

The framework of non-equivalence at word level in the meaning mapping of translation

إطار عدم التكافؤ على مستوى الكلمة في رسم خرائط المعنى في الترجمة

Nadira Chahboub¹

¹Institut de Traduction, Université Alger2, nadira.chahboub@univ-alger2.dz

Received: 08/04/2022

Accepted: 26/05/2023

Published: 27/05/2023

Abstract:

Relying on Mona Baker's work (2011), the present paper, drawing on modern linguistics, discusses problems arising from equivalence and non-equivalence at word level and exploring the common attested strategies for dealing with such a problem. Furthermore, it aims to clarify the process of translation and interpretation at the same level in providing a framework of written translation. The article reached the following conclusions: Translation is a decision-making process; it informs and guides the many key decisions trainee translators have to make.

Keywords: word; non-equivalence; meaning; translation strategy; written translation.

ملخص:

بالاعتماد على عمل منى بيكر (2011)، يناقش هذا المقال، القائم على اللغويات الحديثة، المشاكل الناشئة عن التكافؤ وعدم التكافؤ على مستوى الكلمة واستكشاف الاستراتيجيات الموثقة المشتركة لمعالجة مثل هذه المشكلة. علاوة على ذلك، فإنه يهدف إلى توضيح عملية الترجمة التحريرية والترجمة الشفوية على نفس المستوى من خلال توفير إطار للترجمة التحريرية.

وخلص المقال إلى أن الترجمة هي عملية لصنع القرار، وهو يُعلم ويوجه العديد من القرارات الرئيسية التي يتعين على المترجمين المتدربين اتخاذها.

Corresponding author: Nadira CHAHBOUB

1. INTRODUCTION

From the early studies up to now, many researchers in the translation field have proposed their theories on the question of equivalence. One of the theories in translation well known around the world is that proposed by Eugene A. Nida (1964). He argued that there are two different types of equivalence, namely *formal equivalence*, which in the second edition by Nida and Taber (1982) is referred to as *formal correspondence* and *dynamic equivalence*. Both defined translation as related to the “closest natural equivalent”. Catford’s approach (1965) to translation equivalence clearly differs from that adopted by Nida since it is based on the linguistic work of Firth and Halliday. His main contribution consisted on the introduction of the concepts of types and shifts of translation. House (1977) acknowledges that a translation text should not only match its source text in function, but employ equivalent situational-dimensional means to achieve that function.

Later, many recent works have criticised the works of precursors on translation equivalence, we mention Ran (2009) who conducted a study to analyze the Nida’s definition of translation from a philosophical interpretation and found that the “equivalence” in Nida’s definition is not comprehensive because it does not limit the levels of equivalence.

Mona Baker, in 2011, analyzes equivalence at word level and equivalence above word level, including grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence, and pragmatic equivalence. She also analyzes the question of lexical meaning and its types (in the first edition of her work *In Other Words* (1992). Baker proposed that equivalence is having its hierarchy or levels. One of its levels is the word level. However, in translating a text, a translator may find a problematic word which has no exact or proper equivalent in the target language. It is called no-equivalence at word level.

In Baker (2011), although word rarely occurs on its own, as a single unit of a language, it has its own meaning when spoken or written by itself. The meaning is closely related with the local culture. Consequently, translation and interpreting are engaging with other cultures. Thus, the main consequential task of this

engagement has a major impact on translators. In the same vein, such engagement is based on knowledge and experience while dealing with the translation process.

Furthermore, linguistics discipline has a great deal to offer to translation studies. Modern linguistics does not restrict itself to the study of language but embraces such sub-disciplines as text linguistics and pragmatics. In fact, modern linguistic theory provides a basis for training translators and can inform and guide the decisions they have to make in the course of performing their work.

In this scope, the equivalence with its different levels is a real issue to understand in constructing and reconstructing the meaning. According to Baker, text is a meaning unit, not a form unit, but meaning is realized through form and without understanding the meanings of individuals forms one cannot interpret the meaning of the text as a whole.

If language were simply a nomenclature for a set of universal concepts, it would be easy to translate from one language to another. But languages are not a nomenclature; concepts of one language may differ radically from those of another. Moving from a language to another has to regard the structure of those languages and their cultures. Let us take the case of English and Arabic in this article. Each language articulates or organizes the world differently.

Among the techniques, beginner translators use to translate a text when a word is unknown for them is borrowing and omission. Borrowing is a common translation technique by using a word or phrase adopted from one language into another. This means that the translator is conscious about using the same word in the target text as it is found in the source text. Omission, is also applied when the learner has no idea on translating the appropriate word. Most of them prefer to omit some understandable words due to this problem.

