Conceptual Translation:
Script Theory over Equivalence Theory

Naser N. AlBzour

English Department, Al AlBayt University, Jordan

E-mail: nnnbzour@gmail.com

Abstract

Unlike most translation studies that mainly focus on describing problematic areas and issues translators oftentimes encounter and thus suggesting or even prescribing some practical solutions and techniques, this study essentially targets the conceptual mechanism that can to some extent explain possible choices made by translators and students of translation. Therefore, this paper is by no means an endeavor to provide any translation assessment or any pedantic instructions of methods and strategies to follow; rather, the researcher has explicitly endeavored to offer some insights into understanding the symptoms and rationales of making choices while translating any text, based on translators' schematic behavior that can be best tackled by *script theory* that shoots far beyond the mere semantic and pragmatic constraints. The study, therefore, attempts to extend the scope of translation studies from the traditional domains of cultural studies and applied linguistics interests into a higher intermediate Sweetserian conceptual analysis of pragmatic behavior and ultimately into some more comprehensive Schankean schematic paradigms.

Keywords: Conceptualization, pragmatics, schematic, Schank, script theory, semantics, semiotics, Sweetser

1.   Introduction

Any modern descriptively nondogmatic theory of linguistics would admit that meaning is not in any sense nor to any extent isomorphic and that semantics and pragmatics as two major disciplines play a vitally integrated role in setting the major landmarks of analyzing and interpreting any meaningful text although the focus, the tools and the scope can be evidently different. The former pays full attention to the shape and content of the textual units as such whether they are words, phrases, sentences or volumes of books; while the latter is primarily concerned with how to relate these textual units to a multitude of contextual factors and components that ultimately shift the content of such texts into intended interplay and channeled force as it has been expounded since the early dawn of the twentieth century by some semioticians like Morris (1964), Jakobson (1959), Johansen (2005), *et al*.; philosophers like Austin (1962) and Grice (1975) and more elaborately examined at later stages by many other semanticists and pragmaticians such as Leech (1980), Leech (1983), Yule (2000), Geeraerts (2009), *et al*.

Therefore, various layers of meaning can be incorporated while analyzing any text and thus different understandings may arise, on the one hand, as a result of the divergence between the semantic content itself as it can be represented lexically and sententially or the pragmatic function and the manipulated effect intended by the user as performed in utterances, on the other hand (see Horn 2006). In other words, "From what we now know about the nature of meaning, a hybrid or modular account seems inescapable; there remains the hope that with two components, a semantics and a pragmatics working in tandem, each can be built on relatively homogeneous and systematic line" (Levinson, 1983:15).

So truly recognized and eminent breakthroughs in the field of cognitive linguistics with indubitably acknowledged research interest in semantics, pragmatics, psycholinguistics and even historical linguistics have contributed to broadening the scope of translation studies that can be accordingly inclined to investigating the dynamism of semiotic aspects of language in general and the pragmatic implications of these premises within vivid synchronic linguistics perspectives. Thus, it is clear why and how Yule (2000, 3) perceives pragmatics as a discipline that "refers to the study of meaning in interaction or meaning in context, exploring how linguistic utterances could be interpreted differently as a result of different contextual forces and communicative goals".

2.   Eve Sweetser on Cognition

The predominant logic and the linguistic framework of such non-formalist analyses seem cogently and smoothly presented in a challenging, yet not so complicated sort of argument for specialists or even hardworking undergraduate students who are familiar with basic premises of cognitive studies, which can be more often than not philosophically as well as linguistically encapsulated succinctly in recent research argument and counterargument. Such a salient argumentation conveniently goes in parallel with the expectations of readers' linguistic competence as well as the level of the schematic register which captures the technicality of this advanced linguistic domain which might seem philosophical to many non-specialists.

One may discern the significance of the cognitive perspective of understanding the systematic nature of language *vis-à-vis* our sophisticated processing of our cognition. Therefore, any relevant approach can be basically perceived within the framework of cognitive semantics and cognitive pragmatics that can precisely an adequately handle a number of areas such as polysemy, lexical choices and pragmatic appropriateness in translation. This gives rise to the questions about the relationship between the acquired sense and other newly associated senses behind any translation choice or choices.

