conditions. The answer of the first question is that as observed, about 56.25% met 3 conditions or more and are natural, but 43.75% did not meet 3 conditions and are unnatural. The answer of the second question is that there is a direct relation between the attraction of the books and naturalness, because the quality of the translated text, the writer's style and the naturalness are important factors in the attraction of a story books.

REFERENCES

Bates ES (1943). Intertrafic: Studies in Translation. London: J. Cape Publication, p.121.
Beekman J, Callow J (1974). Translating the Word of God. USA: The Zondervan Corporation, for Summer Institute of Linguistics, pp. 45.
Belloc H (1931). On Translation, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 30p.
Dressler WU (2003). "Naturalness and Morphological Change". Berlin: De Gruyter, 45p.
Gutt EA (1999). Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publication, 58p.
Harris B (1981). Prolegomenon to Study of the Difference between Teaching Translation and Teaching Interpretation. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, pp. 254.
Jakobson R (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In: On Translation, R. B. Bower (ed.), Cambridge: Harward University Press, 15p.
Larson ML (2001). Meaning-based Translation. NewYork: University Press of America, pp. 48-49.
Mayerthaler W (1981). Morphologische Natürlichkeit. Wiesbaden: Athenaion Publication, 70p.
Newmark P (1988). A Textbook of Translation, New York: Prentice Hal, 89p.
Nida EA (1943). Towards a Science of Translation, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, for the United Bible, 41p.
Rahimi R (2004). "Alpha, Beta and Gamma Features in Translation: Towards the Objectivity of Testing Translation". Translation Studies, 2(5)
Tytler A (1797). Essay on the principles of translation, Edinburgh: Cadell & Davies, extracted in D. Robinson (ed.), 102p.
Williams DS (2005). The Belief Systems of Cultural Brokers in Three Minority Communities in America. Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), 75p.

English to Persian Translation. Detect language English Latin Welsh Russian Mongolian ...Â Translations in context. LangCrowd.com - Your text will be translated by other users. CORRECTMYTEXT.COM - experts will check your text in a foreign language. Grammar. The Old Iranian Lessons. Books. Scribd.com - Books, Audiobooks, News & Magazines, Music. Here's two free months through this invite. Courses. in translating a literary text from English to Persian and to study whether any. cultural barrier has forced the translators to alter the words and phrases during the. transfer or not.Â The range of different translated texts. from one source could help in formulating a generalization on English to Persian. translation methodology. With regard to the fact that cultural markers are. Persian translations of the afore-said books with English ones were compared and contrasted with each other considering the characteristics of natural translation proposed by the great translation theorists and also some popular translators, with the use of questionnaire as a check list. To gather data, one of the research short stories is selected randomly.Â In this article, translation naturalness of some literary books was evaluated. After analyzing the obtained results of the present study, it is found that some essential conditions in translation procedures were neglecting which leads to create low natural translated pieces. There are two research questions Translation article entitled "Translating Gender from English to Persian".Â Naturalness in Translation. 20 Questions to ask your Translation Company. Lost in translation?Â A Study of Idiomatic Expressions and Cultural Concepts in Literary Translation of Simin Daneshvar's 'Savushun'. Translating Dead Souls and Persuasion into Twenty-First Century America. Language lapses could cost you millions*. Literary translation includes a wide range of activities that deal not only with ﬁction or poetry but also with popular science essays, newspaper articles, diaries, memoirs, etc. These different kinds of texts presuppose different strategies and criteria of translation processing. The uniﬁed approach is to consider them integrally as nonstrictly determined translation opposed to strictly determined documentary translation. The difference between the two manifests itself mainly in the proportion of overt and covert regulations and criteria for the choice of equivalents.