



MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
HANOI UNIVERSITY
English Department



Graduation Thesis

Strategies to deal with non-equivalence at word level in translation

SUPERVISOR: Nguyen Ngoc Tan, M.A.
STUDENT: Pham Thanh Binh
CLASS: 11A-06

May 2010 - Hanoi





TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1. Background to the study..... | 1 |
| 1.2. Aims of the study..... | 2 |
| 1.3. Scope and significance..... | 2 |
| 1.4. Organization of the study..... | 3 |
| CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... | 4 |
| 2.1. Introduction..... | 4 |
| 2.2. Overview on translation equivalence | 4 |
| 2.2.1. The concept of equivalence..... | 4 |
| 2.2.2. Different theories of equivalence..... | 5 |
| 2.2.2.1 Quantitative approach..... | 5 |
| 2.2.2.2 Qualitative approach..... | 5 |
| 2.2.2.2.1 Function-based equivalence..... | 5 |
| 2.2.2.2.2 Meaning-based equivalence..... | 6 |
| 2.2.2.2.3 Form-based of equivalence..... | 7 |
| 2.3 The problem of non-equivalence | 7 |
| 2.3.1 Non-equivalence at word level..... | 8 |
| 2.3.2 Recent studies on non-equivalence at word level | 10 |
| CHAPTER THREE: THE STUDY..... | 12 |
| 3.1 Selected English – Vietnamese conceptual and lexical semantic contrastive analysis..... | 12 |
| 3.1.1 Conceptual contrastive analysis..... | 12 |
| 3.1.1.1. Concept on kinship | 12 |
| 3.1.1.2 Concept on color..... | 14 |
| 3.1.1.3 Concept on temperature..... | 14 |
| 3.1.1.4 Concept from communication..... | 15 |
| 3.1.2 Lexical semantic contrastive analysis..... | 16 |
| 3.1.2.1 Pronouns | 16 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.1.2.2 Classifiers..... | 19 |
| 3.1.2.3 Word Formation..... | 19 |
| 3.2. Classification of non-equivalence at word level | 20 |
| 3.2.1. No equivalent words between 2 languages..... | 20 |
| 3.2.2. The source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language.... | 24 |
| 3.2.3. The target language lacks a superordinate..... | 25 |
| 3.2.4. The target language lacks a specific term..... | 26 |
| 3.2.5 Differences in expressive meanings..... | 28 |
| 3.2.6 Differences in physical and interpersonal perspective..... | 29 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: SUGGESSTIONS AND CONCLUSION..... | 30 |
| 4.1. Strategies to tackle non-equivalence at word level..... | 30 |
| 4.1.1 Translation by a more specific word (hyponym)..... | 30 |
| 4.1.2 Translation by a more general word (superordinate) | 32 |
| 4.1.3 Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word..... | 33 |
| 4.1.4 Translation by cultural substitution..... | 35 |
| 4.1.5 Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation | 37 |
| 4.1.6 Translation by paraphrasing..... | 38 |
| 4.1.7 Translation by omission..... | 41 |
| 4.1.8 Translation by illustration..... | 42 |
| 4.2. Conclusion..... | 43 |
| 4.3 Suggested exercises | 45 |
| REFERENCES | 47 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Baker's taxonomy of non-equivalence at word level (1992)..... | 10 |
| Table 2: Vietnamese personal pronouns (Thanh Ngo, 2006) | 16 |
| Table 3: Addressing terms used among Vietnamese family members (Duong, 1999) | 17 |
| Table 4: Kinship terms used in social interaction (Duong, 1999)..... | 18 |
| Table 5: Selected categories and examples about Cultural Concepts..... | 21 |
| Table 6: Individualism Index Values among nations (as adapted from Hofstede , 2000) | 22 |

ABSTRACT

This study primarily investigates the problem of non-equivalence at word level in translation between English and Vietnamese which is observed as the weakness of the majority of students in English Department – Hanoi University.

The paper aims at, first and foremost, presenting rationale, background knowledge and different approaches relate to non-equivalence before contrasting some typical conceptual and lexical semantic fields to prove that there is a considerable linguistic gap between English and Vietnamese. Then the study will propose a classification of non-equivalence based on Mona Baker's theory. Eventually, the study also suggests several effective strategies to deal with non-equivalence at word level in translation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Mr. Nguyen Ngoc Tan, M.A, lecturer of the English Department, Hanoi University. This thesis could have probably not completed without his patient, enthusiastic and instructive supervision and encouragement.

Thanks are due to Mr. Bob Motsay, lecturer in English Department, whose constructive ideas and feedback have been invaluable during the process of revision.

I also would like to show my profound gratitude to all of the lecturers in the English Department of Hanoi University for tirelessly devoting time and efforts to enrich, broaden and deepen my knowledge over the past four years. My special thanks go as well to the English Department of Hanoi University for giving me the opportunity and permission to implement this thesis.

Besides, I am deeply indebted to my beloved family for their wholehearted support and encouragement. I also would like to dedicate my special thanks to my classmates in 11A – 06, who have supported, cooperated and provided me with valuable suggestions.

Finally, I cannot fully express my gratitude to all the people whose direct and indirect support assisted me to accomplish my thesis in time.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

The necessity of translation service is dramatically acute in our modern world. Not only do nations depend on it to bridge what would otherwise be an impossible communication gap, but it also accommodate human access to the wealth of global scientific and technology information, as well as to the ideas that shape our society. However, translation has never been an easy task, but truly an art which requires great efforts and proficiency of translators. Not surprisingly, the translator's role is, however, by no means a passive and mechanical one, and has also been compared to that of an artist. A translator must well-understand both languages, as well as the culture that he is to translate.

“Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language” (Newmark, 1981, p. 7). Translation consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text; analyzing it in order to determine its meaning; and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context.

Equivalence is one of the procedures used in translation. In his work on translation equivalence, Catford (1988) defined translation as the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in other language (TL). Translating consists of 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 (Nida & Taber, 1982). Halverson (1997) notes equivalence the relationship existing between two entities and the relationship is described the similarity in terms of any or a number of potential qualities. Pym (1992, p. 37), for one, has pointed to its circularity: equivalence is supposed to define translation, and translation, in turn, defines equivalence. The translators, by finding equivalence in translation can show the tentative nature of their assertions, invite the readers, as intelligent individuals, to join and decide which translation is accurately render the ideas, concepts and words of original text.

Generally, almost all translation scholars emphasize the role of equivalence in the process or product of translation directly or indirectly. Therefore, it is in the center of the translation studies. It must be said that much ink has been devoted to the problem of non-equivalence in translation which shed light on many studies. As a consequence, the nature of non-equivalence, its taxonomy and strategies tackling non-equivalence at word level, the basic unit of meaning, will be clearly clarified in this paper.

1.2. Aims of the study

Firstly, the study aims at stressing the significance of equivalence in translation process, as well as, raising reader's awareness on the matter of non-equivalence. The author will start with a brief literature review on previous researches and studies about this topic as a good way to provide readers background knowledge, ideas and approaches made by famous world scholars. This section demonstrates international linguistic community's concern over cross linguistic non-equivalence and worldwide efforts in addressing this challenging issue. Interestingly, equivalence is still a controversy topic when a group of researchers has argued its necessity; nevertheless, the debate provides us many useful ideas and viewpoints taken from different lens.

Secondly, the study proposes non-equivalence taxonomy and some acknowledged tactics to deal with the problem at word level. As classifying non-equivalence to different types, the author will help the readers better understand the problem before suggesting relevant strategies to cope with it. The study aims at providing a set of strategies which can solve almost all problems founded in English –Vietnamese situation. Moreover, the study also introduces some useful exercises for reader's further practicing and researching.

1.3. Scope and significance

Interestingly, the study will not only analyze linguistic but also consider cultural perspective as important factors causing non-equivalence in translation. It is easy to see cultural gap has always been a barrier among languages. It is also desirable that the paper will give the reader a comprehensive view on the phenomenon, which, later, can be served as reference for students who want to get basic understanding or to develop their own study on the same problem.

Furthermore, word level is the focus of the study since word is the basic unit of meaning in linguistic. Properly addressing non-equivalence at this level will pave the way for the success in the fight against non-equivalence at higher level (colloquial, sentence, paragraph etc.) In view of the complexity of non-equivalence and the limited space of this paper, the author will have to confine the discussion only to non-equivalence at word level instead of the full treatment of non-equivalence at various levels, such as at syntactic or even textual one.

1.4. Organization of the study

In this paper, the author is going to clarify the concept of translation equivalence and classify the problem of non-equivalence at word level so as to find strategies for handling it.

The thesis starts with Chapter One, which provides the background, purposes as well as the scope, significance and organization of the study, followed by Chapter Two, which provides some rationales and, at the same time, reviews several different points of view relate to the concept of translation equivalence before summarizing and choosing one of the viewpoint that the researcher will take as the basis for the whole thesis. In Chapter Three, the author will contrast some concepts and lexical semantic fields to prove the existence of non-equivalence between English and Vietnamese, then introduce taxonomy of the non-equivalence problem while Chapter Four concentrates on the strategies to deal with non-equivalence classified in the previous chapter. The thesis ends with providing some suggestions on exercises and a brief conclusion for the whole study.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

Interlingual translation has never been an easy task. Much ink has flown on discussing the term equivalence in translation. It has sometimes been said that the overriding purpose of any translation should be to achieve equivalent effect, i.e. to produce the same effect on the readership of the translation as was obtained on the readership of the original. Will (1982) acknowledges the concept of translation equivalence (TE) as the “essential issue not only in translation theory, over the last 2000 years, but also in modern translation studies” (p.134). He even emphasizes that “there is hardly any other concept in translation theory which has produced as many contradictory statements and has set off as many attempts at an adequate, comprehensive definition as the concept of TE” (p.134).

2.2. Overview on translation equivalence

2.2.1. The concept of translation equivalence

Numerous linguistic scholars recognized the importance of seeking a proper equivalence during translation process. J. C. Catford defines translation equivalence with his notable statement: “Translation equivalence occurs when an SL (source language) and TL (target language) texts or items are related to (at least some of) the same relevant features of situation substance.”(as cited in Broek, 1978).

As defined by Halverson (1997), equivalence is the relationship existing between two entities, and the relationship is described as one of similarity in terms of any of a number of potential qualities.

J. House (1997) states the notion of equivalence is the conceptual basis of translation. Catford (1965) also shares “the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL equivalents and the central task of translation theory is therefore that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence” (p. 21).