In fact, translation problems arising from lack of equivalence at word level; what does a translator do when there is no word in the target language, which expresses the same meaning as the source language word? From which level the translator can pick the equivalence?

All authors can agree that there is no one-to-one correspondence between elements of meaning within or across languages. Relying on Mona Baker (2011) works, this article is an attempt to identify potential sources of translation difficulties related to the linguistic area under discussion and possible strategies for resolving these difficulties at word level. The present article aims to serve as a

framework for students who want to conduct studies as part of dissertation research works on the problem of equivalence related to translation studies.

2. Translation at word level

Baker acknowledges that, in a bottom-up approach to translation, equivalence at word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator. In fact, when the translator starts analyzing the source language, he looks at words as single units in order to find a direct equivalent in the target language. Baker gives a definition of the term “*word*” since it should be remembered that a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages and might be seen as being a more complex unit or *morpheme*. This means that the translator should pay attention to some factors when considering a single word such as *number*, *gender* and *tense*.

2.1 Lexical meaning

Every word is a lexical unit has something that is individual and makes it different from any other word. It is just the lexical meaning, which is the most outstanding individual property of the word. Moreover, the lexical meaning of a word may be thought as the specific value it has in particular linguistic system it acquires through usage within that system. It is seldom possible to analyse a word or structure into distinct components of meaning. The way in which language works is much too complex to allow that. However, it is sometimes useful to temporarily minimize the complexities of the language in order to appreciate them and be able to better manage them in the long term (Baker, 2011, p.11).

2.2 Propositional versus expressive meaning

According to Baker, the propositional meaning of a word or an utterance derives from the relationship between that word and what it designates in the real or imaginary world, as conceived by speakers of a language to which the word or an utterance belongs. It is on the basis of this type of meaning that one can judge a statement as true or false.

When a translation is described as inaccurate, it is often the propositional meaning that is being reconsidered and rethought. Hence, expressive meaning cannot be judged as true or false. It relates to the speaker’s feelings or attitudes rather than to what words utterances refer to. In a nutshell, the meaning of word or

lexical unit can be both propositional and expressive.

3. Recreating meaning

Baker distinguishes two kinds of recreating meaning i.e. the presupposed meaning and the evoked meaning.

3.1 Presupposed meaning

Presupposed meaning derives from co-occurrence restrictions, that is, restrictions on other words or expressions expected to be seen before or after a particular lexical unit. These restrictions are of two types:

- *Selectional restrictions*: These depend on the propositional meaning of the word. Selection restrictions are deliberately violated in the case of figurative language, but are also strictly respected.
- *Collocational restrictions*: These are semantically arbitrary restrictions that do not logically flow from the propositional meaning of a word. Because of their arbitrary nature, collocational restrictions tend to vary more from one language to another than selective restrictions.

The difference between selectional and collocational restrictions is not always so clear (Baker, 2011, pp. 12-13).

3.2. Evoked meaning

Evoked meaning arises from dialect and register variation. A dialect is a variety of language, which has currency within specific community or group of speakers. It may be classified on one of the following bases:

- Geographical;
- Temporal;
- Social.

Moreover, register is a variety of language that user considers appropriate to a specific situation. According to Baker (2011, p.14), register variation arises from variations along the following parameters:

- (1) *Field of discourse*: It is an abstract term for ‘what happens’ and is relevant for the choice of linguistic elements by the speaker. Different linguistic choices are made by different speakers depending on the type of action other than the immediate action of speaking to which they consider themselves as participants.

- (2) *Tenor of discourse*: It is an abstract term for the relationships between the people taking part in the discourse. The language used by them varies depending on their relationship. Getting the tenor of discourse right in translation can be quite difficult. It depends on whether one sees a certain level of formality as ‘right’ from the perspective of the source culture or the target culture. What the translator chooses will depend on what he perceives to be the overall goal of the translation.
- (3) *Mode of discourse*: It is an abstract term for the role that the language is playing (speech, essay, lecture, instructions) and for its medium of transmission either spoken or written. Linguistic choices are influenced by these dimensions.

In practice, it is seldom possible to separate the various types of meaning of a word or utterance with absolute certainty, because all types of lexical meaning contribute to the overall meaning of a text in complex ways, which are often much difficult to analyse. Moreover, words have meanings, to a large extent, negotiable and are only realized in specific contexts. This requires from translators to go beyond what the average reader has to do to reach an adequate understanding of a text by perceiving the meaning of words and utterances as precisely as possible in order to render them into another language.

