

Rhetorical and Stylistic Issues in Translation Pedagogy

Wolfram Wilss

Volume 30, numéro 3, septembre 1985

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/004610ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/004610ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (imprimé)

1492-1421 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Wilss, W. (1985). Rhetorical and Stylistic Issues in Translation Pedagogy. *Meta*, 30(3), 224–235. <https://doi.org/10.7202/004610ar>

RHETORICAL AND STYLISTIC ISSUES IN TRANSLATION PEDAGOGY

WOLFRAM WILSS

In the past few years two developments have been particularly apparent in linguistic methodology. One of these is based on the recognition, accentuated by recent work in social sciences and the philosophy of action, that in order to be able to use language as a means of communication, one must view language as a framework for functional activity rather than as a formal system. As a result, linguistics has experienced what in German is called "*eine pragmatische Wende*" (a new orientation toward pragmatic issues) which manifests itself in the interest in discourse structure or, as we prefer to say in Germany, in "*Textlinguistik*" (text linguistics). The second has been an increased concern with pedagogical issues, first in foreign language teaching, second in native tongue teaching, and third, last but not least, in translation pedagogy.

The two developments are, of course, not unconnected. The insight has grown that for linguistics to be relevant both in a theoretical and a practical manner, it should not reduce natural language to a quasi-algebraic system, but should take account of "authentic" data which can be observed in actual language use. This tendency toward authenticity has its dangers, the most obvious being what Widdowson has called "irresponsible ad-hocery" (1979 : 242), *i.e.* the underestimation of plausible methodological principles upon which any systematic investigation of linguistic matter must be based. This danger is particularly noticeable in translation pedagogy which, in order to be effective, must take full account of the functional interrelatedness of the source language text sender, the person of the translator and the target language text recipient and must devise teaching material which is suitable for the systematic development of the students' transfer competence.

So what I am trying to do in this paper is to bring plausible methodological principles and the observation of "authentic data" together and to show what issues are involved, if one tries to distinguish between rhetorical and stylistic aspects of a text. The investigation will be tentative because I am uncertain of the ground on which I move, and because there is a lack of reliable maps to guide empirical research. So I shall be feeling my way while I try to get along.

I will begin by setting the linguistic scene, by developing a linguistic backdrop against which the new orientation in linguistics toward communicative, interpersonal aspects of linguistic behaviour must be seen. The dominant, almost categorical view in linguistic research in the 1960s and early 1970s is represented by Generative Transformational Grammar (GTG) and its founder, Noam Chomsky, who in 1965 defined the task of linguistic research in the following notorious fashion :

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its (*sic*) language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance. This seems to me to have been the position of the

founders of modern general linguistics, and no cogent reason for modifying it has been offered. (1965 : 3 f.)

This is rather an arrogant statement. In fact, it is almost obscurantist, because by 1965 Chomsky should have realized that his linguistic philosophy was heavily lopsided and that there did exist quite a number of cogent reasons urgently demanding a modification of this one-sided position and, in effect, a redefinition of the scope of linguistic theory "to help shore up the tottering syntactic structures of vintage transformational grammar" (Haberland/Mey 1977 : 7). There is a sarcastic statement by Bar-Hillel which

cuts right to the sore point : according to him, the recent history of linguistics can be likened unto a row of waste-baskets : once one (e.g. the syntax) waste-basket is full, the overflow goes into the semantics basket, and when that basket is full, there's always pragmatics. (Haberland/Mey 1977 : 7.)

This statement indicates that it has in the last ten years become clear that generative linguistics cannot formulate the requirements and goals of practical communication. The opinion has gained ground that generative theory may not be adequate for describing and explaining discourse from the point of the sender and the receiver because all aspects of social context are given short shrift. It is, however, no coincidence that generative theory, which rests on the assumption that the task of linguistics is to explicate the sentences of a language, dominated the development of linguistics for a period of roughly 20 years. There are plausible reasons for the impact of generative concepts in linguistic thinking : The price which modern linguistic research apparently had to pay in order to establish its place and respectability within scientific practice was a concentration on "powerful", idealized forms of description at the expense of the social dimension of communication, a sort of "semiotic abstinence".