2.2.2. Different theories of equivalence

Translation has been studied by many scholars from different notions of view. Some of translation scholars defined their theories a source-oriented theory, others regarded the target-oriented theories. These theorists have studied equivalence in relation to the translation process, using a variety of approaches, namely quantitative and qualitative approach; however, all translation theories are related to the notion of equivalence in one way or another. Not surprisingly, equivalence plays a crucial role in translation which is the matter of establishing equivalence between S.L and T.L.

2.2.2.1 Quantitative approach

Kade (1968) and Hann (1992), regarding lexical equivalence, divided equivalence into 4 categories. The first type is one - to - one equivalence, when a single expression in the TL for a single SL expression is used. The second one is one - to - many equivalence; when more than one TL expression for a single SL expression is used. Thirdly, when a TL expression covers part of a concept designated by a single SL expression, the phenomenon is called one - to - part - of - one equivalence. Lastly, nil equivalence happens when there is no TL expression for an SL expression.

2.2.2.2 Qualitative approach

Many scholars dedicated themselves to study TE under qualitative approach. Among thousands of paper works on this, some has become the famous and reliable foundations for the latter studies. To date, there have been 3 subdivisions under qualitative approach including: function-based, meaning-based and form-based approach. Eugene A. Nida, Koller and Baker are three linguistic researchers are credited as the founders of these above approaches with their major works of the time.

2.2.2.2.1 Function-based equivalence

Eugene A. Nida (1964) argues that there are two different types of equivalence, including *formal equivalence*- which, in the second edition, is referred to as formal correspondence and

dynamic equivalence. Formal correspondence focuses attention on both form and content (as in Bible, international diplomacy, law and the like) unlike dynamic equivalence emphasizes the text readability.

Formal correspondence consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. Nida stresses that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. Dynamic equivalence is a translation principle in which a translator translates the meaning of the original text; producing the same impact on the original wording did upon the ST audience.

Nida (1964) believes that the main aim of equivalent effect is to achieve "the closest natural equivalent to the source language" (p.126). He stresses that the adaptation of grammar, cultural references and lexicon of the ST will lead to the translation naturalness while highlighting the preservation of the text meaning on its style as the root of the equivalent effects. He argues that formal translators who focus more on forms are more likely to misinterpret the "intention of the author" and "distort the meaning" (p. 191-192).

2.2.2.2.2 Meaning-based equivalence

Werner Koller (1977) proposes five levels of equivalence, namely '**denotative, connotative, text-normative, pragmatic and formal equivalence**'. It is noteworthy that Koller's formal equivalence is different from Nida's. As cited in Mehrach (1997, p.14) and Munday (2001, p. 47), Koller distinguishes five types of equivalence as follow: '**denotative equivalence**' refers to the case where the ST and the TT have the same denotations, that is conveying the same extra linguistic facts; '**connotative equivalence**', also referred to as 'stylistic equivalence', is related to the lexical choices between near synonyms; '**text normative**' refers to text types, i.e., the description and analysis of a variety of texts behaving differently; '**pragmatic equivalence**', also called 'communicative equivalence', is oriented towards the receptor of the text, as he should receive the same effect that the original text produces on its readers; '**formal equivalence**', may also be referred to as '**expressive equivalence**', is related to the word-for-word rendition of forms, aesthetic and stylistic features of the ST.

2.2.2.2.3 Form-based equivalence

Baker (1992) proposes five levels of equivalence: *equivalence at word level*, *equivalence above word level*, *grammatical equivalence*, *textual equivalence*, *pragmatic equivalence*. Firstly, *equivalence at word level* is taken into consideration. Baker defines the term “word” and notes that word sometimes have different meanings in different languages, and relates meaning of words with morpheme. Baker introduces problems at word level and above word level before suggesting some strategies in dealing with them. Secondly, *grammatical equivalence* refers to the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. She affirms that grammatical rules across languages may differ, which lead to some problems in finding a direct correspondence in the TL. Thirdly, *textual equivalence* refers to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text regarding information and cohesion. Whether the cohesive relations between TL and SL should be maintained depends on three main factors, that is, the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type. Finally, *pragmatic equivalence* refers to implication of the TL text. The duty of a translator is recognizing the implied meaning of SL text, and then reproducing it in a way that readers of the TL can comprehend clearly without any misunderstanding culturally.

2.3 The problem of non-equivalence

The problem of non-equivalence has been drawing the attention of many researchers. Jakobson claims that "there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code units" (as cited in Munday, 2001). Jakobson also explains the differences between structures, terminology, grammar and lexical forms of languages are the main reasons of non-equivalence. Jacobson states that "equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics." (as cited in Munday, 2001). In his theory, the general principle of cross-language difference and the concept ‘*semantic field*’ has been established.

Catford (1996) found that there are two factors which affected the equivalence i.e. *linguistic and cultural factors*, leading to two kinds of equivalents i.e. linguistic and cultural equivalents. This finding of Caford is very significant because it consists of both important approaches toward equivalence, namely, linguistic and cultural approaches. On the contrary, there were

some arguments against Catford theory. Snell-Hornby (1988) claims that textual equivalence introduced by Catford is “circular” and his examples are “isolated and even absurdly simplistic” (p. 19-20). Furthermore, she criticizes equivalence in translation is an illusion because there are many aspects, including textual, cultural and situational ones, get involved in the equivalent degree of the translation. House (1977) also agrees that not only functional but situation factor need to be taken into consideration during the process of translation.

Equivalent effect, as judged by Newmark, is “the desirable result, rather than the aim of any translation” (p.134). Accordingly, the equivalent effect is a result which all translators long to achieve. Further, Newmark (1988) argues that the text may reach a 'broad equivalent effect' only if it is 'universal' that means cross culture share common ideas.

2.3.1 Non-equivalence at word level

Among many approaches introduced above, Mona Baker was the most outstanding theorist dramatically focusing on equivalence at word level since, as being claimed by her, word is the basic unit to be considered in meaning of translation text. Her analysis on word level is particularly clear, easy to comprehend.

It is undeniable that Mona Baker’s theory on non-equivalence at word level is universally supported by a great number of famous linguistic scholars and researchers. Firstly, Haliday (1985) strongly stresses the importance of seeking for equivalence at word level by the famous saying “meanings are realized through words, and without a theory of wordings, there is no way of making explicit one’s interpretation of the meaning of the text” (p.17). Additionally, in the book *To Mean or Not to Mean*, the theorist Monia Bayar (2007) also appreciates the significance of word level equivalence by affirming that equivalence “designates an area of correspondence ranging around the word” (p.163). She even involves the roles of lower units such as the phoneme or the morpheme.

Roger. T. Bell (1991) is another notable researcher to mention equivalence at word level. She also figures out that there is no word equivalence among languages since even in the same language there is no absolute synonym between words. Newmark (1991) agrees “it is

impossible to expect perfect translation equivalence between SL word and its TL correspondent” (p.100). He emphasizes that between the two words that are deemed to be correspondents, one always covers more ground in meaning than the other, leading to the problem of non equivalence at word level.

In addition, Catford (1996) is another famous researcher who stresses on the equivalence at word level. He started with categorized translation regarding three perspectives: the extent of translation (full translation versus partial translation); the grammatical rank at which the translation equivalence is established (rank bound translation vs. unbounded translation); the levels of language involved in translation (total translation vs. restricted translation). Carford notes that in rank-bound translation an equivalent is sought in the TL for each word, or for each morpheme encountered in the ST.

It is noteworthy that Vanessa Leonardi (2000) introduces Baker’s theory as “an extremely interesting discussion of the notion of equivalence” (p. 7). As appraised in Leonardi’s paper, Baker has provided “a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined”. The author particularly compliments levels of Baker’s approach as “putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach” and agrees that in a bottom-up approach to translation, equivalence at word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator.

Particularly, in his study, namely *Translation Equivalence and Different Theories*, Ghadi (n.d.) strongly focuses on Mona Baker non equivalence at word level and take it as the basic theory before addressing the word non-equivalence between English and Persian. In his writing, non-equivalence at word level of Baker is thoroughly introduced and analyzed relative to other approaches as a way to confirm the validity and soundness of the theory.

Last but not least, Magdalena, P. M. (2005) accommodates the readers with a considerably comprehensive analysis on Baker’s theory on non-equivalence at word level before attempting to address specific problematic words and expressions between English and Polish. The paper strongly corroborates Baker’s theory by working on every problems and strategies of non-equivalence at word level and rationally provides the pros and cons of each. All in all, the

pertinence of Baker's theory has been critically recognized. As a brief introduction, the following table will present common problems of non-equivalence at word level as specified by Mona Baker.

| Non - Equivalence At Word Level | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----|--|
| 1 | Culture - specific concepts | 7 | Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective |
| 2 | The source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language | 8 | Differences in expressive meaning |
| 3 | The source language word is semantically complex | 9 | Differences in form |
| 4 | The source and target language make different distinctions in meaning | 10 | Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific forms |
| 5 | The target language lacks a superordinate term | 11 | The use of loan words in the source text |
| 6 | The target language lacks a specific term (hyponym) | | |

Table 1: Baker's taxonomy of non-equivalence at word level (1992)

2.3.2 Recent studies on Non-equivalence at word level

Ghadi (2009) has written a particular interesting study analyzing equivalence at word level in the English technical text and the translations in Persian. After reviewing some of the important theories on equivalence, he has chosen Baker's theory as the foundation to study *the use of strategies by expert and non-expert*. From the original dental text book (in English), 120 significant words were drawn by systematic random sampling procedure. The original English dental book consists of 24 chapters and from each chapter 5 words were randomly drawn to come up with 120 words.

The result of Ghadi study is very useful since it strongly show the frequency of use for each strategies introduced by Baker. Accordingly, translating by a general term, the use of loan word and loan word plus explanation are the leading strategies applied by both the expert and non-expert. Unfortunately, the author did not provide the reason or explanation for this preference and why the other strategies are less used.

In the article “Translation-Strategies Use: A Classroom-Based Examination of Baker’s Taxonomy”, Giménez (2005) explores *the use of strategies by undergraduate*. The study evaluates student’s translation from English to Spanish. An experiment was conducted among 160 third-year students of English Studies who supposed to be at upper-intermediate or advanced level of English. Those students were provided a prior instruction about basic concepts on equivalence and Mona Baker’s categories as well as a variety of strategies to solve non-equivalence.

