**Introduction to Translation and Interpretation**

**The Comparison between Interpreting and Translation Process**

Translating and interpreting is an interesting and challenge job for a number of reasons. In translating or interpreting is to enable the trainees to form as rapidly as possible correct structures in the transfer of written or spoken texts from one language to another. The translator or interpreter must create in the reader’s or listener’s mind the exact impression that the source writer or speaker intended to convey. Most of translators and interpreters must be ready to work in any subject. This seemingly impossible requirement is, in fact, attainable partly because it is more important to transfer the precise meaning of the original text than to produce faithfully in the target language the words, phrases or sentence produced in the source language.

Interpreting process implies an entire process of how an interpreter produces equivalences between a spoken and portions of a utterance into another language in spoken too. According to Pochhacker (2004), interpreting is a form translation in which a first and the final rendition in another language are produced on the basis of one time presentation of an utterance is a source language. In other to be able to interpret a text (presented orally), the interpreter must be able to receive and understand the incoming message then express its meaning in the target language. To accomplish this task, the interpreter must go though the overlapping series of cognitive processing activity, i.e. attending the message, concentrating on the task at hand, remember the message, comprehends the meaning of the message, analyzing the meaning for the message, visualizing the message non verbally, and finally reformulating the message in the target language.

On other hand, according to Selescovich (1978) compresses these tasks into “the immediate and deliberate discarding of the wording and retention of the mental representation of the message,” and interpreters often refer to this as “dropping form”. By discarding the form (words, structure, etc) of the source text the interpreter is free to concentrate on extracting and analyzing the meaning of the text, and conceiving the strategies for formulating the message in the target language.

The translation processes implies an entire process of how a translator produces equivalences between a text and portions of a text into another language. The translation process can be described as decoding the meaning of the source text, and re-encoding or translating this meaning in the target language. Behind this simple process lie various activities like checking grammar, syntax, idioms, semantics, and the like of the source language and also the culture of its speakers. The translator needs in depth knowledge in decoding and then re-encoding the meaning in the target language. In many cases, it is necessary that the translator's knowledge of the target language is more important than his knowledge of the source language. Nida (1974) the process of translating will not be able appropriately based on meaning found in the dictionary but also the context of situation and context based of the texts as well. Dealing with the comparison between translating and interpreting process, there are three problems of interest discussed; (1) What are the differences between translating and interpreting process? (2) What are the similarities of translating and interpreting process? (3) How the process between translating and interpreting process?

**The Concept of Translating Process**

Nida (1974) the process of translating will not be able appropriately based on meaning found in the dictionary but also the context of situation and context based of the texts as well. By the same token, the process of translation refers to the automatic use of the translator’s knowledge of his native language structure which is transferred into the target language. Nida (1974) claims it is essential to recognize that each language has each own character, e.g. world building capacities, pattern of phrase order, techniques for linking clauses into sentence, marker of discourse, and special discourse type of poetry, pro verbs and song.

**The Concept of Interpreting Process**

According to Pohhacker (2004), interpreting is a form translation in which a first and the final rendition in another language are produced on the basis of one time presentation of an utterance is a source language. In addition to Setton (1996) notes that interpreting is a process by which a spoken language or utterance take place in one language which is intended or presumed to convey the same meaning as previously existing utterance in another language.

**The differences between translating and interpreting**

Based on the data analyze show that interpreting (oral translation) focuses on the time of the rendering immediately after delivery of the utterances from the speaker, the interpreter renders the message of the speaker to the hearer. Interpreting as a oral translations delivered in communication situation, where the need of attention is focused on the message of the utterance of the SL and transfer of the message to the TL.

Both of translating and interpreting are belonged to the field of translation studies but the focus on the attention and different one another. Translating covers the field of processing on the written text ranging from scientific document, legal, economic, sacred text, literary text manuals. Written translation is not delivered directly but in certain time according to the need of the client and can use the aid of dictionaries, team work, and prove reader as well as the help expert in which the type of text is going to translated. In term of time duration, to get a product of translating may acquire more time before it is considered as a final work.

**The similarities between translating and interpreting**

Despite, in one hand the translating and interpreting process where both are concerned with rendering a message in the SL into an equivalent message in the TL the two greatly diverge. The constraints imposed on each and the skills required for both vary in many respects. Apparently, a translator performs his task in a written, hence visible, text, with reference sources accessible to interpreter with the possibility of revising, altering, modifying, editing and polishing the TL version, and in an atmosphere of little stress and relatively fewer constraints.