Despite the almost repressive character of GTG, there had always been a strong linguistic undercurrent which was based on the conviction that all people must adjust to their physical and social environment and that in this permanent adjustment process language plays an outstanding role. This comes out quite clearly in a statement by Jakobson which he made one year before Chomsky appeared on the international linguistic scene : "Linguistics is concerned with the language in all its aspects — language in operation, language in drift, language in the nascent state, and language in dissolution" (Jakobson/Halle 1956 : 55).

Compared with GTG, this is much wider and, admittedly, more "dangerous" definition of the scope of linguistic inquiry. In view of its openendedness, it is totally irreconcilable with Chomsky's position. Chomsky could, however, say in his defence, that GTG, although it represented a new, mathematically oriented conceptual map, has had an important forerunner in the person of de Saussure who, within the framework of "*linguistique de la langue*", stated that *langue* is a norm or a "*fait social*", which underlies "*toutes les autres manifestations du langage*". Advertently or inadvertently following de Saussure, Chomsky concluded that the "investigation of performance will proceed only so far as understanding of underlying competence permits" (1965 : 10).

This statement, in my opinion, is challengeable for two reasons : first, what we know about competence, we know through performance as a psycholinguistically and sociolinguistically based operation relating extralinguistic matter to linguistic concepts (onomasiological aspect of language theory) and *vice versa* (semasiological aspect of language theory).

Second, *langue*, or for that matter, competence is a static concept which underestimates the dynamic character of language use and rules out of court two essential properties of natural language, namely its purposiveness and its addressee-specificity.

There is no denying the fact that Chomsky's heavily rule-oriented approach is useful for certain purposes, such as machine translation ; on the other hand, the most important feature of human language is its interactive capability. It was Firth, the first holder of a chair of general linguistics in Britain, who, probably expanding de Saussure's concept of linguistics, stressed the social function of language :

The multiplicity of social roles we have to play as members of a race, nation, class, family, school, club, as sons, brothers, lovers, fathers, workers, church-goers, golfers, newspaper readers, public speakers, involves also a certain degree of linguistic specialization. Unity of language is the most fugitive of all unities, whether it be historical, geographical, national, or personal. There is no such thing as "*une langue une*" and there never has been. (1957 : 29)

It is obvious from this quotation that for Firth the focal point of linguistics is the investigation of the ways and means in which we use language in order to accomplish linguistic interaction in a social context. Now, some 25 years later, it is again the social context, "... the question of how and why language is put together the way it is" (Grimes 1975 : 29), which explains the involvement of linguistics in speech functions, discourse structure, textualization and all those questions which form the new post-Chomskian research paradigm of communicative competence, a concept which, under the influence of sociology, ethnomethodology and cognitive psychology, has aroused so much interest in linguistic circles all over the world. To quote Brown/Yule :

The analysis of **discourse** is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for. While the formal approach has a long tradition, manifested in innumerable volumes of grammar, the functional approach is less well documented. Attempts to provide even a general set of labels for the principal functions of language have resulted in vague, and often confusing, terminology. We will adopt only two terms to describe the major functions of language and emphasise that this division is an analytic convenience. It would be unlikely that, on any occasion, a natural language utterance would be used to fulfill only one function, to the total exclusion of the other. That function which language serves in the expression of "content" we will describe as **transactional**, and that function involved in expressing social relations and personal attitudes we will describe as **interactional**. Our distinction, "transactional/interactional", stands in general correspondence to the functional dichotomies — "representative/expressive", found in Bühler (1934), "referential/emotive" (Jakobson 1960), "ideational/interpersonal" (Halliday 1970) and "descriptive/social-expressive" (Lyons 1977). (1983 : 1.)

In performing discourse, we draw upon linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge. Knowledge and behaviour are interdependent, so that central task of discourse analysis must be the investigation of the interrelatedness of linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge (world knowledge). Both knowledge domains are dominated by experience which is mentally represented by rules ; in fact, there is no intersubjective knowledge — and, for that matter — no intersubjective communication which is not based on rules which are, however, much more complex than the binary, computer-like, sentence-bound rules which Chomsky used for describing and explaining linguistic competence. In order to understand the complexity of communicative rules, we must regard linguistic utterances as linguistic configurations with a thematic, a functional and a text-pragmatic

dimension. These three dimensions can be derived from the respective text surface structure. The text surface therefore acquires the dimension of an instrumental set of instructions guiding the production of a text by the text sender and the comprehension of a text by the text recipient.