On the other hand, the scope of such interests may capture what determinants of synonymous or polysemous considerations rather than homonymous ones can thus intervene. As well, this ensures the relevance of what pragmatic implications behind drifting particular forms from their semantic import can be. These questions should be born in mind all through any pertinent study to precisely perceive the purport how such explicit regularities behind these meaningful choices operate; a matter that is not acknowledged by objectivists, whose premise of truth condition of the real world is pushed to the extreme against the linguistic cognitive structure (see B. AlBzour 2016).

Apparently, that is why conceptual factors must be always stressed in any semantics and pragmatics theory upon which translation studies may primarily hinge. Therefore, it would be beneficial to integrate both the synchronic and the diachronic aspects as inseparable variables of analysis since there should be always an intermediate stage where 'A' goes to 'B' in a systematic way that gradually ends up with the existence of 'B'. this type of conceptualization can be literally and metaphorically rationalized, bearing in mind that random metamorphosis is by no means possible or plausible since language is a unique system within which variables should operate systematically by default.

This does not, of course, contrast with Saussurean assumptions of the arbitrariness of the linguistic system since the arbitrary manifestation is confined to the conventional constituents of the language i.e the orthographical or the phonological presentation of the signifier with respect to the real world content of the signified (cf. B AlBzour 2016). However, the shared motivated meaning can be never understood in light of such arbitrary chaos. This can be best exemplified in the arbitrary relationship between the verb "see" in its real world where vision is not associated with the shape or the sound of the letters "s", "e" and "e", while it is systematically suitable to associate "see" with its new metaphorical senses in human cognition (Sweetser 1990).

In the same vein, the pragmatic dimension can be better understood in lines of an experientalist cognitive approach that is epistemically rationalized. Thus, it is logical to ruling out any formalist or deterministic approach of semantic analysis to cater for possible interpretations in question because the former advocates rather abstract mathematical analysis of the linguistic system while the latter hinges upon the idiosyncratic aspects of cultural impact on meaning and cognition. Hence, these approaches obviously fall short to explicate the dynamic nature of the pragmatic speech acts of utterances within their real world. Furthermore, one may explain denial of such approaches of traditional semantics ranging between feature analysis and field analysis. Undenying their merits, one can demonstrate how they can be very limited in proposing a satisfactorily comprehensive approach to a translation theory.

The researcher opts for overtly preferable cognitive approaches that can be much better presenting a feasible argument of meaning and meaning theory. Therefore, Sweetser (1990, 16) argues, "I intend to describe and motivate generalizations which cannot be described in terms of objective features or logical truth values". Sweetser's outstanding vision surpasses her mere analysis to encompass not only the Indo-European languages, but it can be also extended to a theory of universal semantics. Unlike formal feature-based semantics which cannot "account for observed regularities", cognitive analyses, cannot only describe the observed meaning patterns, but motivate and explain them in a natural and elegant way (B. AlBzour 2016). For instance, one of the crucial and maybe primitive attempts in this regard has the directionality of justifying why the interest in semantic change had not been acknowledged until recently unlike the phonological change.

Phonological changes used to look more systematic and easily traced, where as semantic changes used to be thought of as 'random whimsical and irregular'. The process of tracing semantic changes requires more profound analyses to unveil the cognitive and metaphorical mapping beyond the simplistic analysis of semantic feature. However, this does not underestimate recent works that reflect evolutionary directions in historical linguistics from 'less situated to more situated'. However, the researcher may persist that the goal after all in this paper is to increase our general understanding of not only semantic relations but also and ultimately cognitive schemes.

To grasp the idea of systematicity of cognitive schemes with relevance to our internal cognitive structure, one may refer to the doubts cast around the evident regularities of sound changes which had been refuted till the Neogrammarians set these parameters of such regularities. Hence, lots of arguments have tried to exemplify and elucidate the 'interconnections' among semantic domains which apparently reveal the potential reconstruction based on regular structuring. This regular structuring is inherently latent within the metaphorical parameters of the linguistic system itself (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999).