On the other hand, an interpreter, whether consecutive or simultaneous, is deprived of the above facilities, works under very stressful conditions and deals with an oral, hence an invisible, text, in addition to a plethora of other constraints. The corollary is that the interpreter is in a dire need to extra, i.e. compensatory, strategies such as the exegetic or paraphrase strategy, segmenting and chunking, queuing, calquing, approximation, borrowing and ellipsis to enable the interpreter accomplish and arduous feat.

**Function of Translation**

According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2000:546), Function is  
a special activity or purpose of a person or thing. Basically, the special purpose or  
function of translation is as a medium of communications. As Duff (1989:5) says,  
“As a process of communication, translation functions as the medium ‘across the  
linguistic and cultural barriers’ in conveying the message written in the foreign  
languages.”

In other words, the function of translation is a medium or a means to  
carry the message from the SL to TL. And it is very helpful for people which come  
from around the world in communication to each other.As Nida (1981:2) states, “Translation means communication because it has three essential elements to form a process of communication. The three essential elements are source, message, and receptor, and these elements must be found in all communication activities”. In brief that, translation is a means in communication, that has source, message, and receptor which must be found in all communication activities.

**Types of translation**

**Word-for-word translation**

This is often demonstrated as interlinear translation, with the TL immediately below the SL words. The SL word order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context. Cultural words are translated literally. The main use of word-for-word translation is either to understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as a pre-translation process.

**Literal translation**

The SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context. As a pre-translation process, this indicates the problems to be solved.

**Faithful translation**

A faithful translation attempts to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures. It “transfer” cultural words and preserves the degree of grammatical and lexical “abnormality” (deviation from SL norms) in the translation. It attempts to be completely faithful to the intentions and the text-realization of the SL writer.

**Adaptation**

This is the “freest” form of translation. It is used mainly for plays and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the SL culture converted to the TL culture and the text rewritten.

**Free translation**

Free translation reproduces the matter without the manner, or the content without the form of the original. Usually it is a paraphrase much longer than the original, a so-called “intralingual translation”, not translation at all.

**Idiomatic translation**

Idiomatic translation reproduces the “message” of the original but tend to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialism and idioms where there do not exist in the original.

**Translation Types according to Code**

Ro man Jakobson (1959 in Schulte and Biguenet, 1992:145) distinguishes three ways of interpreting a verbal sign: it may be translated into other signs of the same language, into another language, or into another code that is nonverbal system of symbols. These three types are succinctly put as follows:

**1. Intralingual translation or rewording**

It is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.

**2. Interlingual translation or translation proper**

It is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.

**3.Intersemiotic translation or transmutation:**

It is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign system.

The first type is exemplified by synonyms in the same linguistic code or language, paraphrase or replacing an idiom such as ‘pass away’ by ‘die’. The second type is seen in replacing certain code-units in Sl by equivalent code-units in TL. The third refers to the use of signs or signals for the purpose of communication; the most important semiotic system is human language in contrast to other systems such as sign language and traffic signals. Obviously, this type lies within Jakobson’s framework in which translation is perceived as the conversion of a sign into another alternative or equivalent sign, be it verbal or nonverbal. (Ibid, 232; and Shuttleworth and Cowie, 2007: 85).

**Translation Types according to Mode: Written vs. Oral:**

Translating/Interpreting: General Remarks

Nida and Taber’s above definition, may best accommodate interpreting as the reproduction of “ the closest

natural equivalent” of the SL message in the TL serves as a common ground or interface of translating and interpreting”, the former is not mainly or exclusively concerned with the accurate, semantic transference. The translated text should, at least ideally and theoretically, be as semantically accurate, grammatically correct, stylistically effective and textually coherent as the source text.

On the other hand, we may analogously postulate the following workable definition for interpreting: Interpreting consists in conveying to the target language the most accurate, natural equivalent of the source language oral message.

**Convergent/Divergent Requirements for Translating/ Interpreting Competence**

There are at least five common or interfacial requirements for both translating and interpreting competence vis-à-vis ten for interpreting. The five requirements for competent translators are: mastery or proficiency of SL and TL, thorough knowledge of source and target cultures, familiarity with the topic/register, vocabulary wealth, and finally awareness of the three–phase process, i.e., SL decoding, transcoding or SL-TL transfer and TL encoding. Interpreting, on the other hand, requires at least five more: short-term memory for storage and retrieval, acquaintance with prosodic

features and different accents, quick wittedness and full attention, knowledge of short-hand writing for consecutive interpreting and finally self-composure.