4. The problem of non-equivalence

Based on the above discussion, we outline some of the more common types of non-equivalence, which often pose difficulties for the translator and some attested strategies for dealing with them. First, the choice of suitable equivalent in a given context depends on a wide variety of factors. Some of these factors may be strictly linguistic. According to Nida and Taber (1982, p.12) the main goals of translation is to reproduce the source language message into the target language closest natural equivalence in terms of meaning and style. It means that the main objective of translation is the “closest equivalence” in meaning and structure. However, researchers were unanimous on the fact that finding the closest equivalence is not easy to do.

Other factors may be extra-linguistic. It is virtually impossible to offer absolute guidelines for dealing with the variety of non-equivalence which exist among languages. The choice of suitable equivalent will always depend not only on the linguistic system being processed by the translator, but also on the way

both writer of the source text and the producer of the target text, who is the translator, choose to manipulate the linguistic systems in question.

Within the teaching-learning process, students, working as translators, are continually faced with choices. Thus, they are intuitively or consciously following a theory of translation. What translation theory actually does is to identify and define a translation problem; to indicate all the factors that have to be taken into account in solving the problem, to list all the possible translation procedures, and finally, to recommend the most appropriate translation and the suitable equivalence (Aguado-Giménez, 2005). This is why translation is a decision-making process and a problem-solving task:

Decision-making because of the choices the translator faces. As Hatim & Mason (1990, p.12) say, *“translation is a matter of choice, but choice is always motivated: omissions, additions and alterations may indeed be justified but only in relation to intended meaning”*

Indeed, the concept of equivalence here is of great significance, it constitutes a main chapter in didactics. Generally speaking, after having a basic knowledge of what translation theory is, students are generally instructed in the different steps to translate a text: Reading the source language text, finding an equivalent, and judging the target text. Students should realize the importance of the skill of reading, to get the gist of the text they are going to translate. Once they get familiar with the process of translation and the many factors implied, they were instructed in the different translation strategies depending on the level they occur i.e. the word level or beyond the word level.

In this context, Harmon (2019, pp.14-15) says: *“without the concept of equivalence it is equally difficult to imagine translation didactics, where it constitutes the point of departure and reference, and finally the goal to be pursued”*).

Baker (2011), focused on the question of learners and how they could overcome the problem of equivalence at word level by suggesting a range of strategies commonly used by professional translators which are considered interesting and useful.

4.1 Baker's approach to translation equivalence

New adjectives have been assigned to the notion of equivalence (grammatical, textual, pragmatic equivalence, and several others) and made their appearance in the plethora of recent works in this field. An extremely interesting discussion of the notion of equivalence can be found in Baker (2011) who seems to offer a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels in relation to the translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. She distinguishes between:

- Equivalence that can appear at word level and above level, when translating from one language into another. The first case is discussed in this article.
- Grammatical equivalence, when referring to the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. She notes that grammatical rules may vary across languages and this may pose some problems in terms of finding a direct correspondence in the target language. In fact, she claims that different grammatical structures in the source language and the target language may cause remarkable changes in the way the message is carried across. These changes may induce the translator either to add or to omit information in the target text because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the target language itself.
- Textual equivalence, when referring to the equivalence between a source language text and a target language text in terms of information and cohesion. Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the source text which can help the translator in his mission to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the target audience. It depends on the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the source language text. His decision will be guided by three main factors, i.e. the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type.
- Pragmatic equivalence, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work

out implied meanings in translation in order to get the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the target community reader to understand it clearly (Leonardi, 2000, pp.6-7).

5. The strategies for dealing with non-equivalence at word level

The following paragraphs display some common strategies for dealing with non-equivalence at word level. Basically, non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word, which occurs in the source text. The translation strategies, mentioned in this article, is the one which is called as Baker's taxonomy. Baker's taxonomy (2011) is a set of translation strategies proposed by the researcher. Moreover, according to Owji (2013), Baker's taxonomy includes the most applicable set of strategies because it shows the strategies used by professional translators.

Usually, literal translation is the one learners use to translate. Based on Newmark (1988), this method is mostly used as a first step to translate a text by beginners. Yet, not many students understand on how to translate a word in more general way. Consequently, they use omission.

“Omission is described as the act of omitting or leaving something out a piece of information or a thing left out. Omission is often applied when the translator has no idea on translating the appropriate words. Most students prefer to omit some untranslatable words due to this problem. However, employing omission in translating a text cannot be too much to employ” (Junining, 2020).