The thematic, functional and pragmatic investigation of a text can be facilitated by questionnaires enabling the text analyst to take apart its discourse structure, thereby using the so-called Laswell formula "who uttered what for whom with what communicative purpose in mind in what communicative setting?" Such questionnaires, which I have outlined somewhere else (Wilss 1977 ; 1982 : VI), permit two important conclusions :

1. Individual linguistic behaviour is not so random as to be beyond the realm of systematic inquiry. Linguistic behaviour is, as indicated, based on rules which the language user must not violate, if he wants to make sure that his message gets across to the recipient. Since these rules represent common knowledge, it is possible to account for, and even predict, language use.

2. Any linguistic approach, if it is meant to lead to systematic and not only to anecdotal results, must ultimately be founded on reliable concepts about the nature of language and how it is used. This framework need not be fully explicit, e.g. on the pattern of GTG ; it may — or it must, in order to be of any practical value — remain below the level of abstract idealization with its inherent danger of ignoring observable data or cutting them down to methodological size.

If we accept the hypothesis that language use is not simply a sequence of grammatically well-formed sentences, but a "dynamic process of meaning creation" (Widdowson 1979 : 129), a widening of the domain of linguistics to include language use as interpersonal activity is imperative. This approach entails two areas of inquiring ; first the investigation of what I, following Widdowson (1979 : 12), am inclined to call "rhetorical acts", and second the investigation of style, "style" here understood as the ensemble of idiolectal stylistic features as they can be observed in a specific text. I prefer the term rhetorical acts to "speech acts", because Speech Act Theory, while representing a significant progress in relation to Chomsky's generative theory, cuts down communication to a restricted number of speech acts, which appear to function largely without complication. Speech Act Theory therefore covers only those cases of linguistic activity which are undisturbed by linguistic complexity. On the other hand, complex communicative requirements occur in many areas of written communication, not least of all in the area of translation which, as a specific type of linguistic performance, is subject to specific communicative needs, norms and conditions. Speech Act Theory does not offer a consistent way of determining how a specific utterance comes to receive a particular meaning.

Another reason speaking for the use of "rhetorical acts", is the fact that English "rhetoric", in contrast to German "*Rhetorik*", has a broader semantic range, including the concept of structure. It is therefore completely wrong, e.g., to translate "The Rhetoric of LSP prose" into German as "*Die Rhetorik der fachsprachlichen Prosa*". Whenever we use a language, we perform rhetorical acts representing admonitions, requests, warnings, praise, criticism, insults, justifications, personifications, persuasions, threats, questions, answers, advice, demands, permission, promises, greetings, apologies, confessions, suggestions, assertions, appeal, prayers, allusions, declarations, and what have you.

A specific set of rhetorical acts can be found in argumentative discourse, which may proceed along the lines of any type of logical relations, for example, causal, conditional, concessive, adversative, constative and purposive :

Casual : Since he was ill, he could not attend the meeting.

Conditional : If he is ill, he cannot attend the meeting.

Concessive : Although he is ill, he will attend the meeting.

Adversative : He is ill, but he will attend the meeting.

Constative : He attended the meeting. Afterwards, he fell ill.

Purposive : In order to be able to attend the meeting, he pretended not to be ill.

Each particular rhetorical act is like a frame which contains slots, such as conjunctions indicating the semantic perspective of the individual rhetorical act. Formulated in this way, a frame is characteristically a fixed stereotypic representation of modal knowledge.