Giménez (2005) notes that translation using a related word; translation by paraphrase using unrelated words and translation by omission seem to be favored by Spanish native speakers. According to the study, Spanish students did not use strategies such as translation by a more general word and translation by cultural substitution while their English classmates did not use the following strategies: translation using a loan word or a loan word plus an explanation, and translation by cultural substitution. It was concluded that all the students failed to use cultural substitution. Regarding the failure of the students, the author explains that the students at that level of translation training are not qualified enough to master the use of given strategies though they tried to apply provided strategies when exposing to difficult situations. Above all, the study reaffirms the accuracy and pertinence of Baker’s strategy taxonomy

In summary, Mona Baker’s categories of non-equivalence at word level and strategies to address the problem has been corroborated and strongly recognized by many linguistic theorists and researchers. Its application is not restricted only in the profession of translation but also in university training thanks to its soundness and comprehensibility. As observed in English Department-Hanoi University, senior students also share the weakness in dealing with non-equivalence, especially at word level in English – Vietnamese translation. Moreover, the majority unaware of the matter of non-equivalence, hence, is incapable of tackling it. Under this circumstance, this study will take Baker’s taxonomy of non-equivalence at word level and strategies as the basement of analysis. It is the fact that almost all of the previous study dedicated to analyze the non-equivalence of English and some other frequently used language such as Spanish, German, Chinese, and Arabic etc. It is noteworthy that, in this paper, Baker’s theory will be applied in such a way that truly reflexes the problem of English-Vietnamese translation which has not been deeply explored.

CHAPTER THREE: THE STUDY

In this chapter, in the first half, the author examines some typical English – Vietnamese conceptual and lexical semantic fields so as to prove the existence of remarkable differences between English and Vietnamese. That could be considered as the premise for further analysis and discussion in the study. Since there are too many differences between two languages, the occurrence of non-equivalence in translation is inevitable. It is noteworthy that all the discussion from this section will take the word level as the main focus.

Afterward, a classification of the non-equivalence at word level between English and Vietnamese will be proposed based on the form-based approach of Mona Baker. Baker (1992) categorizes some of the problems of non-equivalence at word level as well as introduces strategies used by professional translators. This study desires to apply Baker taxonomy and strategies in a wise adaptation to English- Vietnamese circumstance.

3.1. Selected English – Vietnamese word level conceptual and lexical semantic contrastive analysis

3.1.1. Word level conceptual contrastive analysis

3.1.1.1 Concept on kinship

English uses the suffix **-in-law** to refer to relatives related by marriage, as in the *evil mother-in-law* and the *ungrateful daughter-in-law*. But there is no distinction about whether that is husband or wife's side while Vietnamese does have the clear separation among “*mẹ chồng*”, “*mẹ vợ*”, “*bố chồng*”, “*bố vợ*”, “*anh chồng*”, “*anh vợ*”, “*chị chồng*”, “*chị vợ*”, “*em chồng*”, “*em vợ*”

English uses the prefix **step-** to refer to relatives related only by re-marriage, not blood, as in the *evil stepmother* and the *ungrateful stepdaughter*, for instance. It also uses the prefix *half-* to refer to children who share only one parent (*half-brother* and *half-sister*). It is easy to see the difference between “step brother” and “half brother” in English. i.e. a “half” brother or sister

shares one parent biologically; a "step" brother or sister is by marriage, with no blood relation. That discrimination is absent in Vietnamese since there is no concrete name for those kinship.

For the term “*aunt*”, Vietnamese makes a distinction depending on whether it involves a paternal aunt or a maternal one. Accordingly, the word “*cô*” (father’s young sister) or “*đì*” (mother’s young sister) will be used in different situations. English fails to make this distinction of relationship in the sense that they do not indicate whether it involves a maternal or paternal aunt. It uses a general term for the two and can therefore not be considered as total equivalents of the Vietnamese terms. Likewise, there is a distinction between “*chú*” (father’s younger brother) and “*cậu*” (mother’s younger brother) in Vietnamese. Still in the same domain, let’s consider the term “*bác*” in Vietnamese. The term is quite vague since it may refer to father’s or mother’s older sister or brother.

Vietnamese pronouns differentiate seniority for relatives more clearly than English pronouns do. The children of one's parents' older siblings are called “*anh họ*” and “*chị họ*”, the children of one's parents' younger siblings are called “*em họ*”. These pronouns apply regardless of whether “*chị họ*”, is much younger than oneself. That shows that one has less seniority than one's “*anh họ*” or “*chị họ*” and more seniority than one's “*em họ*”. English, in comparison, only has the one word “*cousin*” to collectively describe the children of all of one's parents' siblings without differentiating seniority or sex.

Moreover, Vietnamese kinship terms distinguish between *blood relations* and *in-law status* include “*thím*” (aunt or wife of father’s younger brother), and “*mợ*” (aunt or wife of mother’s younger brother).

Undoubtedly, there might be quite a few other cases demonstrating the differences between English and Vietnamese kinship terms , nevertheless, it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed account of all the kinship terms available .

3.1.1.2. Concept referring to color

Regarding color, according to Berlin and Kay (1969), there are eleven basic colour in English, i.e. "black," "white," "red," "green," "yellow," "blue," "brown," "orange," "pink," "purple" and "gray." However, in Vietnamese, there are just 7 basic ones, including green, red, white, violet, yellow, brown, black. In English there is a strong distinction between "**green**" and "**blue**" but in Vietnamese the word "xanh" can be used for both in many circumstances. For example, Vietnamese people say "đèn xanh" when talking about green traffic light instead of "đèn xanh lá cây". Another case is "trời xanh" referring to blue sky instead of "bầu trời màu xanh da trời". In many cases, in Vietnamese, there is no strict necessity to clearly clarify the level of darkness or lightness of color in detail. For instance, Vietnamese say "hoa cúc vàng" without wondering if the daisy is yellow or orange.

On the other hand, when Vietnamese have many specific word to refer different saturations of a single color, "tím" has many sub-divisions such as "*tím hồng, tím củ, tím hoa mơ, tím hoa cà, tím hoa sim*", "nâu" might be clarified as "*nâu gụ, nâu cánh gián*", "đỏ" can be specified as "*đỏ rực, đỏ tía, đỏ au, đỏ tươi, đỏ hồng*"; "trắng" can be "*trắng toát, trắng tinh, trắng đục, trắng hếu*".

3.1.1.3 Concept referring to temperature

In English there are 4 basic words about temperature, i.e. hot, cold, cool, warm, while in Vietnamese there are also 4 words: "nóng, ấm, mát, and lạnh". Two words "hot" and "cold" is the two extreme of the temperature and that is the same for "nóng, lạnh" in Vietnamese. However, "ấm" and "mát" can not be understood as "warm" and "cool" in English. The word "**warm**" in English can imply the comfort and discomfort of the climate whereas the word "ấm" in Vietnamese always convey the good feeling from the speaker.

Example: Source text: Mặc thêm cái áo len vào cho ấm !

Target text: Wrap yourself warm with this sweater!

Depends on different cases, “warm” might be translated as “*nóng*” or “*ấm*”, as illustrated in the following examples.

Example: Source text: It’s getting warm in here.

Target text: Ở đây bắt đầu hơi nóng rồi đấy.

Source text: It’s getting warmer today.

Target text: Xem ra hôm nay trời đã ấm dần lên.

When referring to the temperature, “cold” and “cool”, both, can be understood as “*nguội*” in Vietnamese. First, “nguội” with bad implication can be translated as “cold”.

Example: Source text: Ăn cơm đi kẻo thức ăn nguội.

Target text: Go ahead and eat, otherwise the food will get cold.

Source text: Không ăn đi để thức ăn nguội hết rồi!

Target text: The food will get cold if you don’t eat it now.

However, “nguội” with good implication can be translated as “cool” in English.

Example: Source text: Coi chừng! Để nguội rồi hãy ăn.

Target text: Be careful! Let the food cool a bit before you eat it.

3.1.1.4 Concepts from communication

It is interesting to examine the answers given to a negative question in English and Vietnamese. If the question is either positive or negative, but the answer is negative, the respondent will say “no” in English. However, that is totally different in Vietnamese. The answer is directly the reply for the negative or positive question; therefore, the answer “no” for a negative question will equal a positive response.

Example: “Don’t you want to go with us?”- “No” (means I do not want to go)

“Anh không muốn đi cùng chúng em à?” - “Không” (means I want to go)

3.1.2 Lexical semantic contrast

3.1.2.1 Pronouns

In the domain of the personal pronouns, Vietnamese has *more forms* than English does, as shown in Table 1. The use of Vietnamese personal pronouns pragmatically implies either intimacy/familiarity, among close friends of the same age, or a lack of deference and high degree of arrogance towards the addressee and/or third-party pronominal referent of superior age (Luong, 1990).

| Persons | | | Number |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|
| P1 (addressor) (English "I/we") | P2 (addressee) (English "you") | P3 (third person referent) (English "he, she, it/they") | |
| <i>tôi</i> | / | <i>Nó, hắn, y</i> | Singular |
| <i>tao</i> | <i>mày, mi</i> | | |
| <i>ta</i> | / | | |
| <i>Tớ</i> | / | | |
| <i>mình</i> | / | | |
| / | <i>mình</i> | | |
| <i>Chúng tôi</i> | / | <i>chúng nó, chúng, họ</i> | Plural |
| <i>Chúng tao</i> | <i>chúng mày, bay,</i> | | |
| <i>ta/ chúng ta</i> | <i>chúng bay</i> | | |
| <i>chúng tớ</i> | / | | |
| <i>mình, chúng mình</i> | / | | |

Table 2: Vietnamese personal pronouns (Thanh Ngo, 2006)

Another element related to lexical semantics is how Vietnamese and English speakers use words to make reference to persons or items in the world around them. Most Vietnamese

pronouns are kinship terms, and their use depends on the social context and the relationship between the speaker and listener (Luong, 1990).