3.   From Sweetser to Schank

Through our step by step argument, it would be rational to refer to English perception verbs with their potential internal mapping within our cognitive paradigm, drawing upon Kurath's (1921) observations concerning some physical body aspects and their correlative symbolism of certain emotional reflexes. Therefore, the heart's physical function of pumping blood is undeniably associated with the upheaval of our emotions such as love, hatred, fear, courage and passion. Accordingly, this inspired Sweetser (1990) to incorporate the physiological analyses of interpreting the link-up between different emotional states and physical changes; thus color can comparatively reflect our emotional reaction.

This cognitive perspective has led Lakoff and Johnson (1999) Traugott (1990) and Sweetser (1990) and others to deeply explore how the "correlations between our external experience and our internal emotional and cognitive states" can explicitly portray the 'mind as body metaphor', as well as an extension of interactive mapping (Sweetser *ibid*, 30). Consequently, this can explain some interrelations between 'concrete verbs' and their extended abstract senses of perception verbs cross-linguistically.

Therefore, we can map out the sources of perception verbs in English and how these verbs constitute their target domains. For example, the metaphor of physical sight captures the domain of knowledge and intellection in some expressions like "I saw it with my own eyes" to indicate enough degree of certainty because of the certainty of visual data and visual knowledge, and this can reveal the *directionality of semantic change from concrete to abstract and from physical to mental* with different degrees of associations in various world languages although one must admit that the tendency sometimes may operate in a reverse direction (B. AlBzour 2016).

In the following section, therefore, it is worth considering to rationalize and thus posit a unifying pattern that may underlie the linkage between these physical and mental domains that stress the operational roles and processes in the mind (Johnson 1987). Thus, we may note that vision and intellect can be associated to each other in their domains because of the salient common features between vision and thought rather than any other physical senses. The prime rationale behind this claim is that vision is the main source of objective data about the surroundings unlike olfactory and auditory stimuli that cannot be denied though, (cf. Johnson 1987).

However, one needs to modify this piece of argument to be more consistent and more convincing. There might seem some inaccuracy in our purport in the sense that the previous argument excludes a wide range of physically 'sight-underprivileged' or blind people, who were born without 'vision', yet it is not 'impossible' for them to develop a compensatory sense which is vision-like to some extent yet it is not. This would be more coherent and go much in harmony with the argument about the predominant assumptions in ancient cultures that "physical blindness was considered to be concomitant of the highest level of internal vision". (Sweetser 1990: 40).

On the other hand, the cognitive argument concerning the communicative and subjective internal self of the perception verb "hear" seems more cogent. This can link the auditory physical channeling to a mental activity. This auditory activity more often than not reflects a deep relation between "hearing" and "heedfulness", on the one hand as in " I can hear" which means "I can understand", or more obviously in " not to be deaf to someone's argument". One can maintain that hearing, on the other hand, can be used to express obedience and subjection. This internal receptivity of the verb seems more universal since it finds echoes in Hebrew Old Testament and other Semitic languages such as السمع Arabic- as far as the researcher knows as a native speaker of Arabic as it can be manifest in the Arabic collocation "السمع و الطاعة", i.e. literally hearing and obedience, which may go far beyond the structural forms into a conceptual interactive frame that may envisage how the mind accordingly works (Pinker 1997).

The regularity of such conceptual semantic reconstruction can be evidently seen in the very fact that the distribution of the internal and external correlation is systematically mapped out. Verbs such as *see* and *hear* can overlap to a certain extent to convey communicative features of *understanding*. In addition, other verbs of perception such as *smell* and *touch* can less frequently develop metaphorical associations with the mental domain to encompass meanings such as *know* and *understand*. This assumption can be valid in English and other Indo-European languages, yet it would be less accurate in some Semitic languages because a verb like *touch* can be used in such intellectual domains in Arabic.