In performing rhetorical acts, we do not only express meaning ; we also express speech functions. This is to say that we want the recipient to understand our message in a particular way. The type of speech function is based on the intention of the sender of a message ; it may be described in various manners. Personally, I prefer to make a distinction between a generic speech function and a number of specific speech functions. The generic function of any speech act is informative ; informative utterances can be subdivided into six specific speech functions :

1. **Cognitive**, e.g. reference, description, explanation, argumentation ;
2. **Expressive**, e.g. egocentric attitude, interpretation, cursing, writing a poem, creating new metaphors and similes ;
3. **Emotive**, e.g. making people angry or hysterical, consoling, creating team spirit or enthusiasm, infuriate people, condemnation ;
4. **Appellative**, e.g. imperative utterances, threats, suggestions, exhortations, persuasion, urge, requests, invitations, talking in forbidding terms ;
5. **Performative**, e.g. declaration of war, forming alliances, declaring a person married, divorced, baptized, dead, holy ; declaring a meeting closed/opened ;
6. **Phatic**, e.g. greetings, honorifics, conversational routines, talking about the weather.

The distinction of speech function is, however, not always so clearcut. Complaints or criticism e.g. can be listed under the category of expressive or emotive or appellative speech function.

Another feature of speech functions worth mentioning is that they are not language-specific, but language-universal.

We are all related in numerous and complex ways to other members of society, but each of us is continually reminded of the range and depth of divisions among men. Each man has a unique image of the world ; each has unique desires. The uniqueness is relative, however, rather than absolute : A man is more different or less different ; he is never absolutely different. Even the most sophisticated members of modern society share much with the most primitive tribes in the most remote parts of the world ; the most ardent members of an ideological faction have much in common with their bitterest political enemies. Whatever other purposes rhetoric may serve, it is, fundamentally, a means for achieving social cooperation : The writer's goal is to engage in some sort of cooperative activity with the reader. Achieving this cooperation requires change — change sometimes in the reader, sometimes in both the reader and the writer. The writer wants the reader to know what he knows, or at least understand, the values that he accepts, and so on. Writing and speaking are the principal means that man has developed for promoting social cooperation and, hence, for maintaining and improving a civilized community. (Young *et al.* 1970 : 171 f.)

This is due to the fact "that human experience is so much alike throughout the world" (Nida 1982 : 9). And de Beaugrande says : "... the question of how people know what is going on in a text is a special case of the question of how people know what is going on

in the world at all" (1980 : 30). According to Bühler's "*Organonmodell*", human beings use linguistic signs in the form of texts for three different purposes, descriptive-representational, appellative, and expressive with sender-receptor-neutral, receptor-oriented and sender-oriented reference. These three speech functions cut across individual languages. "The kinds of things that are communicated in each part [of a discourse] seem to be recognizable in any language ..." (Grimes 1975 : 33.)

The language-universality of speech functions is the reason for Widdowson to make a clear distinction between text and discourse :

When confronted with a sample of language, a chapter in a chemistry textbook, for example, there are two ways in which we might describe it. We may treat it as an exemplification of the language system and point out the incidence of certain linguistic structures and items of vocabulary : in other words, we can describe its formal properties as an instance of linguistic usage. To do this is to conduct a register analysis and to characterize this sample as *text*. If we treat the sample in this way, however, there are a number of things about it that we fail to account for. In the first place it clearly does not just exist as usage, as an exemplification of the language system : it is also an instance of use ; it communicates something and does so in a certain manner. If we were to ask the author or the reader to describe the sample, the likelihood is that he could characterize it as a *description* or a *report* or a set of *instructions*, or an *account* of an experiment. These terms do not refer to the linguistic properties of the sample as text, but to the communicative function of the sample as discourse. A register analysis of the sample as text will tell us nothing about the communicative functions of language use. (1979 : 23.)

I am afraid I cannot accept Widdowson's argumentation. It is an established fact that we communicate through the surface structure of a text. It is, as indicated, the surface structure which provides us with clues concerning first the meaning of a particular text specimen, second the text function (message-intention of the author) and third the implied or explicit, at any rate reconstructable relation between the text producer and the text recipient. I think register analysis (or as it has more recently been called, "sublanguage" analysis (Kittredge/Lehrberger 1981) and discourse analysis can and must be combined into one unified descriptive and explanative framework which can be used for theoretical as well as for didactic purposes, e.g. the intralingual drawing up of inventories of linguistic data — morphological, lexical, syntagmatic and syntactic — which are used for fulfilling specific communicative purposes.