Cháu Cù (great grand father/mother)
 Ông (grand father)
 Bà (grand mother)
 Bác (father's older brother/ sister)
 Bà (mother's older sister)
 Mợ (mother's younger brother's wife)
 Cậu (mother's younger brother's wife)
 Thím (father's younger brother's wife)
 Chú (father's younger brother)
 Chú (mother's younger sister's husband)
 Cô (father's younger sister)
 Dì (mother's younger sister)

| I | You |
|---|---|
| Con (son/daughter) | Bố (father) Mẹ (mother) |
| Em (younger sister or younger brother) | Anh (older brother) Chị (older sister) |

Table 3: Addressing terms used among Vietnamese family members (Duong, 1999)

Interestingly, Vietnamese hierarchical kinship system of pronouns is also applied to *outsiders*. Even though the listener is not a family member or relative, kinship terms are used as pronouns to address and refer to friends and unfamiliar interlocutors (Luong, 1990). One uses the appropriate pronouns depending on whether the person is the same age as oneself or one's grandparents, parents, children, or grandchildren. For example, for people older or of the same age as one's parents, the appropriate pronoun could be “*bác*”, meaning parent's older brother or sister. If the person is younger than one's parents, the appropriate pronoun could be “*chú*” or “*cô*”, meaning father's younger brother or sister. People of the same age as one's grandparents can be called “*ông*”, “*bà*”, or “*cù*”, which are various pronouns for grandparents and great-grandparents. For example, a person who is approximately the age of one's uncle or aunt could be addressed as *chú* or *cô*, respectively. In addition, the way in which one addresses himself or herself depends on the listener's age and status. For instance, when meeting someone approximately the age of one's aunt or uncle, it is common to address oneself as *cháu*

“niece/nephew” in the northern dialect or *con* “son/daughter” in southern dialect. When meeting someone approximately the age of one’s older sister, one may address himself or herself as *em* “younger sibling” and address the speaker as *chị* “older sister.” It is common to address the listener with pronouns that indicate an older age as a sign of respect (Luong, 1990); typically, the older the age, the higher the status.

| 1 st person | Con | Cháu | Em | Chị | Anh | Cô | Cậu | Chú | Bác | Ông | Bà | Cụ |
|------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2 nd person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| + Con | | | | | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Cháu | | | | | | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |
| Em | | | | (+) | (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Chị | | | (+) | | | + | + | + | | | | |
| Anh | | | (+) | | | + | + | + | | | | |
| Cô | + | (+) | + | | | + | + | + | | | | |
| Cậu | + | (+) | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Chú | + | (+) | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Bác | + | (+) | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Ông | + | (+) | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Bà | + | (+) | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Cụ | + | (+) | | | | | | | | | | |
| (+) Tôi | | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |

Table 4: Kinship terms used in social interaction: exact (+); not exact + (Duong, 1999)

On the contrary, English pronouns are not dependent on the social or personal relationship between the speaker and listener, nor do they indicate age or status.

Apart from personal pronouns and kinship terms, Vietnamese people also use status terms (occupational titles); e.g., *đồng chí* (comrade), *giáo sư* (professor), or *bác sĩ* (doctor), *sếp* (boss) and personal names as modes of address and reference. In Vietnamese, status terms and personal names are used to address others and to refer to oneself more commonly than in English.

3.1.2.2 Classifiers

Vietnamese has a group of words which not found in English—classifiers. The two most common classifiers in Vietnamese indicate animacy i.e. *con* as in “con gấu”(bear) and inanimacy i.e. *cái* as in “cái ghế” (chair). Besides, there are Vietnamese words that classify the shape and size of objects such as *cây* (long and slender) in “cây vàng”(long piece of gold), *cuốn* (long and cylindrical) in “cuốn phim” (camera film), and *mảnh* (small piece) in “mảnh vải”(small piece of cloth).” According to K. L. Nguyen (2004), there are also words that indicate a set or group of objects such as *bộ, nhóm, đàn* in *bộ chén* (set of dishes), *nhóm người* (group of people), and *đàn bò* (herd of cows) or *đàn vịt* (flock of geese)

3.1.2.3 Word Formation

Another difference between English and Vietnamese is reduplication as a way to form new word. Vietnamese frequently uses reduplication across word classes of verbs, adjectives, and nouns whereas reduplication rarely occurs in English and is primarily used in words that reflect sounds or noises such as “click clack” (Thompson, 1965).

In general, when a verb is repeated, this reduplication indicates movement. For instance, *vẫy* (*tay*) can be reduplicated to indicate a repetitive nodding motion: *vẫy vẫy* (*tay*). As for the case of adjectives, reduplication can imply a lesser degree of a quality. For example, one can imply that a girl is not as pretty as previously thought: *Cô ta xinh* “She is pretty” versus *Cô ta xinh xinh* “She is kind of (or less) pretty.” Color terms such as “green,” *xanh*, can have a lighter shade by reduplicating the word, *xanh xanh*. Certain nouns can be reduplicated to indicate reoccurrence or multiple instances such as *ngày ngày* “day day,” which implies many days or all days (C. T. Nguyen, 1999; G. T. Nguyen, 2003).

Also in reduplication, Vietnamese has the unique form in which people add the combination “-iếc” into the word ending, as in “sách iếc, bút biếc, phở phiếc, cà phê cà phiếc etc.”. Certainly, there is no such phenomenon in English word formation.

Summarily, as illustrated in the contrastive analysis between English –Vietnamese conceptual and lexical semantic perspective, there is a big gap between Vietnamese and English language which it is strongly proved that non-equivalence will definitely a fact every translator, sooner or latter, will experience. In other word, the principle that a translation should have an absolute equivalence relation with the source language text is problematic. As clearly clarified above, English and Vietnamese have many differences in concepts, in word usage and word formation which lead to the non-equivalence at word level of the two languages. This problem is especially focused by Mona Baker in the book *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation* (1992) with a sound explanation and discussion. Therefore this paper will take her arguments as a strong foundation of analysis but dedicate to English –Vietnamese translation.

3.2 Classification of non-equivalence at word level

3.2.1. No equivalent words between 2 languages, especially culture- specific concepts. The source language word expresses a concept totally unknown in target language.

It is obviously difficult for one to translate a word in English into Vietnamese and vice versus once it does not exist in the target language. It is a Herculean task for a translator when he has to transfer a concept that people of TL has never heard about. Cultural concept is not the only but the most common case in which a translator is likely to introduce an exotic concept to people of TL.

Not surprisingly, no matter how excellent a translator can be in terms of both linguistic and cultural backgrounds, there are always concepts that cannot be translated from one language to another. This phenomenon has been defined as “cultural untranslatability” by a great number of international researchers and scholars.

It is noteworthy that “cultural untranslatability” is likely to happen due to so many differences between Western and Oriental culture, in general, and English and Vietnamese culture, in particular. In addition, geographical features, history, and development level of two nations contains many distinctive points generating certain concepts that can not be translated in a way

that Vietnamese people can easily comprehend. Culture is something which can not be conveyed through words. All of these lead to the loss of meaning in translation process.

When comparing English and Vietnamese, it is quite easy to figure out many cultural terms that are absent in the other. Some non-equivalent cultural categories which are considered hurdles by many inexpert are listed in table 6 as a quick review. Each category is supported with several examples. In fact, there are many other categories in cultural field that can confuse a translator when seeking for an absolute equivalence.

| Categories | English | Vietnamese |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Food and drink | Meat pie Continental breakfast Vegemite Pizza Sandwich | Bánh trôi Bánh tét Bánh ướt Bún thang Chè kho |
| House and furniture | Manor Bungalow Cupboard | Nhà sàn Tủ chè |
| Clothes | Balaclava, Sneakers | Áo Tứ thân, Áo dài |
| Political regime | Shadow Cabinet, Front Benchers House of Representatives | Chủ Tịch Ủy Ban Hành Pháp Trung Ương, Bí Thư Thành Ủy |
| Occupation | Access And Equity, Drag Queens | Nghề Bán Cháo Phở, Quân tử |
| Traditional practices | Muckup Day, New Year's Resolution | Tết Hàn Thục Cây Nêu Câu Đố |
| Ethical issues | Fair Go, Wife Swapping; | Sợ Vợ Chữ hiếu Tiết Hạnh |

Table 5: Selected categories and examples about Cultural Concepts

Vu (2007) takes the cultural difference between Western and Oriental society and among nations as the root of linguistic untranslatability. Tropical monsoon climate, complex geographical position, and long traditional water rice agriculture are the elements creating Vietnamese

culture. Therefore, words related to rice processing (*gieo mạ, làm cỏ, gầu giai, gầu sòng, bón thúc, bón đón đông, xay, giã, giần, sàng, thúng, mủng, nong, nia, sọt, gạo tẻ, nếp cẩm, tám xoan, tằm, cám, trấu; bánh đa, bánh đúc, bánh chưng, bánh dày, bánh giò, bánh khúc, bánh cốm...*); marriage procedure (*dạm ngõ, ăn hỏi, thách cưới, nộp cheo...*), beliefs and religions (*đình, chùa, miếu, am, phủ, điện thờ, bàn thờ, ngai, bài vị, mẫu thuẫn, chúa thượng ngàn...*) are very popular to Vietnamese but quite exotic to foreigners.

Another typical cultural difference between English and Vietnamese is individualism. In some cultures, individualism is seen as a blessing and a source of well-being; in others, it is seen as alienating. In his publication, Hofstede exhibits 'Individualism Index Values (IDV) for 50 countries and three regions, but due to the limited space, this paper will extract a part of it.

| Country | IDV | Country | IDV |
|----------------|-----|-------------|-----|
| USA | 91 | Philippines | 32 |
| Australia | 90 | Malaysia | 26 |
| Great Britain | 89 | Hong Kong | 25 |
| Canada | 80 | Chile | 23 |
| Netherlands | 80 | West Africa | 20 |
| New Zealand | 79 | Singapore | 20 |
| Italy | 76 | Thailand | 20 |
| Brazil | 38 | Equador | 8 |
| Arab countries | 38 | Guatemala | 6 |

Table 6: Individualism Index Values among nations (as adapted from Hofstede , 2000)

This table does not provide Vietnam's index, however, other Southeast Asia's index can reveal a meaningful interpretation. The IDVs for Southeast Asia nations are far lower than the average, and the United States, Australia and Great Britain have a high degree of individualism.

That explains why a normal word i.e. “privacy” which is used with high frequency in English might cause big trouble when being translated into Vietnamese. In western countries where

individualism is a social common value, personal privacy is of prime importance. In English, the word “privacy” describes the right to keep their personal matters and relationships secret (Cambridge Advance Learner Dictionary, 2008). In other words, a personal life, business, and document, information must be respected and not interfered. Unfortunately, in Vietnamese there is no concept which directly denotes this since in Oriental culture, collectivism is strongly appreciated.

Political regime is one of the lexical sets that include a great number of incongruous pairs. The word “*Speaker*” extracted from the title “Speaker of the House” in British or the United State Houses is translated as “Chủ Tịch Hạ Viện” in Vietnamese. The Speaker is a leadership position in the majority party and actively works to set that party's legislative agenda. When translated as “Chủ Tịch” in Vietnamese, the word “Speaker” is misunderstood as occupying the strongest power of the House and he/she is the one to make the final decisions. Nevertheless, in many nations, especially those with the Westminster system of government, the position of speaker, modeled after the Speaker of the British House of Commons, is ideally scrupulously politically neutral. In other word, the Speaker is the person to negotiate and manage the House's debate.

Another case in Ethical Issues field is the word “*tiết hạnh*” which indicate the morality, the faithfulness of a wife to her husband even though he is alive or not. In Vietnamese this word does not only refer to the sexual relationship but also the honesty and morality of a woman, which can not be conveyed through the word “chastity” in English. Since the day couples make the religious vow, according to Confucianism, the women must be totally loyal to their husband and even can not build up or express desire to others. A spinster who has never been married can not have sexual relationship with anyone to protect their virgin and their reputation.