Thereby, we can smoothly move into another domain of interrelations between different cognitive domains by oscillating between the real world denotation of the root the epistemic counterparts ranging between what can be understood as an obligation in one case and probability in another. Thus, the epistemic meanings of many lexical items tend to show kinship to the physical world and epistemic world. This very metaphorical presentation of implication of modality creates what Sweetser deems as pragmatic ambiguity in some instances where the modal '*must*' is used to express obligation in once case and possibility in another instance.

This phenomenon seems to be somehow universal among related and unrelated languages such as Indo-European, Semitic, Dravidian, Mayan *etc*. The extension from the root to the epistemic meaning seems systematic and can be evidently traced in children's speech in language acquisition (see Kuczaj and Daly 1979). This close realization can reveal the intricate correlation between the world outside and our conceptual world inside. This mapping, therefore, springs from the socio-physical to the epistemic spheres in a closely related regular sense. No wonder then that any similar cognitive processing at any linguistic level follows symmetrical mapping, so these "symmetrical mapping strategies can be identified cognitively as a result of meaning radiation, meaning infusion and diffusion" (AlBzour B. 2016, 97).

Force dynamics (Talmy 1985) has rigorous impacts on basic analysis of the semantics of root modality in terms of lexical content that presents the physical and the social aspects of forces and barriers that explain the root function of words like modals. Consequently, it can be maintained that 'must' and 'may' can show the influence of such force dynamics of completely different forces since 'may' has the least barrier restriction while 'must' shows a great extent of choice restriction and excluding alternatives of interlocutors. On the other hand, 'can' may overlap with 'may' to some extent, but that overlap can be intuitively recognized since 'can' denotes the doer's positive ability while 'may' is related to 'the lack of restriction on the part of someone else', (Sweetser 1982). Such assumptions and analyses by extension can wider encompass discoursal aspects of meaning, (cf. Jackendoff 1990 & 1996).

To move some steps further, one may differentiate between other modals sharing similar force dynamics of obligation namely *ought to*, *have to* and *need to* which resemble 'must' in a sense. The differences between these three modals are of course deemed in terms of the degree of obligation each one denotes, so 'ought to' has the least obligatory value compared to the most obligatory modal 'must'. In addition, the source of obligation can be different: morally or socially in 'ought to', extrinsically imposed authority as in 'have to' and internal to the doer himself as in 'need. Other root modals are treated and analyzed by in light of Palmer's (1979) and Lakoff's (1971) on the basis of intuitive evaluation covering a wide range of modality such as futurity, necessity, obligation, condition and volition.

Given that in our rudimentary analysis, the researcher moves forward in his assumption that meaning must apply beyond the epistemic world: "epistemic modality is metaphorically viewed as that the real-world which is its closest parallel in force dynamic-structure" (Sweetser 1990, 59). Therefore, our understanding of the socio-physical barriers is closely related to the mapping of the metaphorical structure of our reasoning processes. However, this metaphorical mapping is not alien to the real world root of modality. They are both interrelated to some extent, and the epistemic aspects are not autonomous from the root counterparts. Hence, the obligatory root modal 'must' in 'you must be at school' can clearly tell us that 'must' in 'I must conclude that…' extends this sense of socio-physical obligation to encompass the epistemic force in our cognitive structure and schematic perception, (cf. Silva 2003).

By the same token, similar but more complicated analyses of speech act verbs and speech act modality tend to be concise and precise as well by delineating and reiterating the basic landmarks of three domains: content domain, epistemic domain and speech interaction domain. It is unanimously agreed upon in pragmatics that conversational world and conventional world are two different entities though the former is an extension of the latter, exactly like the extension of the epistemic world relates to the real world. The argument for script dynamics can be extended about the realization of the three integral domains (content, epistemic and conversational) semantically and discoursally.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Conceptual Translation

Therefore, the researcher insists that any plausible interpretation of any text should take into consideration the contextual factors that can give rise to the multi-aspect status and functions of any utterance while demonstrating the multilayer interpretation in causal or resultative relations that can be simply interpreted within the concrete-content domain, so any correct interpretation does not rely on form; rather it depends on discoursally motivated choices between textual and contextual components of the script in question.