**Translating/Interpreting Constraints**

The constraints imposed on the interpreters are more andgreater than those on the translator. They also vary in type and degree of intensity as regards the direction of translating or interpreting, i.e., whether from L1 into L2 or the other way round. Below are the main constraints.

**Linguistic Constraints**

1. **Syntactic Constraints.**

The different word order in SL and TL puts a heavy burden on the interpreter. A case in point is when interpreting a verbal sentence from Arabic into English. The verb may introduce a long nominal phrase. The interpreter has to store the verb and wait for the whole subject before he could retrieve and start the English rendition. Deprived of the sufficient time for manipulation, structural asymmetry often obliges the interpreter to commit pauses and delays among other things**.**

1. **Semantic Constraints**

These constraints compel the interpreter to exert a far more laborious effort than those originated by syntactic constraints, for as Jackendoff (1991: 96)puts it, “once one understands the meaning, the syntax follows naturally and automatically.” Lexical incompatibility between SL and TL gives rise to slips, hesitations and even pauses, due to the interpreter’s struggle with a difficult jargon term, a neologism or a blended word as in interpreting words like Macdonalization or the 1980s Reagonomics.

1. **Phonological and Prosodic Constraints**

They include features that are non-existent in either SL or TL pertaining to segmental phonemes (vowels, consonants, consonant clusters, and diphthongs ), suprasegmentals and prosodic features such as stress, intonation, pitch, rhythm and tempo. Many scholars rightly maintain that translating/interpreting is an intercultural communication act that requires bicultural competence.

1. **Paralinguistic and Psychological Constraints**

These constraints include the speaker’s tone and loudness of voice, the tempo of delivery and gestures as well as the psychological state of the interpreter and/or speaker as regards nervousness instead of self – composure. The laborious task of simultaneous decoding and encoding and his/her concern over accuracy of rendition puts him/her in a very stressful situation. The act of interpreting is inversely proportional to the above constraints and to such psychological factors as fatigue, timidity or stage fright for interpreters who have to directly address the audience.

**Translation Theories: A General Survey**

According to Newmark (1981: 19), translation theory is concerned mainly with determining appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts or text-categories. It also provides a frame work of principles, restricted rules and hints for translating texts and criticizing translations, a background for problem solving. Any theory should also be concerned with translation strategies adopted to address difficulties and problems in certain complicated texts. Likewise, Graham (in Ross,1981: 23-24 and 26) asserts that any substantial theory of translation assumes some formal inquiry concerning the general principles of accomplishment, the very principles which define an object and specify a method of study. A rigorous theory of translation would also include something like a practical evaluation procedure with specific criteria. A good survey of the theories of translation is perhaps best furnished by E. Nida (1976:66-79) who avers that due to the fact that translation is an activity involving language there is a sense in which any and all theories of translation are linguistic (ibid:66). He classifies these theories into three: philological theories, linguistic theories and socio-linguistic theories, the sequel of three diverse perspectives and different approaches toprinciples and procedures of translation. If the emphasis is on the literary texts, the underlying theories of translation a r e best deemed philological; if it is on structural differences between SL and TL, the theories may be considered linguistic; and finally if it is on a part of communication process, the theories are best described as sociolinguistic. However, a more comprehensive survey subsumes far more than Nida’s three sets of theories as elaborated below.

**Philological Theories**

Philological theories rely upon ‘philology’ as the study of the development of language, and the classical literary studies. They are mainly concerned with the comparison of structures in the native and foreign languages, especially the functional correspondence and the literary genres in addition to stylistics and rhetoric .Nida explicitly states:

The philological theories of translation are, of course based on a philological approach to literary analysis. They simply go one step further; in place of treating the form in which the text was first composed, they deal with corresponding structures in the source and receptor languages and attempt to evaluate their equivalences … Philological theories of translation are normally concerned with all kinds of stylistic features and rhetorical devices. (Nida, 1976: 67-68).

**Philosophical Theories**

The most prominent proponent of these theories is George Steiner, who claims that his book After Babel (1975) is the ‘first systematic investigation of the theory and practice of translation since the eighteen century.’ He primarily emphasizes the psychological and intellectual functioning of the mind of translator. He elucidates that meaning and understanding underlies the translation process, averring that a theory of translation is essentially a theory of semantic transfer from SL into TL. He defines his ‘hermeneutic approach’ as “ the investigation of what it means to ‘ understand a piece of oral speech or written text, and the attempt to diagnose the process in terms of a general model of meaning” (Steiner,1975:249.