Different kinds of non-equivalence require different strategies, some very straightforward, others more involved and difficult to handle. Regarding the nature of non-equivalence, the context and purpose of translation will often rule some strategies and favour others.

5.1. Common problems of non-equivalence:

In Baker (2011), the following are some common types of non-equivalence at word level:

- A. ***Culture-specific concepts:*** Different cultures may inflict an equivalence problem in translation; this problem is called culture-specific concepts.

The source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept may be abstract or concrete; it may be related to a religious belief, a social custom or even type of food. For example, there is a concrete concept such as in the word *squarely* in English unknown in the Arabic language culture. Let us consider the following sentence:

Ex: ...Whether we possess the courage as a nation to *squarely* meet those challenges...

The word *squarely* means directly, not an angle to one side (Oxford dictionary).

If we look at the origin of this word, we find the word *square* that is called half of every geometric form with four completely contrasting ribs that evaluates an existing angle, making this geometric form a linguistic reference for total convergence. In English, this word has a direct, truthful and even fair meaning, which Western culture expresses in a square geometric form. The equivalent is absent in the Arabic culture, where we do not find in the Arabic language many similarities or graphic images inspired by mathematics and engineering. The Arabs claim that the face takes a central place in the human body and thus reflects its orientation and focus. We find that Arab culture produces a lot of meanings centred around people's faces, where it is said "تقابلا وجها لوجه", which means *meet "face-to-face"* or "قالها في وجهه" i.e. *says directly, full convergence and "face-to-face"*. The equivalent in the Arabic translation may occur as follows:

... إن كنا نملك الشجاعة كأمة لمواجهة هذه التحديات وجها لوجه...

B. The source-language concept is not lexicalized in the target language:

This type of non-equivalence problem is nearly the same with the culture specific concepts. This happens when the source-language word is known in the target culture but not lexicalized.

Ex: The example here is the word *standard* in *standard warranty*. It expresses a concept which is easy to understand in English but this word has no equivalence in Arabic. We simply say in Arabic الضمان.

C. **The source-language word is semantically complex:** The source-language word may be semantically complex even when it is morphologically simple. This is a common problem in translation. A single word, which consists of single morpheme, can sometimes express a more complex meaning than a whole sentence. The word itself can be simple as *Googling*. **Googling**, in English, means the activity of searching any kind of information in the internet by using the research engine Google. In Arabic, the equivalent seems to constitute a sentence: استعمال محرك البحث غوغل.

D. **The source and target languages make different distinctions in meaning:** Translator may also deal with a case where the target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. What one language regards as an important distinction in meaning another language may perceive as irrelevant. For example, the word “overnight” in the following sentence:

Ex: ...this difficult history can be overcome **overnight**.

The word *overnight* in English has two meanings: **A-**happening during the night, for a night. **B-** happening suddenly or quickly.

In Arabic, we find Arabs also crossing the short period with a phrase "بين عشية وضحاها". The concept of this phrase is that at the speed of the night when the night starts by sunset and ends in the sunrise, there is a time called *Al dhoha* الضُحَى. The name goes back to the time of praying, and prayers pray between sunrise and noon. We find this phrase in the depth of the Arab-Islamic culture, thus achieving excellent equivalence in the target language culture.

E. **The target language lacks a superordinate:** This is a problem when the target language has specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field. For example, the word *facilities*, in English, means any equipment provided in particular purpose has no equivalent in Russian. However, there are several specific words which express the types of facilities in Russian. The word **Jihad** in Arabic has many hyponyms like جهاد أصغر، جهاد أكبر، جهاد النفس، دفاع، هجوم، حرب، قتال. However, in English there are only hyponyms but no general word:

Fight, combat, war, attack, self-control...