One particular important field of research seems to be the investigation of texts in the domain of scientific and technical discourse (LSP discourse) where one can clearly distinguish a number of rhetorical acts, such as instructions, reports, the formulation of hypotheses, exemplifications, generalizations, enumerations, conclusions, definitions, clarifications, inferences of rules from particular instances, etc. Rhetorical acts are represented by specific textual elements which together constitute the rhetorical organization of scientific discourse. A good example of scientific discourse is the following LSP text specimen :

Microelectronics technology will affect us all. But it will affect us in different ways. It will expand the range and raise the quality of existing products. It will foster new products and processes. It will accelerate the communications revolution. As consumers, we will all experience some of these developments to a large degree and all of them to some degree. But as producers we will be differentially prone to dislocation of our working lives. Some will be displaced from jobs or industries which microelectronics will render obsolete. Others will be employed in the microelectronics industry or in the new industries that microelectronics will promote. The consequences for employment as a whole are nowhere known. Many claim that the loss of jobs will be of calamitous proportions ; others argue that similar fears were expressed when computers were first introduced but the predicted disaster failed to

occur. But it seems that some industries will be affected sooner and more gravely than others ; that therefore some categories of workers, some regions and some countries will be hit especially hard.

This text shows that the production and reception of LSP texts is primarily object-oriented. Typically it lacks all ironical, sarcastic, allusive or light-hearted text elements which are characteristic of other text-types such as commentaries of literary texts in the widest sense of the word. LSP texts follow, if we look at their semantic, functional and pragmatic perspectives, their own text-type-specific rhetorical rules. These rules require a discourse structure which is largely depersonalized. This does not mean that there is only just one rigidly preordained way of describing and explaining scientific subject-matter, but there are constraints which are attributable to the universally logical function of LSP discourse. The tendency towards discourse standardization is most conspicuous in the formalized languages of mathematics, physics, chemistry and electronic data processing. Formalized languages of these types are abstract sign systems ; their function is to facilitate the representation of more or less complex abstract relations in a nonlinguistic functional system. Hermeneutic interpretation of such texts turns out to be useless as a method of understanding LSP discourse. The job of the reader of LSP material is not to decipher unknown things by activating inborn capabilities and by hermeneutically encircling a given text, but to acquire, or comment on, scientific and technical knowledge through analytical operations in a specific field of pure or applied research.

It goes without saying that the rhetorical organization of scientific discourse is, directly or indirectly, translation-related. Since cognitive discourse is not bound to the world-view of a language community, Jakobson is right in stating : "All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language" (1966 : 234). Hence, if anywhere at all, it is in the area of LSP translation that one can expect something like an optimal translation. This leads to the conclusion — not yet empirically tested — that if the same LSP text is translated by several translators with a comparable degree of linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge, the surface appearance of the various translations will show a relatively high degree of rhetorical normativity. LSP discourse possesses, as it were, a sort of rhetorical servo-mechanism which determines the use of lexical, syntactic and phraseological elements of a LSP text not only intralingually, but also interlingually.

Having discussed discourse structure against the background of rhetorical aspects at some length, I would like now to deal with the stylistic features of a text. I hope it has become obvious that rhetorical acts represent universal features of textualization which possess text production-guiding and text reception-guiding quality and are therefore indispensable prerequisites for plausible sender/receptor communicative interaction.

We can therefore conclude that they are largely predictable, because the relationship between form and function is anything but arbitrary, and that they can be integrated into a macro-contextual framework of speech functions and presuppositions. This is particularly true of scientific and technological discourse. It is structured according to established patterns of rhetorical organisation, which permits only a limited extent of idiolectal stylistic variation, because it imposes a large degree of conformity, no matter what language a scientific may happen to use.

If we now look at the stylistic dimension of a text, we must be aware that, according to Crystal and Davy,

"Style" is certainly a familiar word to most of us, but unfortunately to say simply that stylistics studies style does not clarify matters greatly, because of the multiplicity of definitions

that the word "style" has. For clear thinking on the subject, we must say what we consider to come within the purview of stylistics. In this connection, at least four commonly occurring senses of the term "style" need to be distinguished :

1. ... all of the language habits of one person ...
2. ... all of the language habits shared by a group of people at one time ...
3. ... referring to the effectiveness of a mode of expression ...
4. ... literary language ... (1969 : 9 f.)