Again and again, the focal point of this argument moves smoothly through presenting some data buttressing the researcher's claims concerning the necessity of differentiating between and coping with these aforementioned domains with particular emphasis on the crucial role of the pragmatic domain, of course, which indubitably crystallizes the multi-layers of different speech forces. A good portion of such an argument at this level goes in concordance with the current semiotics and cognitive trends (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Lakoff 2002, AlBzour, N. 2011, *et al*).

What is needed goes beyond the naïve truth value to more vividly motivated conversational output. For instance, the analysis of the operating conditionality in relevant domains is more convincing more often that not, though it might be intriguing sometimes to postulate that some assumptions are exclusively distinct or felicitously not overlapping because it is unreasonable to establish any conventionally logical or conversational implicature between any two propositions although both of them may look appropriately valid at the face value in terms of truth condition.

The anomaly emanates from the irrationally implied within the script itself due to the possibility of an interpretable complicated contextualization of the same utterance in the epistemic domain. Interestingly enough, a spectrum of speech acts that govern real conversation in addition to other pragmatic premises based on fundamental assumptions proposed by great scholars have crucially intervened such as Austin (1961), Searle (1969), Grice (1975), Vanderveken *1985 et al*). The narrow views of traditional semantic assumptions fall short to account for a number of dynamic aspects of the metaphorical behavior of language.

The implications of all the aforementioned linguistic arguments may give rise to explicate the lucid role that script theory can play while elaborating on some cognitive aspects that tend to explain how translation theory should capitalize on such cognitive approaches (see N. AlBzour and B. AlBzour 2015 & N. AlBzour 2011). There is no doubt that script theory was launched as a psychological endeavor based on understanding human's behavior beyond the primitive stimulus response patterns so that maximal effects of a positive value can be achieved at the expense of negative ones as it can be presented in a sequence of events technically termed as scenes (Schank 1975). This is the essence of employing frames in renconstructing contextual factors and establishing some situational interaction as proposed by Schank and Abelson (1977). Such interesting hypotheses do consider conceptual transitions that combine both mental and physical ones and thus allow humans to organize knowledge and meaning as such in light of perceiving the way knowledge can be distributed and decomposed situationally (Tomkins 1987).

The vast bulk of translation studies have handled millions of issues in translation theory on the basis of textual components at the lexical level, sentential level and wider textual levels as if translation were a quest for equivalence whether it be formal, functional, dynamic or cultural in traditional terms (see Nida 1964, Catford 1965, Newmark 1988); so these studies have targeted the text itself whether source or target in their analysis, their argument and their assessment or evaluation. This study, on the contrary, is not an attempt to criticize or evaluate the quality of any translation, nor to propose strategies and methods of translation nor to support or retort any argument that deals with critiquing renditions and proposing solutions for translators.

Rather, the researcher is trying to diagnose translation competence not translation performance. This can be attained if we examine some renditions and try to explore how internal relations within the target texts can or cannot match the source text; and thus to what extent these similarities or differences can be approached in light of our dynamic schematic behavior that best reflects substantially intrinsic cognitive processing of meaning networks in terms of script forms and script functions unlike many traditional performance-based studies (see Nida and Taber 1969, Newmark 1981, Sebeok 2003 *et al*).

Therefore, the significance of script theory is innumerably permeating and it can cater for hosts of major issues in the fields of artificial intelligence, linguistics and education (Schank 1975, 1982 and 1986). Thus, deeming knowledge and information as schematic units allows the learner to fill in the blank slots based on stereotyped and anticipated structures and interaction of his/her world knowledge that can be relatively certain, or even tentative within the limitations of three overlapping areas: active, focused and interactive.

This very logical assumption can lend itself to our perception of events because of the episodic nature of our memories as they rely on our own personal experiences and expectations and this allows us not only to understand the texts but also to make inferences and predictions (Schank 1996). One of the most popular examples that has been thoroughly investigated and circulated is Schank's 'restaurant script' where a number of scenes collectively make up and facilitate conceptualizing this script where various components and processes exist and interact serially and parallelly such as the concrete place itself, all the objects inside, the possible scenarios, the participants as well as the adequacy of the client's own experience (cf. Schank 1991, Schank and Cleary 1995, *et al*).