In Vietnamese, the word “*hiếu*” refer to the responsibility of children to their parents even when they are alive or pass away. As a young child, one must obey one's parents. When they are old, one must take care of them. After they pass away, one must honor their memory by worshipping them. At all times, a child should be grateful to his or her parents for raising and teaching them. Generally speaking, it not only the responsibility but also the way of caring and

showing loves to one's parents especially when their parents are getting old. It is hard to find a relevant word to describe this concept in English. The reason is that western culture emphasizes the children independence right in the early age, so that when people are mature, their relationship with parents is not as close as those in Oriental society. It is nothing wrong when elderly people in Western nations lives in nursering homes but it is strongly disapproved in Asia where children are expected to be the shoulders for their ancestors. The closest translation for the word “hiếu” might be “filial piety”.

“Continental breakfast” is another challenge for English- Vietnamese translator since it is an unknown concept in Vietnamese. In fact, a typical “continental Breakfast” consists of croissants, or bread, some marmalade, and coffee or tea. A "Continental Breakfast" is a lighter option in comparison to a Full English Breakfast, which is usually greasy, fried foods and quite meat heavy. It is impossible to find a Vietnamese equivalent for this term.

“Stakeholder” is translated by English- Vietnamese dictionary as “người giữ tiền đặt cược”. However, when considering a sentence “On the eve of his departure for the US and Brazil, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh on Friday said that India was a important stakeholder in the endeavor to address the challenges of nuclear security, terrorism”, people do not see any link between the word and the above Vietnamese translation. The translation “người giữ tiền đặt cược” will misinterpret the true meaning of original text.

“Collect call” is a telephone call that the receiving party is asked to pay for. It is a normal concept in English but quite exotic in Vietnamese society. Vietnamese people only get used to the practice that the caller will be the one to pay phone fee. Thereby, it is impossible to find its perfect Vietnamese equivalent.

3.2.2. Concepts are known but no equivalent words in TL. The source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language.

The concept **“quân tử”** describes a talented and straight forward man who possess many good quality in accordance with Confucian. There is no equivalent word in English. In case one has

to translate it into English, he might have to use the word “gentleman” but it does not truly match with each other as “gentleman” means a man who is polite and behaves well towards other people, especially women or a man of a high social class (Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary, 2008). So the soundness of this transference is restricted in certain circumstances.

Besides, in English there is a concept named “*de facto relationship*” which is not lexicalized in Vietnamese. In fact, in Vietnam this concept exists for long but Vietnamese words and phrases (i.e. bà bé, bà nhỏ, lấy vợ bé) can not convey the whole meaning of the English one. “De facto relationship” means marriage without legal certificate. As defined in Australian law of property, a de facto relationship covers all relationships between two adults (over the age of 18) who live together as a couple; and are not married; and are not siblings or a parent or child of each other.

3.2.3. The target language lacks a superordinate. It may have a specific word but no general word.

Mona Baker (1992) proposes the necessity to group vocabulary in a language into some conceptual fields. She states that *semantic fields* are the division “imposed by a given linguistic community on the continuum of experiences” (Baker, 1992, p. 18). She introduces some certain semantic fields such as “SPEECH, PLANTS, VEHICLES, DISTANCE, SIZE, SHAPE, TIME, EMOTION, BELIEFS, ACADEMIC SUBJECTS, and NATURAL PHENOMENA”. In addition, *lexical sets* are “the actual words and expressions under each field” (Baker, 1992, p.18). Baker continues with clarifying the hierarchy of semantic fields, from the more general words, namely *superordinate*, to the more specific i.e. *hyponym*. For example, in the field of FURNITURE, FURNITURE is a superordinate and table, desk, chair, cabinet, bookshelves, armchair, couch, cupboard, hammock, sofa, rug, etc.

“*Problems*” is an extraordinarily frequently used word in English but it might be a puzzle for English – Vietnamese translator since there are a great number of Vietnamese words nominated to be equivalence but each of them owns a slightly different connotation. It does have a list of Vietnamese words which can be thought of such as “vấn đề (issues), vấn nạn/tệ nạn (irregularities), khó khăn (difficulties), trở ngại (obstacles), trục trặc (as in mechanical troubles), biến chứng (complications), thắc mắc (queries). “Problems” can, however, be translated as “chứng”. “Breathing problems” should be translated as “chứng khó thở”.

Similarly, "*rice*" can be interpreted as "mạ, lúa, thóc, gạo, com, cốm, bỏng" in Vietnamese depending on whether one is planting it, harvesting it, cooking it or eating it.

English does not have the general word for "*đàn*" in Vietnamese. English words that describe groups of animals are "herd (herb of cattle)," "flock (flock of geese)" and "school (school of fish)". It may be difficult for Vietnamese translators to use English vocabulary that consists of lexical-semantic distinctions which do not present in Vietnamese.

3.2.4. The target language lacks a hyponym

This phenomenon is noteworthy since it is likely to occur during a translation course. It is quite the opposite of the above case, which means in the T.L. there are not enough specific terms to illustrate words in the S.L. For example, a superordinate as the word "*house*" in English has plenty of subordinates such as "*bungalow, cottage,croft, chalet, lodge, hut, mansion, manor, villa, hall*" and in Vietnamese there are a number of words like "*nhà sàn, nhà tranh, nhà tranh vách đất, nhà lá, nhà ngói, nhà gạch, nhà vườn, biệt thự, vila, nhà chòi, túp lều, nhà trệt*". However, specific terms do not equally match each other, resulting in the non-equivalence between S.T and T.L.

Correspondingly, a semantic field "*cooking*" in English has many lexical sets such as "*boil, roast, bake, brew, stew, braise, simmer, poach, grill, seal, glaze, prick, brown*" but Vietnamese sets including "*luộc, xào, chiên, rang, bác, rán, tráng, rim, nướng, nướng vỉ, hấp, hấp cách thủy, hầm etc.*" do not completely go with its counterparts.

In Vietnamese there are at least fifteen hyponyms for a superordinate "*to wear*", but Vietnamese general term are absent. There many hyponyms to count such as "*để*" (as in "để tóc, râu"), *đi* (as in "đi giày, vớ, bít tất, hia, hài"), *mặc* (as in "mặc áo, quần"), *đội* (as in "đội nón, mũ, tóc giả"), *chít* (as in "chít khăn"), *đeo* (as in "đeo kính, nhẫn, dây chuyền, cà vạt"), *thắt* (as in "thắt dây lưng, càvạt"), *đánh* (as in "đánh phấn"), *thoa* (as in "thoa son, kem chống nắng"), *tô* (as in "tô son"), *bôi* (as in "bôi son, nước hoa"), *xức* (as in "xức thuốc, dầu"), *xịt* (as in "xịt

dầu thơm”), *đóng* (as in “đóng khố”). All the above Vietnamese hyponyms can be translated as “to wear” or “to put on”. “To put on” can not go with “hair” but “to put on a wig” is accepted. Besides, “to wear” can be replaced by “to apply” just in case “to apply makeup”.

As for the verb “*to carry*”, there are so many Vietnamese words can be thought of, such as “*đem, đưa, mang, vác, xách, đội, cõng, cầm, ôm, bồng, khiêng, gánh, quảy, đeo, đeo, chở, lai, thô, địu, bung, bê, kiệu, công kênh*”. Vietnamese word choice will be subject to what to be carried and how people carry it. For instance, *mang* means ‘to carry a general object’, *vác* means ‘to carry on one’s back’, *khiêng* means ‘to carry a heavy object’, *bồng bế* means ‘to carry (a child) on the side of one’s hip’, *xách* means ‘to carry an object with a handle’, and *bung* means ‘to carry with both hands and in front of one’s body’.

There are approximately seven Vietnamese specific words referring to the *lost* of something, i.e. “*mất, thua, lạc, thất, sụt, bại, chết*”. Therefore what is lost will determine the Vietnamese words to be used, for example one will use “*mất*” as in *mất tiền* (lose money), *mất bạn* (lose friends), *mất mặt* (lose face), *mất niềm tin* (lose faith) ; “*thua*” as in “*thua trận* (lose a battle), *thua cuộc* (lose a contest); “*lạc*” as in “*lạc đường* (get lost), *lạc hướng* (lose the direction); “*thất*” as in *thất tình* (lose one’s love), *thất vọng* (lose one’s hope); “*sụt*” as in *sụt cân* (lose weight); “*bại*” as in *bại trận* (lose a war)”, or “*chết*” (lose one’s life).

Another case is the noun “*áo*” in Vietnamese. In English there are over ten sub-divisions such as “*shirt, blouse, sweater, windcheater, pullover, cardigan, coat, jacket, slip, shawl, cape, smock, dress, tunic, etc.*”, however, Vietnamese words including “*áo sơ mi, áo lạnh, áo ấm, áo bông, áo choàng, áo tơi, áo dài*” are not enough to transfer meanings of its English counterpart.

Referring to *the state of producing light*, English made a clear distinction among *sparkle, glitter, glisten, glimmer, twinkle, shimmer* i.e. “*Sparkle*: To shine brightly with small many points of light ; *Glitter*: To shine brightly with many little flashes of light; *Glisten*: To shine from a wet surface; *Glimmer*: To shine with a faint unsteady light; *Twinkle*: To shine with a light that changes rapidly from bright to faint to bright again; *Shimmer*: To shine with a soft

light that seems to shake slightly”(Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary, 2008). A Vietnamese word for these might only be “lấp lánh”.

To describe *the moving of a part of body*, English propose many words such as shake, tremble, shiver, quiver, shudder i.e. “*Shake*: to move or make somebody or something move with short quick movements from side to side or up and down; *Tremble*: to shake slightly, usually because of coldness, fright ; *Shiver*: to shake suddenly because of coldness; *Quiver*: to shake slightly; to make a slight movement because of strong emotion; *Shudder*: to shake suddenly, violently with horror ,disgust”(Cambridge Dictionary, 2008). Vietnamese does not have enough hyponyms for each item.

3.2.5. Differences in expressive meaning

Another common problem a translator encounters is that at a time he translates a word which has different expressive meaning in S.L. and T.L. For example the word “*sexy*” in English means “attractive” which generally has a positive, complimentary meaning. On TV, it is used often. For example, on Star World Channel, the show “Grey’s Anatomy” is advertised as “better, funnier, and sexier.” For the show “American Idol”, they advertised it as having “the sexiest judges”. Nevertheless, in Vietnamese it means “khiêu gợi, gợi tình” (wearing erotically). Hence if in the sentence “You look so sexy today!” translators interpret that “Hôm nay em thật là khiêu gợi”, it might insult the listener and make her misunderstand the compliment of the speaker.