The following presentation deals only with the effectiveness of a mode of expression, because "... the most important stylistic feature is adding 'color' ... adding color is breaking the flow of objectivity by a descriptive characterization" (Wallace 1981 : 272). Well-known stylistic means of expression include repetition, omission, allusions, quotations, metaphorical expressions, chiasms, measured units, shifts of expectancy, ellipsis, irony, inversion, understatement, overstatement, formulaic expressions, syntactic compactness and many others. Contrary to rhetorical acts which are text-type-specific, stylistic features of a text are largely author-specific, covering micro-level rather than macro-level strategies of a text. As optional text features they are not text-constitutive and therefore largely unpredictable. Stylistic features are like decorations in a book. This is not to imply that stylistic features do not fulfill important functions in a text. According to Nida *et al.*, stylistic features may serve — within the context of biblical texts — "four major purposes : acceptance, identification, impact and esthetic appreciation" (1983 : 165). If we move outside the domain of biblical texts, we might add at least one very important function, namely persuasion (in particular in advertisement texts).

In more detail, Nida has pointed out that stylistic devices may be motivated by various purposes.

Repetition, for example, may be important in providing semantic unity, but it may also heighten impact by providing emphasis. An unusual order of expression may increase impact, but if it is combined with parallelism or chiasm, it may provide significant aesthetic appeal. A break in sentence structure (normally spoken of as an anacoluthon) may increase impact, while highly figurative language is a factor in coherence. Features such as irony and hyperbole are particularly important in matter of intentionality, while measured units, as in poetic lines, have definitely aesthetic appeal (1982 : 41).

If we want to uphold the distinction between "rhetorical acts" and "stylistic devices" of a text, we must recall that the investigation of rhetorical acts will provide answers to the question of how language users put their knowledge of communicative rules to communicative effect and "how they structure an ongoing interaction" (Widdowson 1979 : 117). On the other hand, the investigation of stylistic features of a text seeks to accomplish three things, first to reveal the personal predisposition of an author towards his text, second to describe the ways and means the author employs in order to make his text optimally attractive to the envisaged reader (or readership), third to help to evaluate his command of the communicative potential of a language.

It is obvious that our discussion of rhetorical and stylistic features of a text has immediate implications for translation teaching in general and for LSP translation teaching in particular.

... the concepts and procedures of scientific inquiry constitute a secondary cultural system which is independent of primary cultural systems associated with different societies. So, although for example, a Japanese, and a Frenchman, have very different ways of life, beliefs, preoccupations, preconceptions, and so on deriving from the primary cultures of the societies they are members of, as scientists they have a common culture. In the same way, I take it that the discourse conventions which are used to communicate this common culture, are

independent of the particular linguistic means which are used to realize them. Thus, for example, the expression of cause and effect relations and the formulation of hypotheses are necessary rhetorical elements in scientific discourse, but they can be given a very wide range of linguistic expressions. So I would wish to say that scientific discourse is a universal mode of communicating, or universal rhetoric, which is realized by *textualization*. (Widdowson 1979 : 51 f.)

If we regard translation as an act of target-language re-textualization, translation pedagogy must adopt a discourse- or text-based rather than a sentence-based approach. Hence, translation pedagogy must develop a translation teaching framework which enables the teacher to operate along general communicative strategies representing the translation process as an attempt to maintain the form/function relation of the source language text in the target language, taking account of the specific needs and predispositions of the target language reader or target language readership to the extent as this is feasible in the respective context. This can be done in two complementary ways, retrospectively and prospectively, by comparing finished translation products with the source language text, and by carefully watching the translation process as a progressive, multi-stage accomplishment, analysing it as a combination of knowledge, imagination, intuition, creativity and other attributes of human mind.