4.2 Translation in Scripts

Any cognitively and discoursally-oriented treatise should bank on fathoming the structure and the mechanism of world knowledge that may surpass the boundaries of semantics and pragmatics because semantics is like a car that needs an engine; this engine is equivalent to pragmatics. However, the vehicle would never be in service without wheels, and this is tantamount to our schematic knowledge that can never operate effectively if ever without the gas of scripts! Such a nontraditional approach has its bearings in semiotically-oriented cognitive studies where "the rudimentary pursuits for fabricated sorts of perfect equivalents or semi-equivalents are doomed to utter failure unless the whole text is communicatively taken as a single micro-sign that operates within a wider macro-sign and sign system in totality" (B. AlBzour and N. AlBzour 2015).

To substantiate the argumentation this study has tackled, the researcher has tried to examine a recent authentic case that can fuel the validity of this paper's assumptions and may consequently trigger a considerable amount of future research and experimentation in the field of translation studies as well as interdisciplinary studies of thematic relevance. In this brief section, the empirical part this researcher has exploited was extracted from a translation exam conducted one month ago in April 2016. Forty five BA students, juniors and seniors, have been officially tested as part of their Spring second achievement examinations. The students were given a short English journalese text that went viral through social media and international news agencies a week before administering this exam. The examinees, whose native language is Arabic, were asked to translate the seven-line English text into idiomatic standard Arabic and they were allowed to use any hardcopies of English-English dictionaries to exclude any odd lexical unfamiliarity that may block the understandability of the source text.

The results and the renditions were graded, examined and analyzed for the sake of future research endeavors. Here is the headline used as a title for this text: "An Iranian Man was Sentenced to 74 Lashes for Killing a Dog"! The whole body of the text simply describes how an Iranian man hurled a dog against his car several times and the strict sentence for 74 lashes this man underwent in return, no more no less! Almost all the renditions show a systematic cognitive tendency through which choices can be anticipated based on the totality of relevant events that such scripts consist of even when wrong choices were made. For the sake of clarity and consistency, the morpho-syntactic choices have been ignored and/or neutralized in all these renditions because they neither add nor take.

It has been noticed that these renditions reflect how these students have relied on their wholistic schematic competence rather than their lexical repertoire of their lexicons. Therefore, three students rendered the headline into " رجل ألماني محكوم ب 74 لاشات'. The first aspect of such script saliency is the mistranslation of 'Iranian' into 'ألماني' instead of 'إيراني' because of the phonological similarity of the script of the last syllable that exhibits the genitive morpheme in Arabic. In addition, the schematic scenario of passing a sentence helped such students and others to fill in with expected kinds of punishment even if it might look nonsensical, so these three students completed the scripts with transliterating the word 'lashes' into Arabic 'لاشات' which can be understood as a kind of punishment although vague or meaningless.

On the other hand, eight students ignored the script of the word 'sentence' and concentrated on the script of the word 'kill'. Typically, the act of killing an animal can be fulfilled in many different scenarios, so these students precisely translated 'kill' into 'يقتل' without showing any serious problem apart from modifying the past tense of the ST into present in the TL. The conceptualization of this aggressive act of cruelty triggers an erroneous connection between the act itself and the manner of killing, so the sentence itself vanished and the number of lashes has been deemed and filled with the same number of 'cutting into seventy four pieces', i.e. 'و يقطّعه أربعة و سبعون قطعة' instead of rendering 'seventy four lashes', which might make some sense in its totality as a full script where this sequence of acts can be accordingly expected in similar contexts.

Moreover, nine students show a tendency to alternate their expectations via conceptualizing the verdictive act of this judiciary sentence into another predictable event as a period of time, so they rendered it as "يحكم ب أربع و سبعين سنة", i.e.