For Americans, a strong individual is a better one, someone who can "stand on his/her own two feet"; someone who stands out as an individual. For Vietnamese, a group member should not stand out. In fact, translating the word “*individual*” in the compliment in English, "She is a real individual!" to Vietnamese becomes an insult: “Cô ấy thực sự rất cá nhân”. This pejorative remark has the combined sense of: She is weird (different) and selfish (does what she wants without conforming others).

The word “*exotic*” is another example. It means “unusual and often exciting because of coming (or seeming to come) from a distant country” (Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary, 2008).

“Exotic” has a neutral or even positive meaning in most of the case. However, in Vietnamese, the adjective “ngoại lai” often convey a disapproving meaning. It refers to something which is not suitable or even against Vietnamese culture.

3.2.6. Differences in physical and interpersonal perspective

Baker (1992) notes that the TL may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the SL (p. 22). A word in English might conveys additional meanings relative to Vietnamese one, hence, it makes translators confused which words to be used properly provided that the context itself offers them enough detailed information. The physical perspective concerns the location of things or people in the context with others. For example, in English, “*come*” means getting closer to the place where the speaker is or is to be while “*go*” means getting away from the speaker. The same explanation for other pairs such as “take- bring” .Vietnamese does not make such a distinction.

“Interpersonal perspective draws the attention to the relationship among participants in the discourse” (Baker, 1992, p. 23). For example, with word “*to give*”, Vietnamese makes a distinction on whom to be given. If a junior gives presents for his seniors, or the elderly, Vietnamese use “biếu, tặng, cúng, nạp”. The English verb “to give” corresponds to Vietnamese verbs *đưa* (to give with one hand), *cho* (to give to someone of your status or younger), *tặng* (to give to someone who is slightly higher in status), and *biếu* (to give to someone who is much higher in status or age / to give with great respect).

CHAPTER FOUR: SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

Non-equivalence at word level between English and Vietnamese is undoubtedly inevitable. There are numerous examples of cases to prove that non-equivalence is a fact which a translator absolutely will encounter in reality. It may be that the concept or idea is new to Vietnamese people, as in the case of “privacy”, which is, in fact, a relatively new concept in general, and a very difficult concept to understand and explain in many languages. It may also be that the concept is known or understood but there is no specific word in Vietnamese used to express it. Another difficulty is that, in addition to their concrete meaning, some words have special connotations that are not conveyed by the Vietnamese word for the same thing and so forth. There has been a strong need to figure out proper strategies to cope with these problems, striving for the correspondence in cross-linguistic translation. The strategies listed below can be used to handle cases of non-equivalence at word level

4.1. Strategies to tackle non-equivalence at word level

After dealing with the difficulties implied in the lack of equivalence at word level, Baker (1992, p. 26-42) proposes nine strategies to solve non-equivalence at word level. When applying to English – Vietnamese circumstance, a strategy is omitted; hence, totally there are eight strategies to be introduced in the following section.

4.1.1 Translating by a more specific word

The strategy of translation by a more specific term (hyponym) is the opposite of the following-mentioned strategy of generalization. There is a warning that this strategy might lead to over interpretation of the source language meaning, which in the majority of cases seems to be more dangerous than over generalization. However, in some cases, it may be appropriate or necessary to use a more specific word to translate an English word into Vietnamese. This usually involves choosing among several different words, as there may be many Vietnamese words that correspond to the general category or meaning expressed by English word.

Example 1:

Source text: Almost a quarter of people in the UK do not wear sunscreen to protect themselves from the sun's rays. ("Many in UK," 2006)

Target text: Gần như một phần tư người dân Anh quốc không thoa kem chống nắng để bảo vệ làn da khỏi các tia từ mặt trời.

As in prior analysis, there is no Vietnamese general word correspond with the verb “**wear**” in all cases. But depend on each, translator need to use a different Vietnamese word which is suitable and applicable in that context. In this example it is necessary to use the word “thoa” instead of “mặc” in Vietnamese since it sounds more natural.

Example2:

Source text: Xiong Mingqiang, born with a deformity, is carried on his mother's back. ("A Mother's love," 2010)

Target text: Cậu bé tật nguyền bẩm sinh Xiong Mingqiang thường được mẹ địu sau lưng.

Vietnamese has many words that mean “to **carry**” with distinction being made depending on the size and shape of the object and how it is carried (e.g. in the hand, or in the arms...). Accordingly, there are some Vietnamese word to be used such as “*đem, đưa, mang, vác, xách, đội, cõng, cầm, ôm, bồng, khiêng, gánh, quảy, đeo, đeo, chở, lai, thò, địu, bung, bê, kiệu, công kên*”. In this case, “địu” is the best choice.

Example3:

*Source text: During **Tet holiday**, a number of villages in northern and central Vietnam hold rice cooking contest. ("Rice Cooking Competition," 2009)*

Target text: Trong dịp Tết, một số làng ở miền Bắc và miền Trung Việt Nam tổ chức cuộc thi nấu cơm.

Similarly, the English word for “**rice**” can be translated by many different Vietnamese words, depending on whether one is planting it, harvesting it, cooking it, or eating it. In these cases, the English word alone is not enough to determine the appropriate Vietnamese translation, and it is

necessary to examine the English context.

Example 4:

Source text: The man wearing red cravat is my father's closest friend.

Target text: Người đàn ông đeo cà vạt đỏ là bạn thân nhất của bố tôi.

As introduced in the previous chapter, there are many ways to translate the verb “*wear*” in Vietnamese. The duty of a translator is selecting the right word among many. In this example, it should be translated as “*đeo*” to sound Vietnamese.

4.1.2 Translating by a more general word

Translation by generalisation is one of the most commonly applied strategies in dealing with various kinds of problems in translation. The translator usually uses a more general word (superordinate) or a more commonly known to replace the more specific one. Yet the possibility of relative ease of rendering a problematic specific concept with a more general one may result in excessive generalization and eventually in oversimplification (loss in meaning) in the translated text. Above all, using a superordinate is one of the popular strategies for dealing with many types of non-equivalence. It works equally well in most, if not all, languages, since the hierarchical structure of semantic fields is not language-specific. Under certain circumstances, it may be appropriate to use a more general word to translate an English word with no specific Vietnamese equivalent.

Example 1:

Source text: ...meaning can not be completely determined within the historical, geographical, and cultural milieu without consideration of social aspects (Tate, W.R., 2006)

Target text: ...ngữ nghĩa không thể chính xác nếu người dịch không quan tâm tới các khía cạnh xã hội mà chỉ dựa trên môi trường lịch sử, địa lí, văn hóa .

The word “*milieu*” refers to the physical, social conditions which provide a background in

which someone acts or live. Obviously, its meaning is more specified than the word “môi trường” (environment) but it sound agreeable in this context.

English makes distinctions among sedan, coupe’ i.e. the former have 4 seats, two or four doors and a separate section at the back for bags, boxes and cases while the latter just have 2 seats. Besides, there are some other items such as “*auto, limousine, limo, banger, jalopy, automobile*”. Vietnamese, on the one hand, refers to all four-wheel, motorized vehicles as “ô tô”.

Similarly, the English words “*paw*”, “*foot*”, or “*leg*” may all be translated by the Vietnamese word “chân”, which does not suggest any problems of comprehension in Vietnamese, as it should be clear from the context which of these words is meant.

Example 2:

Source Text: She is interested in how the messages on the sweaters evolve over time.

(Bergquist, 2010)

Target Text: Cô ấy quan tâm tới việc những thông điệp trên những chiếc áo len đã thay đổi như thế nào theo thời gian.

Unlike “change”, “evolve” denotes the change during millions of years or a gradual process of change. What the translator did is finding the semantic field then grasping the core propositional meaning

4.1.3 Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word

This strategy is particular useful when a translator encounters an expressive word .If carelessly, he might fail to convey the true meaning or even cause misunderstanding. There are cases even the translator picks up a word which seems to equivalent but perceived differently in the target language. Therefore, using a less expressive correspondence in the target language to avoid the risk and to sound natural is a good recommendation.

Example 1:

Source text: Galenia pubescens, an exotic plant from South Africa has been found in great numbers in coastal environments in the south of Spain. (García Lomas, 2010)

Target translation: Một loại cây lạ xuất xứ từ Nam Phi tên là Galenia pubescens đã được tìm thấy ở các vùng ven biển Nam Tây Ban Nha

Back- translation: A strange plant from South Africa named Galenia pubescens has been found in great numbers in coastal environments in the south of Spain.

“**Exotic**” has no absolute equivalent in Vietnamese and many other oriental languages. It is a word used by westerner to refer to unusual, interesting things which come from a distant country. The orient does not have a concept of what is exotic in this sense and the expressive meaning of the word is therefore lost in translation

The word “**sexy**” should be transferred as “quyến rũ” in Vietnamese since it is more neutral and not likely to convey a disapproving meaning as “gợi tình”.

Example 2:

Source text: The number of computers in schools has mushroomed in recent years. (Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary, 2008)

Target text: Lượng máy tính trong các trường học đã tăng nhanh những năm gần đây

Back-translation: The number of computers in schools has increased fastly in recent years.

The verb “**mushroom**” refers to the tremendously fast growth, but the Vietnamese expression “mọc lên như nấm” implies a negative meaning. “Mọc lên như nấm” is often used to mention the over-heated or uncontrollable development. Hence, in this case, it should be replaced by a more neutral word “increase” since the growth in quantity of computer in school is good news.

Example 3:

Source text: Overseas Vietnamese was delighted with remarkable changes in the motherland. (“Overseas Vietnamese nun,” n.d.)

Target text: Việt Kiều vui mừng trước những thay đổi đáng kể ở quê hương.

Back- translation: Overseas Vietnamese was delighted with remarkable changes in the homeland.

It is quite dangerous to translate “***motherland***” as “mẫu quốc” as each single syllable meaning. People from the United States and former British colonists would sometimes describe the United Kingdom as the "Mother Country", often carrying a strong British Imperialist connotation. Other Vietnamese versions such as “đất mẹ, quê mẹ”, still, bring about an unnatural feeling; hence, “quê hương” should be the best translation.

4.1.4 Translation by substitution

This strategy involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression with one of the different meanings but similar impact in the translated text. Most Vietnamese translators dislike this strategy and prefer direct translation claiming that it is a way to respect for the original text.

Cultural equivalence substitution

The strategy of translation by cultural substitution involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression in the source text with a target language item which describes a similar concept in target culture and thus is likely to have a similar impact on the target readers. The obvious advantage of using this strategy is that it gives the readers a concept which they can identify and which is easy to understand, familiar and appealing to them. The translator then avoids the necessity of providing footnotes or lengthy explanations of the item. With certain texts, e.g. those where historical background is very important, this strategy should not be employed as it may lead to overgeneralizations or simple misunderstandings. However, translators are motivated to make some additional appropriate changes in the texts they are translating in order to achieve the cultural appropriateness. Even though it is not a compulsory duty of the translator, the outcome of these efforts is truly admirable.