If both methods are meant to establish pragmatic intertextual equivalence as a set of conditions defining a particular case of source-language/target language reformulation, they should be a useful tool to make translator-students aware of rhetorical acts and to sensitize them towards the stylistic quality of a text. Rhetorical acts are, as we know, based on universal rules of language use. So there seems to be no reason why it should not be feasible to teach transfer competence in such a way that a student learns to recognize rhetorical acts, to make the process of translation less chancy and time-consuming, more systematic and efficient, and to reproduce them appropriately in the target language. The ultimate aim of translation teaching could be the development of text-type-based transfer grammars.

Whether in the long run they would obtain a similar standard of discourse precision as conventional sentence grammars have obtained in the description of the syntactical features of language, is, however, doubtful, because thought processes and their linguistic representations cannot be explained on the basis of all-embracing hard-and-fast rules.

However, there is no need for over-complicating this task by theoretical issues, because the translator-student knows intuitively how to understand and produce discourse of different kinds in his own language. By way of systematic application of this knowledge to translation issues he can be made to create intertextual discourse, either by going from his own language to a foreign language, or (preferably) from a foreign language to his own language, as the occasion arises.

In this way he will learn to understand translation as a sequence of processes in which he performs rhetorical acts which cohere into larger text segments, ultimately establishing patterns of translation methods and translation techniques which characterize translation as an attempt to reproduce the whole of the rhetorical pattern of a source language text in a target language. Thus the teaching syllabus should contain a specific component designed to specify the nature of different rhetorical acts, the way they are realized in the source language and in the target language and the way they combine into different varieties of language use or different text-typological varieties. These specifications may then form the basis for the design of text-typological material which focusses on the teaching of discourse-bound translation rather than on the teaching of how to translate single lexical items or isolated phrases, clauses, sentences, or sentence-

combinations. One might argue that this is impossible, that the translation process is highly personal and hence is not subject to objective control. I believe, however, that although no methods can be developed that infallibly lead the translator-student through the translation process to adequate solutions, translation research can conceive of methods that will be helpful in his efforts. Such methods are called heuristic procedures. Heuristic procedures must, however, not be equated with rule-governed procedures. A rule-governed procedure specifies a finite sequence of operations that can be carried out mechanically, without falling back on intuition, and invariably leads to a correct result. A heuristic procedure, on the other hand, starts from a series of questions that guide investigations and improve the chances of discovering a workable solution for a specific problem. Hence, another long-term aim of translation teaching should be to develop communicative strategies which enable the translator-student to cognitively recognize just those conditions in a context of situation which must be satisfied in order to establish pragmatic source language/target language equivalence. In speaking of pragmatic equivalence, I assume the existence of conceptual patterns and rhetorical acts which constitute a particular universe of discourse independently of the linguistic repertoires used by different languages to make interlingual communication possible. What we need for translation teaching is a mediating area of inquiry which will exploit the results of theoretical and descriptive translation studies in such a way as to reveal their applicative relevance to the translation teacher. (Wilss 1981 ; 1982 : IX.)

This framework should also include the teaching of how to translate features of individual style. The adequate translation of stylistic features can, of course, be a very intricate matter, for three reasons, first, because style is, as mentioned already, largely unpredictable, second, because style is a very elusive phenomenon tending to thwart all efforts at systematic teaching, and third, because it may be difficult or even impossible to find an adequate target language equivalent for a particular source language stylistic feature.

Here is an example which I take from a text on the impact of international terrorism on life in Britain and the mounting crisis of confidence between the state machine with its larger-than-life ears and the ordinary citizen whose civil liberties are under serious attack. One sentence in this text reads as follows :

The rise of terrorism on an international scale, of subversion as a respectable military weapon — recognized by such classical strategists as von Clausewitz, it is a common tool of all modern government — and the scope of sensitive technical information, jealously guarded by the average defence ministries, have all helped to create a state of paranoia, and a paranoia of the state.

Apart from the complex syntax with its shift of expectancy by means of a parenthesis, it is practically impossible to reproduce in German the chiasm — "state of paranoia/paranoia of the state" — because German lacks a word which is as handily ambiguous as the English word "state" (in German one would have to differentiate between "state" as "*Zustand*" and "state" as "*Staat*").