'the man was sentenced for seventy four years', which is quite logical and coherent for any sentence to be for a short or a long period of years in the context of crime-penalty scripts; however, what might look quite non-feasible and less coherent is passing such a long term sentence of imprisonment for killing a dog, not murdering a human being in the third world not in Switzerland!

More strikingly, four students exhibit a confused cognitive processing of the mental picture that represents 'death'. The death script is almost universal in most of its scenarios as a cessation of one's life although the manifestations of death can vary from one culture to another where death can be portrayed as an end of one phase and the beginning of another in some cultures; one's first and last doom in other cultures or even a transformation in a pantheistic sense in some other cultures. However, these four students show a bizarre cognitive behavior as they translated 'sentenced into 74 lashed' into ''. This rendition reveals how these students converted the script of '74 lashes' into a non-logical script of 'death sentence for 74 times'; it might be argued that 'cats have nine lives' metaphorically, yet no sane person would ever think of a human being with seventy four lives!

More coherently, six students retrieved their scripts that may portray the scenarios of some folk tales about packs of wild dogs that may attack people in the wilderness. Therefore, these students ignored all the previous scripts an even reversed some of the participants' roles, so they translated the sentence into their script-based form and analysis as '', i.e. an 'Iranian man killed 74 dogs that attacked him', so the man plays the role of an agent who executed death against dogs instead of being himself an experiencer or the patient of the penalty. In addition, these students disposed with the number of lashes and replaced it with the number of dogs to fit in the slots of their alternative script's components!

Another group of seven students also manipulated the thematic roles within the text in a different way so that the scrip texture would not collapse while mentally processed. Therefore, they translated the headline into ' رجل إيراني يقتل كلب بجلده أربع و سبعين جلدة', i.e. 'an Iranian man killed a dog by lashing it 74 times'! Again, the man plays the role of the agent while the dog remains the patient that has undergone the act of lashing which in turn shows the manner or the instrument of death according to this script.

What goes contrary to most logical expectations yet reflects schematic problems is the rendition opted for by three students as they mixed two opposite scenarios in one single script and this may trigger humorous effects! These students translated the given text into 'الحكم على رجل إيراني بالموت أربعة و سبعون سنة', i.e. 'an Iranian was sentenced to death for 74 years'! Such a rendition can be really deemed as a joke, yet it can explicitly reveal how the script of 'sentence' entails death as one unit as it can be realized in the phrase 'death sentence'. So far so good; however, it seems it was hard for these students to remerge the script of '74 lashes' which they misconceptualized as '74 years', so a paradoxical result humorously surfaced as 'death for 74 years'!

Finally, only five students were able to show some lexical and thematic expectations and correspondence between the source scripts and the target scripts as they more appropriately translated the text into ' الحكم على رجل إيراني بأربع و سبعين جلدة لقتله كلبا'. This rendition can clearly envisage how these students successfully managed to retrieve their own conceptual scenarios and how they smoothly tailored them into logical script relations.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, the researcher has addressed the issue of deliberate choices made by translators and students of translation in light of their conceptual abilities to read, analyze and render source texts. It has been found that such renditions whether appropriate, less appropriate, inappropriate or even wrong can clearly display the logical mechanism that these translators would implement based on their schematic knowledge to translate scripts into scripts not words into words nor sentences into sentences. These SL scripts sometimes help translators fill in the gaps when lexical or cultural problems surface; nonetheless, other scripts can lead translators to make wrong choices because of processing the events and the scenarios of given texts from source language perspectives when such scripts comparatively mismatch their counterparts in the target language partially or fully. Such an argument this paper highlights and advocates overtly goes in an antagonistic spirit against the traditional views that depict translation as a simplistic process of finding lexical equivalence between the SL and the TL because choices are deliberately made based on sequential and consequential events within each script and between scripts themselves.

References

AlBzour, B. A. (2016). Cognitive systematicity of semantic change: cross-linguistic evidence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3), 91-98.

AlBzour, B. A. and Naser N. A. (2015). From semantics to semiotics: demystifying intricacies on translation theory. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6(5), 121-127.*

AlBzour, N. N. (2015). Sociocultural nuances and their semiological implications. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *5*(6), 157-165.

