

Meaning and Evaluation System Analysis of Translation in the Framework of Afferent and Inherent Semantic Features

Hamid Reza Shairi¹

Associate Professor, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Babak Ashtari

M.A. Student of French Language Translation, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Received 2 August 2015

Accepted 19 February 2016

Extended abstract

1. Introduction

Translation is an active process in which a meaning is transferred from a source to a target language. During this process, meaning can be modified by variations in ontology, understandings, and beliefs of those who belong to the target civilization. Sometimes these variations can turn the meaning-making process into a controversial challenge for both translators and critics. Therefore, reflections on the impact of the meaning-making process and its influential differences in the receiving civilization hold absolutely a crucial position in translation studies. These differences, which are all classified under a main category called interculturality, represent a mass of studies accomplished in the field of translation. Such studies adopt mainly a semantic point of view and work mostly on meaning analysis and its perception in the target language. In this regard, researchers have recently renovated the field and introduced two main semantic sub-systems for multidimensional concept of meaning-making: *signification* and *evaluation*. Signification is related to a *signified unit* of a *linguistic sign* and its encompassing properties known as *seme*. However, evaluation includes a range of different actualizations from more tangible referential properties to the most abstract ones.

2. Theoretical Framework

During the process of translation, it is essential to consider the importance of both semantic features (signification) and the inferential values (evaluation) of the translated text. If the interculturality is based on variations in signification, signifying units may exchange (such as in Christmas and Norouz), however variations in values may provoke antipathy, position takings, or even enmity of the readers toward the translated text (as in Jerusalem/Ghods/ Or shalim or Palestine/Israel, etc.).

3. Methodology

¹ Corresponding Author: shairi@modares.ac.ir

In this study, which is concentrated on semantic features and their relationship with evaluation attributes (or values), we will have a look at *afferent* and *inherent* semantic features which were first introduced by *Rastier* in the field of semantics. After establishing a meticulous study on these features, which is specially labeled for its classification of afferent/inherent semes and the idea it provides about the functionality of figures of speech, we will propose an explanation, within a semantic framework, about meaning-making process and variations of intertextuality in practice. In the end, a connection will be established between semantic properties and evaluation systems found in the field of translation.

4. Results and Discussion

To do so, we utilize articles, journals, and books as our research materials and adopt a descriptive point of view to study the phenomenon of intertextuality.

In this regard, we assume that inherent features satisfy initial needs of translation while afferent properties are for answering its essential needs. As a result, meaning transference, in case of afferent figures, will provoke much bigger concerns for translators as they need the presence of some kind of *encyclopedic knowledge* beyond the ordinary language competency they have stored in their mind. This encyclopedic knowledge is not only essential for translators but also must be present or at least accessible for the target language readers.

Other factors that can modify meaning reception during the process of translation are context of speech, figures, personality, and inferential capacities of the readers. Yet, evaluation systems and semantic values can always interfere with the discourse meaning-making process and break the boundaries of semantics. This is particularly the case of litotes (understatement of values) and euphemism (promotion of values).

5. Conclusion

The purpose of the present study will be then an analysis of the semantic features and their status in translation studies based on textual values and evaluation systems of the target language and its culture.

The reason for such a study is to improve the awareness in students of translation disciplines who will sooner or later confront intertextuality and its problems. In like manner, the present study will be helpful for decision-making and justifying unusual behaviors of translators in case of intercultural difficulties. It also opens a horizon for future students and researchers about ideology, values exchange, and particularly the case of censorship in political translations.

Key Words: Componential analysis, Afferent/inherent seme, Evaluation system, Semantics, Translation.