- F. **The target language lacks specific term (hyponym):** more commonly, languages tend to have general words (superordinate) but lacks specific ones (hyponyms), since each language makes only those distinctions in meaning which seem relevant to its particular environment. In English, there are several hyponyms under the word **house** which have no equivalents in many languages, just like **bungalow, cottage, hut, mansion, lodge,croft, manor, villa and hall**. These are new concepts in the Arabic culture, and some of them are translated using borrowing from English. However, the word فَلَاح in Arabic means *make the land (to grow it), win, (he gets what he wanted), peasant (decorate the sale and purchase of the seller and buyer), persist (increased the price of the basket to deceive the buyer), break (his lip), success (happiness and welfare in life)...* but not all these hyponyms have their equivalents in English.
- G. **Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective:** This problem is related to a condition where one language regards physical or interpersonal perspective more importance than in another language. Physical perspective has to do with things or people are in relation to one another or to place, expressed in pairs of words such as come/go, take/bring, arrive/depart and so on. Perspective may also include the relationship between participants in the discourse. For example, depending on who gives to whom, Arabic possess more than ten equivalents for the word **give** which are: أعطى، أسدى، دفع، قدم، منح، ناول، أفاد، أمد، جاد، بذل...
- H. **Differences in expressive meaning:** This problem deals with a condition where a word in the target-language may have the same propositional meaning as the word in the source-language, but with a different expressive meaning. When the target language is more neutral compared to the source-language, the translator might add the expressive meaning if necessary. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is more emotionally loaded than the source-language item. This is often the case with items which relate to sensitive issues such as religion, politics and sex.

Ex: the word *Salaf* سلف in Arabic means the ancestors. The term refers to the very first generations of the Prophet's companions and is often accompanied by the adjective *Saleh* صالح meaning good and virtuous. The word *Salafism* is among the most difficult words to translate from the Arabic language as it is emotionally loaded. It means a theological current whose followers want to live Islam as closely as possible to that of the Prophet.

- I. **Differences in form:** There is often no equivalent in target-language, for a particular form in the source text. Some suffixes and prefixes which convey propositional and other types of meaning in English often have no equivalents in other languages. For example, Arabic has no ready mechanism for producing such forms and so they are often replaced by an appropriate paraphrase, depending on the meaning they convey. This language has no equivalent for some suffixes like –ish (childish, greenish, hellish) and –able (drinkable, readable, retrievable). Usually, this problem is solved using paraphrase just like *drinkable* which means “suitable for drinking” "قابل للشرب", *readable* "قابل للقراءة", *retrievable* "قابل للاسترجاع" .
- J. **Differences in frequency and purposes of using specific forms:** This case is about a difference in the frequency and the purposed of particular form between the source language and the target language. English uses the continuous –ing form for biding clauses much more frequently than other languages which have equivalents. For example, when German uses every –ing form in an English source text with an equivalent –ing form in a German, as target text, it would result in unnatural style. Arabic uses, in most cases, **a noun** for the –ing form.
- K. **The use of loan words in the source of text:** The use of loan words in the source text poses a special problem in translation. Loan word is used because it can add sophistication to the text or to the subject matter. It is quite common in dealing with modern concepts and *buzzing* words. English tends to use loan words widely not just for effect to sound beautiful but because English is the language of science and innovation. The word *kito* simply means *healthy food* with some specificity just like the way we

take it and the quantity and the quality of the meal itself. But the word *Kito* here is considered buzzing. ***Kitosis*** means a metabolic state that occurs when your body burns fat for energy instead of glucose (carbs). This word looks elegant and sounds good.

The above are the more common problems of non-equivalence illustrated with some examples using English and Arabic languages. In dealing with any kind of non-equivalence, it is important first of all to assess its significance and implication in given context. It is better to try as much as possible to convey the meaning of key words which are focal to the understanding and development of a text, but translators should not look at every word in isolation but the meaning of the text as a whole.

5. CONCLUSION: Strategies used by professional translators

At the end, we opt to conclude our article with the strategies used by professional translators. Baker (2011) suggested that equivalence has its hierarchy or levels. One of its levels is the word level. However, in translating a text, a translator may find a problematic word that is hard to translate since it has no exact or proper equivalence in the target language. Regarding this problem, Baker (2011) highlighted several approaches that professional translators have used to address translation. Baker's translation strategies provide the most appropriate set of strategies, because it shows the techniques used by experienced translators. These strategies are presented as follows:

- ***Translation by a more general word (superordinate):*** this is one of the common strategies for dealing with many types of non-equivalence, particularly in the area of propositional meaning. It works well in most languages. Using this strategy, the translator simply translates the source-language specific word into a general word in the target language. For example, *leap*, *vault*, *spring*, *bounce* which can be represented by the general word *jump*.
- ***Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word:*** In translation, a translator can also decrease the expressive meaning of a word if it is necessary. Translation by a less expressive word is a way to solve the non-equivalence problem by decreasing the expressive meaning of the word or making it sound

The framework of non-equivalence at word level in the meaning mapping of translation

more neutral/common. In English, the word skyscraper's expressive meaning can be downgraded by using the equivalent *Tall building*.