For example, “***HSC***” –the abbreviation of Higher School Certificate in New South Wales should be translated as “bằng tú tài Úc” hoặc “Bằng tốt nghiệp phổ thông trung học Úc”. “***Junior***

High School” and “*Senior High School*” in the United State of America is transferred as “Trường Trung Học Cơ Sở” and “Trường Trung Học Phổ Thông” respectively.

In British and Australian university, “*Vice Chancellor*” should be translated as “Viện trưởng”, “Hiệu trưởng” instead of “Phó Viện Trưởng”, “Phó Hiệu Trưởng” because this person manages both the educational and administrative system in a university. If this position is translated as “Phó Viện Trưởng” or “Phó Hiệu trưởng”, Vietnamese people will misunderstand that he does not play the primary role in the university and so do not have power. However, that is not true since a chancellor does not directly administer the university and that is just an honored position.

Likewise, “The baby weighs six *pounds*” (đứa bé cân được 6 cân Anh) should be translated as “đứa bé cân được hơn 2 kí 7”. Or “The two houses are 100 *yards* apart” (Hai nhà cách nhau 100 mã Anh) will be translated as “Hai nhà cách nhau chừng 100 thước”.

Interestingly, “*Mother Day*” is translated as “Ngày Lễ Vu Lan” in Vietnamese. In two cultures, “Mother Day” and “Ngày Lễ Vu Lan” share a common meaning as a day to honor mother and motherhood.

Functional equivalence substitution

A practically good way to be considered is using functional equivalence substitution. For example, “*Shadow Cabinet*” is translated as “Nội các đối lập” even though the word “Shadow” means “Bóng tối” in Vietnamese. If the translator use the Vietnamese combination “Nội các bóng tối”, it is likely that many Vietnamese will not understand.

Another example, “Kremlin protested against the White House” should be translated as “Chính quyền Nga chống đối Chính quyền Liên Bang Hoa Kỳ” since “*Kremlin*” palace is the symbol of Russia and the “*White House*” is the head of the United State’s power. The translated version “Kremlin chống đối Nhà Trắng” is probably acceptable but there are chances that many Vietnamese will not comprehend clearly the message.

A functional equivalent of “*The Internal Revenue Service*” in the USA can be translated as “Cơ quan thuế vụ” instead of “Dịch vụ thu nhập thuế nội bộ”. “*The Pentagon*” which means a five-sided shape with five angles is often translated into “Lầu Năm Góc” or “Bộ Quốc Phòng Mỹ”. “*The State Bank of Vietnam*” is transferred as “Ngân hàng Trung Ương Việt Nam” whereas “Ngân Hàng Trung Ương Nhật Bản” is rendered as “Bank of Japan”.

4.1.5 Translating by using a loan word plus explanation

Another strategy which is particularly useful in dealing with culture-specific items is the strategy of using a loan word. This also helps in the case of very modern, newly introduced concepts. The loan word can, and very often even should, be followed with an explanation. The reader does not have problems with understanding it and his attention is not distracted by other lengthy explanations. There is some objection to this strategy in Vietnam, as many translators prefer to select new words in Vietnamese rather than borrow English words. However, this strategy is very useful when the translator deal with concepts or ideas that are new to Vietnamese audience, culture-specific items, and proper names of diseases or medicines that are widely known in English names.

For instance, HIV and AIDS are two loan words that are frequently used in Vietnamese, as they are referred to by their English names in almost every part of the world. Because these words have been in common used in Vietnam for a long time, they are often used without any accompanying explanation. Whenever a loan word is used, it is better to give an explanation. ORESOL, for instance, stands for Oral Rehydration Solution (dung dịch bù nước bằng đường uống). In many packages, it is written in English with the explanation in parenthesis as **ORESOL (muối uống để bù nước)**.

Also in medical field, Gastroesophageal reflux disease, commonly referred to as GERD or acid reflux, is a condition in which the liquid content of the stomach regurgitates (backs up or refluxes) into the esophagus, inflames and damages the lining of the esophagus. So the best way to translate this term is **GERD (Trào ngược dạ dày thực quản là tình trạng thực quản trở**

nên viêm tấy dưới tác dụng của acid đi từ dạ dày lên)

The new items as “**boomerang**” must be thoroughly explained. Hence, after using the loan word, the translator needs to include an explanation so that reader can better understand. , “boomerang” is described as “a curved stick that, when thrown in a particular way, comes back to the person who threw it” but it can be added that “boomerang can be used for animal hunting”. The completed Vietnamese version should be: *Bumorang (vật dụng của thổ dân Úc ném ra bay tới đích rồi quay về chỗ người ném, có thể làm vũ khí săn bắn)*

“**Hitchhiking backpackers**” can be corresponded with “*Tây balô*” or “khách du lịch ba lô” and the explanation “khách du lịch đeo balô thường đứng bên đường vẫy xe hơi/xe vận tải xin đi quá giang”.

“**Mandolin**” is a well-known musical instrument with metal strings (usually eight) arranged in pairs, and a curved back, played with a plectrum. So its translation can be: *Đàn Măng đô lin (đàn tám dây, xếp theo cặp, đáy tròn, chơi bằng cái lược gà)*

4.1.6 Translating by using a paraphrase

Translation by paraphrasing is another of the possible ways in coping with problematic items in translation. When using it the translator has two possible solutions at his disposal. The main advantage of translation by paraphrase (no matter whether with the use of related or unrelated words) is that it is possible to achieve a high level of precision in specifying the meaning of a word or concept that poses difficulties in translation. The main disadvantage of this strategy is that it usually involves replacing one item with an explanation consisting of several items. Thus a striking disproportion in length of the source text and target text may occur, which is hardly ever a desirable effect. However, this strategy is applicable for the term that is known but not lexicalized in the target language and the case of loan word in the source language. Paraphrasing is also helpful in addressing the problem of semantically complex words.

Example 1:

Source text: As committed, when the integrated resorts are fully open, gaming areas will take up less than 3 per cent of the Gross Floor Area for Marina Bay Sands... (Imelda Saad, 2010)

Target text: Theo dự án, khi các khu nghỉ dưỡng kết hợp đa chức năng mở cửa hoàn toàn, khu vực sòng bài chỉ chiếm chưa tới ba phần trăm tổng diện tích mặt bằng của Marina Bay Sands...

Back-translation: As committed, when the multi-functionally connected resorts are fully open, gaming areas will take up less than 3 per cent of the Gross Floor Area for Marina Bay Sands...

As in dictionary, “integrated” is an adjective referring to the stated of combining many different parts are closely connected and work successfully together, but it is not lexicalized clearly in Vietnamese. So the translator needs to use a set of different word to express the meaning.

Example 2:

Source text: “Urbanization, Migration, and Poverty in a Vietnamese Metropolis” presents the findings of a major interdisciplinary research project led by the SSRC's Vietnam Program and sponsored by the Ford Foundation. (“Urbanization, Migration and Poverty,” 2009)

Target text: Bản báo cáo Đô thị hóa, di cư và nghèo đói ở các trung tâm lớn của Việt Nam đã đưa ra những kết luận của một dự án lớn nghiên cứu trên nhiều lĩnh vực do chương trình SSRC Việt Nam thực hiện và tài trợ bởi Tổ chức Ford.

Back-translation: The report Urbanization, Migration, and Poverty in a Vietnamese Big Centres presents the findings of a major research project in many areas led by the SSRC's Vietnam Program and sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

The word “*interdisciplinary*” has been commonly used with the meaning “involving two or more different subjects or areas of knowledge”, however, there is no Vietnamese word to convey such a complete idea. Paraphrasing “*interdisciplinary*” by a set of Vietnamese word “*trên nhiều lĩnh vực*” is preferable.

Example 3:

Source text: ...the ministry was encouraging all students nationwide to complete junior and senior high school, although compulsory school attendance was only through the fifth grade. .(“Graduation rate at high schools,” 2010)

Target text: ...Bộ đang khuyến khích tất cả học sinh toàn quốc hoàn thành bậc trung học cơ sở và trung học phổ thông mặc dù giáo dục bắt buộc chỉ đến hết lớp năm.

Back-translation: ...the ministry was encouraging all students nationwide to complete junior and senior high school, although compulsory education was only through the fifth grade.

Similarly, “**attendance**” is comprehensible to most of Vietnamese since there is nothing new in the concept, yet, delivering the idea by a Vietnamese word is impossible. Using Vietnamese words “sự tới dự”, the translation will sound non –Vietnamese. Paraphrasing it by a combination of Vietnamese items has brought out an acceptable translation in common sense.

Example 4:

Source text: To make education available to everyone, HCM City has built more schools and community learning centres, in addition to offering tuition support to needy students via scholarships or monthly allowances to families.(“ Graduation rate at high schools,” 2010)

Target text: Để mọi người dân đều có thể tiếp cận với giáo dục, thành phố HCM đang xây dựng thêm trường học, các trung tâm giáo dục cộng đồng và giảm học phí cho cho các học sinh có hoàn cảnh khó khăn thông qua việc trao học bổng hoặc trợ cấp hàng tháng cho các gia đình.

Back-translation: To help everyone access to education, HCM City has built more schools and community learning centres, in addition to offering tuition support to needy students via scholarships or monthly allowances to families.

Despite the remarkable frequency of use in English, the adjective “**available**” do not have a good correspondence in Vietnamese. No Vietnamese can convey its meaning comprehensively.

Base on the whole context, it is agreeable to using different words to make it clear i.e. “*có thể tiếp cận với*”.

Example 5 :

Source Text: An international annual workshop on the prospect of Vietnam farm produce in 2010 is likely to spotlight animal husbandry and coffee growing. (“ Livestocks, coffee in spotlight,” 2010)

Target text: Hội thảo quốc tế thường niên về triển vọng sản xuất nông nghiệp Việt Nam chắc chắn sẽ hướng sự chú ý của công chúng vào ngành chăn nuôi và trồng cà phê.

Back-translation: An international annual workshop on the prospect of Vietnam farm produce in 2010 is likely to draw public attention to animal husbandry and coffee growing.

The verb “**spotlight**” is an interesting example of paraphrasing technique because when functioning as a verb it means “receiving a lot of public attention”. Due to the absence of a Vietnamese equivalent word for a already known concept, it is the chance for a translator to paraphrase it as “*hướng sự chú ý của công chúng*”, which even will produce a beautiful expression.