References

1. Abbasi, A. (2014). Negahi be masael va moshkelate tarjomeh (Studies on English as a second language), Retrieved from <http://www.abbasibe.persianblog.ir>
2. Adam, J. M. (2005). *La Linguistique Textuelle: Introduction à l'analyse textuelle des discours* (éd. deuxième édition). Paris: Armand Colin.
3. Ahmadi, M.R. (2014). Antoine Berman va nazaryy eh gerayesh haye rikhtshenasaneh (An introduction to the deconstructive trends of Antoine Berman) *Naghd zaban va adabyyat khareji* (Critical language and literary studies), 1(13). Al-e-ahmad, J. (1982). *Sangi bar goori* (A Stone upon a Grave), Tehran: Niloofar.
4. Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. London: Clarendon Press.
5. Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. New York: Routledge.
6. Baylon, C., & Mignot, X. (1995). *Sémantique du langage*. Paris: Edition Nathan.
7. Benveniste, E. (1973). *Problems of general linguistics*. Miami: University of Miami.
8. Berger, D., & Robrieux, J.J. (1988). *Les figures de style et de rhétorique*. Paris: Edition Dunod.
9. Chubak, S. (1977). *Antari ke lootiash mordeh bood* (The Baboon Whose Buffoon Was Dead), Tehran: Javidan
10. Cordonnier, J. L. (2002). Aspects culturels de la traductions: Quelques notions clés. *Méta, Journal des Traducteurs*, 38-50.
11. Delzandehrooy, S. (2015). Quine va nazaryyeh adam ghadteyyat tarjomeh (Quine and indeterminacy of translation), *Motarjem (The translator)*, 15-27.
12. Du Bellay, J. (2003). *Défense et Illustration de la Langue Française*. (F. Goyer, & O. Millet, Éd.s.) Paris: Champion.
13. Eslami, A. (2015). Modakheleye motarjem dar man (The translator as writor), *Motarjem (The traslator)*, 115-128
14. Gile, D. (2006). Interdisciplinarité en traduction. *Université technique de Yildiz* (pp. 23-37). Istanbul: Ozturk Kasar.
15. Gouanvic, J.M. (2006). *Au delà de la pensée binaire en traductologie: Essquisse d'une analyse sociologique des positions traductives*. Retrieved from Erudit: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/016662ar>.
16. Heilbron, J., & Sapiro, G. (2002). *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Paris: Le Seuil.
17. Herbulot, F. (2004). La théorie interprétative ou théorie du sens: Point de vue d'une praticienne. *Méta*, 307-315.
18. Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
19. Holliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). New York: Edward Arnold.
20. Jeuge-Maynard, I. (2010). *Encyclopédie larousse*. Consulté sur Larousse: www.larousse.fr/encyclopédie/jeune

21. Khanjan, A. (2015). Anvae mana dartaarjomeh (The types of meaning) *Motarjem (The translator)*, 123-142.
22. Khanjan, A. (2014). Dastavard motaleate tarjomeh (The results of translation studies) *Motarjem (The translator)*, 117-124.
23. Ladmiral, J. R. (1994). *Théorème pour la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
24. Mahdipoor, F. (2012). Jean René Ladmiral, *Ketabe maheada by yat (Book of the Month: Literature)*, 48-63. Malekshahi, M. (2014). Paul Ricoeur, *Motarjem (The translator)*, 15-24.
25. Manafi Anari, S., Shahmoradi, A. (1394). Nazaryyeh harkat johari dar tarjomeh (Theory of substantial in Translation), *Hekmatemoaser (Contemporary wisdom)*, 95-105.
26. Meschonnic, H. (1973). *Pour la poétique II*. Paris: Gallimard.
27. Mohammadi, A., Karimian, F. (2015), Vazhe va mana dar taghabol ya dar taamol ba yek digar dar tarjomeh (Word and sens: mutually exclusive or coexistent in translation), *Motaleate Zaban va Tarjomeh (Language and Translation Studies)*, 107-120.
28. Mounin, G. (1994). *Les belles infidèles*. Paris: Presse Universitaire de Lille.
29. Mounin, G. (1964). *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Presse Universitaire de Lille.
30. Munday, G. (2012). *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. New York: Routledge.
31. Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories* (2nd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
32. Quine, W. V. (1987). *Quiddities: An intermittently philosophical dictionary*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
33. Rastier, F. (1987). *Sémantique interprétative*. Paris: Presse Universitaire de la France.
34. Rastier, F. (2000). *Sémantique interprétative*. Paris: PUF, troisième édition.
35. Ricoeur, P. (2004, 05 25). Culture du Deuil à la Traduction. *Le Monde*.
36. Safavi, K. (2002). *Haft goftar dar bareye tarjomeh (Seven Essays on Translation)*, Tehran: Nashr Markaz.
37. Sapir, A. (1998). *Zaban (Language)*, Tehran: Soroosh.
38. Saussure, F. (1999). *Doreye zabanshenasi eomoomi (Cours de linguistique générale)*, Tehran: Hormos.
39. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1996). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
40. Storey, J. (2009). *what is cultural studies? A reader*. Amsterdam: Arnold.
41. Tourangeau, R. (1980). *Méta, journal des traducteurs*. Consulté sur Erudit: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/004498ar>.