- ***Translation by cultural substitution:*** Translation by cultural substitution allows the translator to replace the culture specific item or expression with the target-language item, which could impact the reader. The main advantage of using this strategy is that it provides the reader with a concept that can be identified as something familiar. Using this strategy, the translator's decision will largely depend on the authority given, the purpose of the translation and the translator's own judgement of obscuring the cultural specificity of the source text.
- ***Translation by using a loan word plus explanation***
In translation, it is possible to translate a word just by adding the explanation after the word. Translation using a loan word is a translation technique in which the translator may leave the word just as it is in the source language text but accompanied by the target language description. When explained, it is possible to use the loan word alone. There is no need to re-explain the word because its length of description can distract the reader. For example, *Katana* (a sword originated from japan used by a samurai).
- ***Translation by paraphrase using a related word:*** this strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by source item is lexicalized in the target language but in different form. This strategy is simply replacing the source language word with the synonyms in the target language. For example, *terraced* can be translated to the target language to an item that stands for "*created in a terrace*". It also works for the word *creamy* which can be translated as "*that resembles cream*". Both of them are still related to each other.
- ***Translation by paraphrasing using unrelated words:*** Translation by paraphrase using unrelated word is used when the source item is not lexicalized at all in the target language. This strategy is bit awkward to use since one slot of a word from the source language will be filled by explanation consisting of several words in the target language. However, the main advantage of the paraphrase strategy is that it achieves a high level of

precision in specifying propositional meaning. For example, (...*the areas most accessible to and disturbed by man*) translated into (... *the places where human beings enter most easily and interfere most*).

- **Translation by omission:** Translation by omission is a translation strategy where the translator can omit particular item or expression which is not vital enough in delivering the meaning to the target language. When this strategy applied, the translation product will likely become very smooth. However, it might be less expressive. Moreover, there is a possibility that there will be a loss of meaning in the translation process. Therefore, this strategy is advised to be used as the last resort.
- **Translation by illustration:** This is a useful option when the word which lacks an equivalent in the target language refers to a physical entity and can be illustrated, particularly if there are restrictions on space and if the text has to remain short and concise. The word is simply replaced with an illustration in the form of the picture. For example, the word tagged as in tagged teabag is not easy to translate without using a long explanation. Here, an illustration of *tagged teabag* can be used instead of paraphrase.

Strategies, such as those outlined by Mona Baker, are useful in different ways. First, they help solve equivalent problems; second, they provide students with opportunities to discuss and reflect on contextualized theoretical issues during their learning process. Third, they may serve as a framework for students who want to conduct studies as part of dissertation research works on the problem of equivalence related to translation studies. I highly recommend Baker list of strategies also for searchers who intend to do extra research works on student's materials in the Institute of translation at University of Algiers 2.

5. Bibliography List :

1. Aguado-Giménez, P. & Pérez-Paredes, P-F (2005), Translation-strategies use : A classroom-based examination of Baker's Taxonomy.

2. Baker, M. & Gabriella Saldanha, G. (1998), Routledge encyclopedia of translation ; publishing by Routledge Taylor and Francis group; London UK;
3. Baker, M. (2011), In other words: A coursebook on Translation 3rd Edition, London and New York: Routledge;
4. Harmon, L. (2019), Translation strategies, techniques, and equivalences in critical approach, explorations: A journal of Language and Literature, pp. 7-16.
5. Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1990): Discourse and the Translator, Harlow, Longman.
6. Junining, E. & Mahendra, V. A. (2020), “Translation strategies for translating a news article”, in *Lingua*, vol. 15, No1, 2020, pp. 79-90.
7. Leonardi, V. (2000), Equivalence in translation between myth and reality, *Translation Journal*, Vol. 4, N° 4, October 2000.
(<http://translationjournal.net/journal/14equiv.html>) (Consulted on 15/03/2023).
8. Newmark, P. (1988), A textbook of Translation. Prentice Hall.
9. Nida, E.A. & Taber, C.R. 1982. The Theory and Practice of Translation, Leiden : E.J. Brill
10. Nida, E.A.(2001), Contexts in Translating, John Benjamins.
11. Owji, Z. (2013), Translation strategies: A Review and Comparison of Theories. *Translation Journal*, Vol. 17, N°. 1 January 2013.
(<http://translationjournal.net/journal/63theory.html>) (Consulted on 20/03/2023)
12. Ran, S. 2009. Philosophical Interpretation on E. A. Nida’s Definition of Translation, China.
13. The New Oxford Dictionary of English, 2005 (electronic version).