AlBzour, N.N. (2011). *Semio-Pragmatic Analysis of Cartoons Discourse: a Step towards Semiotranslation.* Unpublishes Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University.

Baker, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.

Brown. P., and Levinson, C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Longman.

Deane, P. D. (1992). Polysemy as the consequence of internal conceptual complexity: the case of 'over'. In *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics,* 9, 32–43.

Geeraerts, D. (2009). *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. in H.P. Grice (1989),. *The Philosophical Review,* 66, 377-388.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics.* New York: Academic Press. 41-58.

Halliday, K., & Hassan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective.* Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication A cross Cultures*. Exter: University of Exter Press.

Hatim B., and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation an Advanced Resource Book.* London: Routledge.

Hopper P. J., and Traugott, E. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, L.R. (2006). Implicature. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. New Jersey: Blackwell publishing. 3-28.

Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. (1996). Conceptual semantics and cognitive linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 7, 1, 93–129.

Jakobson, Roman. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (2000). (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. 113-119.

Johansen D. Jorgen & Svend E. Larsen. (2002). *Signs in Use: An Introduction to Semiotics*. Dinda L. Gorlée and John Irons (Trans.). New York: Routledge.

John R. Searle. (1969). *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, Mark. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Kuczaj, S. A., and Daly M.J. (1979). The development of hypothetical reference in the speech of young children. *Journal of Child Language*. 6, 563-579.

Kurath, Hans. (1921). *The Semantic Sources of the Words for the Emotions in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and the Germanic Languages*. Ohio State University: George Banta publishing Company.

Lakoff, George. (2002). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books

Leech, N. G. (1980). *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. John Benjamins.

Leech, N. G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman. London and New York.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University press.

Levy, Jiri. (2000). Translation as a decision process. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader.* London: Routledge. 148-159.

Morris, Charles W. (1964). *Signification and Significance: A Study of the Relations of Signs and Values.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Newmark, Peter (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Nida, Eugene A. and C. Taber. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, Eugene. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Leiden, E.J. Brill.

Palmer. F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.

Pinker, Steven. (1997). *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton.

Schank, R.C. (1975). *Conceptual Information Processing*. New York: Elsevier.

Schank, R.C. (1982). *Dynamic Memory: a Theory of Reminding and Learning in Computers and People.* Cambridge University Press.

Schank, R.C. (1986). *Explanation Patterns: Understanding Mechanically and Creatively*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schank, R.C. (1991). *Tell Me a Story: a New Look at Real and Artificial Intelligence.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schank, R.C. (1982.). *Reading and Understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Schank, R.C. (1986). *Explanation Patterns: Understanding Mechanically and Creatively.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Schank, R.C. & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum Associates.

Schank, R.C. & Cleary. C. (1995). *Engines for Education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Sebeok, A. Thomas (2003). Intersemiotic transmutations: a genre of hybrid jokes. In Petrilli (Ed.). *Translation Translation*. New York: Rodopi, 307-312.

Silva, Augusto Soares da. (2003). Image schemas and category coherence: the Case of the Portuguese Verb deixar. In Cuyckens, Dirve & Taylor (Eds.), *Cognitive Approaches to Lexical Semantics.* 281–322.

Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, E. (1982) A proposal for uniting deontic and epistemic modals. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkely, California: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Sweetser, E. (1984). *Semantic Structure and Semantic Change: a Cognitive Linguistic Study of Modality, Perception, Speech Acts, and Logical Relations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Talmy, L. (1985). Force dynamics in language and thought. In *Papers from the Regional Meetings, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 21, 293–337.

Tomkins, S. (1987). Script theory. In Arnoff, Joel, A. I. Rabin and Robert A. Zucker (Eds.), *The Emergence of Personality*. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 147–216.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Traugott, E. (1990). From less to more situated in language: the unidirectionality of semantic change, in Adamson, Silvia; Vivian A. Law, *et al* (Eds.). *Papers from the fifth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 496–517.

Venuti, L. (2012). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Yule, G. (2000). *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press.