4.1.7 Translating by omission

Baker (1992) refers to deletion as "omission of a lexical item due to grammatical or semantic patterns of the receptor language" (p. 40). She states further that this strategy may sound rather drastic, but in fact it does no harm to omit translating a word or expression in some contexts. If the meaning conveyed by a particular item or expression is not vital enough to the development of the text to justify distracting the reader with lengthy explanations, translators can and often do simply omit translating the word or expression in question (Baker, 1992, p. 40). Nida (1964) also shares there are cases where omission is required to avoid redundancy and awkwardness and this strategy is particularly applied if the source language tends be a redundant language.

Example 1:

Source text: Long hours and shared stress at work are leading to office romance.

(Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary, 2008)

Target text: Thời gian làm việc chung và sự chia sẻ khó khăn khi làm việc là những nguyên nhân dẫn tới tình công sở.

Back- translation: Long hours and shared stress at work are leading to more office affection.

“**Romance**” sometimes should be translated as “*tình*”, or “chuyện tình” instead of “câu chuyện tình lãng mạn”, “mối tình lãng mạn” as stated in dictionary. The shorter version, though, can convey the implication which is enough for reader to understand.

In some circumstances, a plural noun is also preceded by a determiner showing plurality (some books, three pens). If the 'double' expression of such category is reflected in Vietnamese, redundancy will occur. Once a given noun is in the plural form, the quantifier has to be deleted.

Such a deletion of expressions or information is debatable in relation to the translation of academic texts, however. Anyone who writes an academic text, for example, will not include unimportant information in his or her writing. Similarly, anyone who reads such a text should consider that all information in the text is important. Translators are not an exception; they should read the text as the original reader or a non-translator reader reads it. That is to say that this notion of information deletion should not be used as 'an excuse' to hide the inability of translators to understand and transfer message of the original text.

4.1.8 Translating by illustration:

This is a useful option if the word which lacks an equivalent in the target language refers to a physical entity which can be illustrated, particularly if there are restrictions on space or if the text has to remain short, concise, and to the point.

"Tò he" toys are sculptured figurines fashioned from colored rice dough. It is made to depict different heroes and ordinary people of daily life, symbolic animals. However, it is still difficult for the readers to visualize what exactly a "tò he" is, what size is it etc. The best way to illustrate a tò he" is showing a photo of it.



4.2 Conclusion

All in all, examples provided in this paper, however, can not cover all cases in real practice of translating non-equivalence at word level. There is a potential space for further study and analysis nominated from international translators and professionals to better explore and share more knowledge and experiences in this field. Apart from Mona Baker's theory, there are many other approaches that latter study can rely on.

Translation equivalence is always long to achieve since it depends on the text, the translator, and the receptors. It is a fact that no matter how competent the translator is, the translation might lose a certain degree of meaning relative to the original text. Not only the linguistic but also the cultural gaps among languages create the possibility of non-equivalence in translation.

Obviously, the larger the gap is, the harder the translation process will be. Hence, it is a must for a translator to continuously improve the personal knowledge on various areas and cultures of different countries. Despite of the recommended strategies, the creativeness of a translator is particularly important as no book can cover all the cases happen in reality.

Last but not least, this thesis is unable to avoid certain limitations. Quality of the study is restricted due to the time limit of research, the scarcity of references, the broad scope and complex nature of the issue as well as the humble experience of the writer. The study apparently can not offer detailed and comprehensive comments on the strength and weaknesses of various strategies up to the expectation. The use of strategies applied in different context as well as more researches on English –Vietnamese case is critically needed.

4.3 Suggested exercises and further reading

Exercise 1

a) Figure out the differences in meaning between the items in each of the following set.

Consulting a good dictionary of English before you comment on its meaning is recommended.

- ❖ Stroll, stride, trot, pace, swagger, stagger, stumble
- ❖ Like, admire, love, adore, worship
- ❖ Well-known, famous, notorious, celebrated
- ❖ Beautiful, handsome, fair, lovely, pretty
- ❖ Brave, courageous, bold, audacious, daring, gallant (
- ❖ Smell, odour, scent, fragrance, perfume
- ❖ Stout, fleshy, fat, plump
- ❖ Strange, odd, queer, quaint
- ❖ Weak, feeble, faint, frail
- ❖ Wet, damp, moist, humid
- ❖ Large, big, great, huge, enormous, immense, vast
- ❖ Look, gaze, stare, glare, gape, glance, peer & peep
- ❖ Merry, gay, jolly, joyful & cheerful
- ❖ Shake, tremble, shiver, quiver, shudder

b) List all the words and expressions you can think of which are available in Vietnamese for each sets

c) Comment on any differences in meaning among individual items in Vietnamese and between English words and Vietnamese corresponding words.

Exercise 2: Make a list of verb in English you can think of referring the increase and decrease. Try to group them into sets starting from the more general ones.

Exercise 3: Make a list of word in English belong to the same semantic field with

- a) to quit
- b) to beat
- c) to adapt

- d) to move
- e) to walk
- f) mistake
- g) journey
- h) newspapers

Exercise 4: Make a list of ten English word which you feel difficult to translate

- a) from English to Vietnamese
- b) from Vietnamese to English

Explain the stem causing your difficulty

Nominate the strategies to deal with each situation

Exercise 5: Produce your translation of 'The Call of The Wild'. Use the suggested table to clarify which problems arising in different paragraphs and the relevant strategies used.

| Source text | Translation 1 | Problem | Strategies | Final version |
|-------------|---------------|---------|------------|---------------|
| | | | | |

REFERENCES

- A mother's love – carries son on her shoulder for 35 years. (2010, Jan 9). Retrieved May 26, 2010, from <http://www.impactlab.com/2010/01/09/a-mothers-love-carries-son-on-her-shoulders-for-35-years/>
- Baker, Mona (1992). *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*, London: Routledge.
- Bayar, M. (2007). *To Mean or Not to Mean*. Kadmous cultural foundation. Damascus, Syria: Khatawat for publishing and distribution.
- Bell, Roger T. (1991). *Translation and Translating*. London and Newyork: Longman.
- Berlin, B. & Kay, P. (1991). *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Bergquist, L. (2010, April 1). Artist uses unique materials to send a message. *Arts and Entertainment Magazine*. Oakland. California.
- Broek & Raymond, V. D. (1978). "The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation", in Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury (eds). *Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations, Poetics Today*, p. 38.
- Catford, John C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay on Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. (3rd ed.). (2008). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Duong, T. N. (1999). Forms of address in formal meetings in educational development projects in Vietnam. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language and Development*. Vietnam. Oct 13-15.
- García Lomas (2010). Invasiveness of *Galenia pubescens* (Aizoaceae): A new threat to Mediterranean-climate coastal ecosystems. *Biology Journal*. Spain.
- Ghadi, A. S. (n.d.). Translation Equivalence and Different Theories. Retrieved May 27, 2010, from <http://e-articles.info/e/a/title/Translation-Equivalence-and-Different-Theories-/>
- Giménez, A. P. (2005). Translation-Strategies Use: A Classroom-Based Examination of Baker's Taxonomy. *Translators' Journal*, Vol 50, No 1, p. 294-311.
- Graduation rate at high schools tops 80 percent target. (2010). Retrieved May19, 2010, from <http://en.vietnamplus.vn/Home/Graduation-rate-at-high-schools-tops-80-percent-target/20105/9053.vnplus>
- Hann & Micheal (1992). *The Key to technical Translation*. Amsterdam, & Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London.: Edward Arnold
- Halverson, S. (1997). The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies. *Target* 1-2(1997), 207-233.
- Hofstede, G. H. (2000). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- House, J. (1977). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Imelda Saad (2010, May 18). No compromise to concept of IRs, with small portion for gambling. Retrieved May 27, 2010, from <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/stories/singaporelocalnews/view/1057444/1/.html>

Kade, Otto (1968). *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung*. Leipzig.

Koller, W. (1977). "Äquivalenz in kontrastiver Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft". In Theory and Practice of Translation. *Nobel Symposium* 39. L. Grähs, G. Korlén, B. Malberg (eds). Bern, Peter Lang.

Leonardi, V. (2000). Equivalence in Translation. *Translation Journal*. Vol 4, No. 4.

Livestocks, coffee in spotlight of annual agri-meeting. (2010). Retrieved May 19, 2010, from <http://en.vietnamplus.vn/Home/Livestocks-coffee-in-spotlight-of-annual-agrimeeting/20105/8766.vnplus>)

Luong, H. V. (1990). *Discursive practices and linguistic meanings: The Vietnamese system of person reference*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Magdalena, P. M. (2005). Strategies and Methods in Dealing with Culture Specific Expressions on the Basis of Polish-English. Translations of Certain Administrative and Institutional Terms. *Proceedings from the Eighth Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies*. Cracow, Poland.

Many in UK don't wear sunscreen. (2006, July 31). Retrieved May 26, 2010, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/5232010.stm>

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies, Theories and applications*. London and New York: Routledge, p. 36.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London and New York: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd, p. 49.
- Nida, Eugene A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, C. R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nguyen, C. T. (1999). *Vietnamese grammar* (6th ed.). Hà Nội, Vietnam: National University Publishing House.
- Nguyen, G. T. (2003). *Vietnamese lexicography* (4th ed.). Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam: Education Publishing House.
- Nguyen, K. L. (2004). *Vietnamese textbook II*. Huế, Vietnam: Hue University.
- Overseas Vietnamese nun happy with changes in motherland. (n.d.). Retrieved May 27, 2010, from http://www.mofahcm.gov.vn/en/tintuc_sk/nr051026103018/news_object_view?newsPath=/mofa/nr040807104143/nr040807105039/ns050831102655#ysezyn9Zq4B6
- Pym, A. (2007). *Natural and Directional Equivalence in Theories of Translation*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Rice cooking competition. (2009, Feb 5). Retrieved May 26, 2010, from <http://www.vietnam-beauty.com/vietnamese-culture/13-vietnam-culture-value/273-rice-cooking-competition-.html>
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Publishing House.

- Tate, W. R. (2006). *Interpreting the Bible: a handbook of terms and methods*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publisher.
- Thanh Ngo (2006). Translation of Vietnamese Terms of Address and Reference. *Translation Journal*. Vol. 10, No. 4.
- Theory and Practice in English Studies 3. (2005). *Proceedings from the Eighth Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies*. Bruno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Thompson, L. (1965). *A Vietnamese Grammar*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Urbanization, Migration and Poverty in a Vietnamese Metropolis: Ho Chi Minh City in Comparative Perspectives. (2009) .*Publications of Social Science Research Council*. National University of Singapore Press Pte Ltd.
- Vu, N. C. (2007). Các khó khăn trong dịch và phương hướng khắc phục. *Language & Life Journal*, Vol 8 (142).
- Wills, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.