He introduces his model in what he calls ‘Hermeneutic Motion’ to describe the process of literary translation. He looks upon the act of translation in the context of human communication across barriers of language, culture, time and personality, thus subdividing this motion into four stages (or moves). The first move is termed trust or faith, which consists of the translator’s assumption that the source text contains ‘a sense to be extracted and retrieved into and via his own language, although this is generally an unconscious action. The second move is referred to as the aggression, penetration or decipherment, in which the translator “invades, extracts and brings home” the meaning of the original. The third move is termed ‘incorporation, embodiment or appropriative use. Translation can introduce new elements into the target linguistic and cultural system. The fourth and final stage or move is labeled µcompensation, restitution or fidelity’The translator must work to restore in his language what he has failed to recover from the original text.

**Linguistic Theories**

Linguistic theories of translation, according to Nida (1976: 69) , are based on a comparison of the Linguistic structures of the STs and TTs, rather than a comparison of literary genres and stylistic features of the philological theories. Their development is due to two factors: first, the application of the rapidly expanding linguistics, the scientific study of language, to several fields such as cognitive anthropology, semiotics, pragmatics, and teaching translation/interpreting skills; and second, the emergence of Machine Translation (MT) which has provided a significant motivation for basing translation procedures on linguistic analysis as well as for a rigorous description of SL and TL (Nida, 1976: 70).

According to Nida and Taber (1969:134) it is only a linguistic translation that can be considered ‘faithful’, because it “is one which only contains elements which can be directly derived from the ST wording, avoiding any kind of explanatory interpolation or cultural adjustment which ca n be justified on this basis.” Nida (1976:75) suggests a three-stage model of the translation process. In this model, S T surface elements (grammar, meaning, connotations) are analyzed as linguistic kernel structures that can be transferred to the TL and restructured to form TL surface elements. His linguistic approach basically bears similarity with Chomsky’s theory of syntax and transformational generative grammar.

Pertinent to linguistic theories is Newmark’s binary classification of translation into semantic and communicative, which somehow resembles Nida’s formal and dynamic equivalence. “Communicative translation,” Newmark (1981:39) states, “attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.

**Translational Action Theory**

This theory views translation as purpose-driven, product-oriented or outcome-oriented human interaction with special emphasis on the process of translation as message-transmission or a ‘translational action from a source text, and as a communicative process involving a series of roles and players the most important of whom are the ST producer or the original author, the TT producer or the translator and the TT receiver, the final recipient of the TT. The theory stresses the production of the TT as functionally communicative for the reader, i.e., the form and the genre of the TT, for instance, must be guided by what is functionally suitable in the TT culture, which is determined by the translator who is the expert in the translational action and whose role is to make sure that the intercultural transfer takes place satisfactorily.

**Sociolinguistic Theories**

These theories endeavor to link translation to communicative theory and information theory, with special emphasis on the receptor’s role in the translation process. They do not completely overlook language structures, instead they deal with it at a higher level in accordance to their functions in the communicative process. These structures may involve rhetorical devices or figures of speech such as simile, metaphor, irony, hyperbole, etc., in both literary and non-literary texts. These theories require the translator exhibit language competence as well as language performance.

**Interpretative Theory (or Theory of Sense)**

This theory, originally designed to reflect the processes which are involved in conference interpreting, is associated with a group of scholars known as the Paris School. It is a reaction against some of the restricted views of linguistics of the time. The proponents of this theory argue that interpreters do not work merely with linguistic meaning, but also need to take into account such factors as the cognitive context of what has already been said, the setting in which the interpreting is taking place and the interpreter’s own world knowledge (Lavault, 1996:97; in Shuttleworth and Cowie:2007: 85). The corollary is that the focus should be on the intended meaning or the sense rather than the words of the ST.

**THE SEVEN STANDARDS OF TEXTUALITY**

* “A text will be defined as a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality.” The first standard will be called cohesion and concerns the way in which the components of the surface text, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are *mutually connected within a sequence*. The surface components depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon grammatical dependencies. ...
* **Cohesion is divided into two types as follows:**
* Recurrence
* Junction
* Recurrence is a direct repetition of elements, since the original occurrence merely happens again (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981:54). Recurrence can be classified as

follows: Recurrence is a repetition of forms or patterns. For example:

* Harry: “You let the *troll* in?”
* Quarrel: “Certainly. I have special gift with *trolls* you must have seen what I did to the one in the chamber back there? Unfortunately, while everyone else was running around looking for it, Snape who already suspected me, went straight to the third floor to head me off and not only did my *troll* fail to beat you to death, that three headed dog didn’t even manage to bite Snape’s leg off properly.”