Nevertheless, or perhaps, in spite of the intricacies involved in reproducing in the target language stylistic features of the source language text, it has long been recognized by translation pedagogy that style is immediately relevant to the teaching and learning of translation. I would like to quote Nida/Taber who stated :

Translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style (1969 : 12).

I believe that style can be incorporated as an integrative element into a translation teaching syllabus and that, properly presented, it can serve as an invaluable aid in the development of intertextual communicative competence. Although style is an individual use of language, its transfer into another language involves the same cognitive procedures as are required for the understanding and transfer of discourse structure. It is precisely because of their individual character that the analysis of stylistic features can and must be used to direct the students' attention to the textual importance of stylistic source language decoding and target language encoding procedures.

The fact that sensible answers cannot be found in all cases through objective procedures is an indication of the relativity of stylistic translational insights. A translator is not a machine-like text reformulator; he is more than a biological being with inborn (nativist) capabilities; he is also more than a cultural cumulation. He is a creative agent, uniquely patterned and deserving a special effort to explore and interpret his nature. On the other hand, he must be aware — or must be made aware — of the fact that translation is a process which represents a highly delicate web of rhetorical and stylistic factors. It activates the awareness of the translator to the highest degree. It is an important job of translation teaching to seek an exchange of information with neighbouring disciplines such as discourse analysis, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and communication sciences. There is a need for empirically based methodological standards which help the translator to become his own critic and supervisor. In this sense theory does not stand in opposition to practice and vice versa; on the contrary, theory can be tested by practice and practice by theory. A fresh look at the relationship between theory and practice of translation is all the more necessary since it is widely conceded that something like a crisis in linguistic theory exists, but there is vehement disagreement about the extent and nature of this crisis. Maybe the crisis is nothing more than the kind of muddle that any complex scientific discipline like translation pedagogy intermittently flounders in, as it tries to probe more deeply into the structure of linguistic processes such as rhetorical and stylistic performance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BEAUGRANDE, R. de (1980) : *Text, Discourse and Process*, London.
 BROWN, G. and G. YULE (1983) : *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge.
 BÜHLER, K. (1934) : *Sprachtheorie*, Jena.
 CHOMSKY, N. (1965) : *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass.
 CRYSTAL, D. and D. DAVY (1969) : *Investigating English Style*, London.
 FIRTH, J.R. (1957) : *Papers in Linguistics (1934-1951)*, London.
 GRIMES, J.E. (1975) : *The Thread of Discourse*, The Hague.
 HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1970) : "Language Structure and Language Function", in J. Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics*, Harmondsworth, pp. 140-164.
 JAKOBSON, R. (1960) : "Closing Statement : Linguistics and Poetics", in Th.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 350-377.
 JAKOBSON, R. (1966) : "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in R.A. Brower (ed.), *On Translation*, New York, pp. 232-239.
 JAKOBSON, R. and M. HALLE (1956) : *Fundamentals of Language*, The Hague.
 KITTREDGE, R. and J. LEHRBERGER (1982) : "Sublanguage — Studies of Language", in *Restricted Semantic Domains*, Berlin/New York.
 LYONS, J. (1977) : *Chomsky*, London.
 MEY, I.L. and H. HABERLAND (1977) : "Editorial : Linguistics and Pragmatics", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1/1, pp. 1-12.
 NIDA, E.A. (1982) : *Translating Meaning*, San Dimas, Ca.
 NIDA, E.A. et al. (1983) : *Style and Discourse*, Cape Town.
 NIDA, E.A. and C.R. TABER (1969) : *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden.
 WALLACE, W.D. (1981) : "How Registers Register : Toward the Analysis of Language Use", in *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching*, XIX/4, pp. 267-286.
 WIDDOWSON, H.G. (1979) : *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford.

- WILSS, W. (1977) : "Textanalyse und Übersetzen", in K.-H. Bender *et al.* (ed.), *Imago linguae. Beiträge zu Sprache, Deutung und Übersetzen*, München, pp. 625-651.
- WILSS, W. (ed.) (1981) : *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Darmstadt.
- WILSS, W. (1982) : *The Science of Translation. Problems and Methods*, Tübingen.
- YOUNG, R.E. *et al.* (1970) : *Rhetoric : Discovery and Change*, New York.