(Rowling, 1997: 210)

The above text shows the repetition or recurrence of the word *troll* without changing the form, which is recurrence.

**Partial** **recurrence** is the use of the same basic word but changing it to a

different word class such as to shift the word from adjective to adverb by adding –ly.

For example: Christina has a *beautiful* voice, so she can sing any songs *beautifully*.

**Parallelism** is the reusing of a surface format to present new components.

For example: The steel pipe crosses windswept plains and endless miles of delicate tundra that tops the frozen ground. It *weaves* through crooked canyons, *climbs* sheer mountains, *plunges* over rocky crags, *makes* its way through thick forests, and *passes* over or under hundreds of rivers and streams.

(*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 271)

The italic verbs above are in the same form, in the present simple tense in agreement with the subject *it*.

**Paraphrase** is the recurrence of a subject matter with a change of expression.

For example:

Original: The Hudson River has a couple of interesting physical features that attract the Europeans to settle.

**Paraphrase**: The Hudson River has two interesting physical features that make it very attractive for settlement by the Europeans.

(*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 298)

**Pro- form** is the repetition of a noun of the same content by a pronoun instead of repeating the same thing.

For example: Albus Dumbledore had got to his feet. He was beaming at the students, his arms opened wide, as if nothing could have pleased him more than to see them all there. (Rowling, 1997: 91).

The above example shows another way to repeat the same thing by using a pronoun. The name of Albus Dumbledore in the first sentence is repeated by using the pronoun **he** in the second one.

**Ellipsis** is omission of a structure and its content.

For example: The milk couldn’t be used. All was sour. (Halliday, 1976: 155)

The word all in the second sentence refers to all milk in the first sentence, but the word milk is omitted.

**Junction:** Junction is another cohesive device that shows the relationship of components in a sentence. This cohesive device is categorized into four as follows:

**Conjunctions** are the lexical items that can be used to link things, which are of the same status, such as and, also, besides, furthermore etc. For example: Jill , John and Sim made their way into the tunnel in front of them. (Adirex, 1995: **253).**

**Disjunctions**: Disjunctions are the lexical items that are used to link things, which are of alternative status, such as or, either/or etc. For example, Benjamin is going to buy either a digital camera or an MP3 player with this money.

**Contrajunctions** are lexical items that are used to link discrepant elements, such as *but, yet, however, nevertheless* etc. For example: Today there are no silver coins made for general circulation. However*,* a certain number of special part silver coins are still minted for sale to collectors. These sell at much higher prices than the face – value of the coins. (*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 220).

**Subordinations**: are lexical items that are used to link contents which are dependent on one another, such as because, since, as, thus, while, hence, therefore etc. For example: Because meteorites were formed during the early life of our solar system, they offer valuable information about the history of the earth. (TOEFL Handbook, 2002: 221).

**Coherence:** De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) explain that coherence refers to a set of conceptual relations under the surface text, which is similar to cohesion in the way stretches of language link each other. Cohesion refers to the surface of the text, while coherence refers to semantics or meaning of the text.

Sriduandao (2003) explains that **coherence** is like the spirit of a text, and a text can be coherent without cohesive devices. For example:

**Teacher**: Could you tell me a little bit about your neighbor?

**Student**: The Roberts have three children. Julie is the oldest daughter.

Joey is a Wednesday child. Jinny is the youngest member of the family.

**Teacher**: Anything else?

**Student**: Their servant is very interfering.

The above example shows a conversation between a teacher and a student. This conversation is short of cohesive devices to link the text together, but the receiver can interpret the text easily because the idea of each sentence supports one another well, which is the concept of coherence.

* **Coherence** concerns the ways in which the components of the textual world, i.e. the configuration of concepts and relations which *underlie* the surface text are mutually *accessible* and *relevant*. ... Cohesion and coherence are text-centred notions, designating operations directed at the text materials.

**Cohesion and coherence**

* Cohesion and coherence are text-centred notions.
* The other standards of textuality are user-centred notions.

**Intentionality:** According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), intentionality seems to be a goal on the author’s mind. The author hopes the target audience will be satisfied with the text. intentionality refers to what a text producer plans to do and what he/ she hopes the target text receiver will accept. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) divide the intentionality into two categories: the text producer’s attitudes and a set of goals which are strongly confirmed by the text producer. Each text is written to express the text producer’s intention to the target text receiver.

**Acceptability:** This standard concerns the text receiver’s attitude to evaluate whether the text is acceptable or unacceptable based on the other six attributes of textuality. Each text element must relate to each other and go together well. It may be said that acceptability concerns the text receiver’s attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver, e.g. to acquire knowledge or provide co-operation in a plan. ... Example, In translating any text, a translator must transfer the message, the attitude and the intention of the author of the original text to the target text so that there will be a clear understanding between the text producer and the receiver. Therefore, the translated text should maintain the same message of the original text. If the translated text is misrepresented or is short of any of the standards of de Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) textuality, that translated text is considered unacceptable.

**Intentionality and acceptability**

* Intentionality and acceptability rely on Grice’s cooperative principle:"Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged."

**Grice’s conversational maxims**

* + **Maxims of quantity** : Make your contribution as informative as required. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
  + **Maxims of quality** :Do not say what your believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
  + **Maxim of relation**: Be relevant.
  + **Maxims of manner**: Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief. Be orderly.
* **Informativity:** The fifth standard of textuality is called informativity and concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain. Informativity refers to the author’s intention to provide information through the text. This standard concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected/unexpected or known/unknown (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 9). Infomativity is classified into three levels as follows:
* In short, informativity influences the comprehension of the text receivers because
* it relates the information in the text. Moreover, the extent of the information depends on
* the author’s intention as well as the knowledge and the experience of the target text
* Receiver.

**First – order informativity**

This level focuses on only important content words to make the text informativity. Therefore, the function words such as articles, prepositions, conjunctions etc. are generally omitted. This type of informativity can be found in such text types as telegrams, road signs, warning signs, and advertisements.

**Second – order informativity**

The second – order informativity is another type of information which occurs as an unexpected alternative but a possible one. The attention is reserved for higher-order occurrences (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 143).

For example: Koala and Panda are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

From the sentence above, some alternatives which are related to Koala and Panda

such as animals, bears or mammals occur in mentality. Therefore, this sentence can be

completed with any of those.

**Third – order informativity**

The information in the third – order informativity occurs when the text producer accounts for unexpected or unknown alternatives to the target receiver by using general words, loan words with modification to make clearer explanations. Besides, this third -level informativity can be used to upgrade the degree of information.

For example: Lemon grass is a grass

The above example cannot give any new idea to the receiver because the explanation has low informativity. This text can be upgraded by giving more sensible information as follows: Lemon grass is a type of grass with lemon flavor that grows in hot countries and is used especially in Asian cooking.(*Oxford Dictionary*, 2000: 767)

**Situationality**

The situationality is the sixth standard of textuality, which makes a text relevant to the situation of occurrence (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 9). Generally, people indifferent situations can get different meanings of the same text because of their different experiences. Situationality can help the target audience understand the message of the text easily. Therefore, the producer must create a text according to the circumstance or condition in a particular place and at a particular time. For example, a man raises a T-shirt and says “XL,” and then a woman gives him an XL one. This example shows that the woman in this situation understands the short utterance “XL” of the man by giving him the XL T-shirt, understanding that he wants to ask for a shirt of this size. They understand the same thing because they are in the same situation.

* The sixth standard of textuality can be designated situationality and concerns the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence. ...

Situationality connected with coherence and acceptability, e.g.

* + slow children at play
  + Some elements in text refer to the context of situation (e.g. deictics) and cannot be decoded unless reliance on situationality is made.
* The seventh standard is to be called **intertextuality** and concerns the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts. According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), intertextuality refers to the connection between the target text and the background knowledge of the audience of a text that is inserted into it. This knowledge can be applied by the process called “mediation.” This standard links the previous knowledge in the target audience’s memory with the inserted one. If the audience has some background, which is familiar to the inserted text, he/she can get the idea about that text. e.g. “A tale of two cards”
* Headline for an article in the Daily Mail describing the Xmas cards sent by Blair and Howard – reference to Dickens’s novel A Tale of Two Cities R. de Beaugrande, W. Dressler, An Introduction to Text Linguistics, London, Longman, 1981.
* In short, the seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) are appropriate for analyzing any text types including a translated text by emphasizing
* cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity,situationality and intertextuality.
* These seven standards overlap with each other. If the text does not meet any of the said standards, the text may be considered unacceptable.