МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Національний аерокосмічний університет ім. М.Є. Жуковського
„Харківський авіаційний інститут”

Н.С. Дорошенко
N.S. Doroshenko

ОСНОВИ ТЕОРІЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Навчальний посібник

BASICS OF TRANSLATION THEORY

Textbook

Харків „ХАІ” 2007

УДК 81 (075.8)
UDK 81 (075.8)

Основи теорії перекладу / Н.С. Дорошенко. – Навч. посібник. – Харків: Нац. аерокосм. ун-т „Харк. авіац. ін.-т”, 2007. – 55 с.

Basics of Translation Theory / N.S. Doroshenko. – Textbook. – Kharkiv: National Aerospace University “Kharkiv Aviation Institute”, 2007. – 55 p.

Наведено головні постулати та концепції загальної теорії перекладу, розглянуто його різновиди, принципи моделювання перекладацького процесу, методи та прийоми, що застосовуються у міжмовній комунікації, у викладі сучасних спеціалістів цієї галузі .

Для студентів, що вивчають загальну теорію перекладу за програмою спеціальності „Прикладна лінгвістика”.

Бібліогр.: 35 назв.

The textbook reader is introduced to the basic postulates and concepts of translation theory, translation varieties, models of translating, methods and techniques used by translators in interlingual communication, all of these being presented in the interpretation of modern scholars.

The textbook is intended for the students majoring in Applied Linguistics and meets the requirements of the program in *Translation: the Fundamentals of General Theory* course.

Bibliography: 35 titles.

Рецензенти: канд. філол. наук, доц. Г.В. Коптєлова,
канд. філол. наук, доц. Н.В. Кринська

ПЕРЕДМОВА

Посібник призначений для ознайомлення студентів – майбутніх перекладачів – з основами теорії перекладу в інтерпретації спеціалістів-перекладознавців. Як за метою, так і за обсягом він не може претендувати на охоплення всіх проблем теорії перекладу або на повне розкриття тих із них, які потрапили на його сторінки. Він не може замінити собою фундаментальні праці дослідників цієї галузі, найважливіші з яких наведено в списку рекомендованої літератури. Що посібник має дати читачеві, так це насамперед чітке уявлення про місце перекладу в міжкультурній комунікації, закономірності перекладу і особливості його окремих видів, досягнення в теоретичному моделюванні процесу перекладу та обмеження у пояснювальній силі запропонованих моделей. Читач має змогу порівняти та зіставити точки зору представників різних перекладознавчих шкіл, а також висловити свою думку, відповідаючи на дискусійні запитання наприкінці кожного розділу. Хоча питання конкретних правил і норм вживання англо-українських перекладних відповідників, що розглядаються у курсі практики перекладу, свідомо оминаються , читач ознайомиться з принципами вибору методів і засобів перекладу залежно від мовних та екстралінгвістичних факторів. Окремі розділи присвячено поняттю перекладацької компетенції та проблемам професійної підготовки перекладачів науково-технічної інформації. Посібник завершується рекомендаціями щодо методики проведення досліджень, написання та захисту науково-дослідних робіт студентами, які вивчають теорію та практику перекладу.

Вибір англійської мови для викладу інформації обумовлений метою створення в читача англомовної термінологічної бази з перекладознавства та споріднених галузей лінгвістики.

L e c t u r e 1. THE PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION

LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

"…language is a *CODE* which possesses *FEATURES* – phonological (and, in the case of written languages, graphological), syntactic, lexical and semantic – and …language use is made possible by making selections from among these sets of code features in order to create *TEXTS* which act as adequate vehicles for the communication of meaning." (1:8)

Thus, language has a dual nature: it is 1) a formal structure (a code) and 2) a communication system. "Indeed, *any language resembles a code being a system of interrelated material signs (sounds or letters), various combinations of which stand for various* ***messages…***

The process of language communication involves sending a message by a **message sender** to a **message recipient –** the sender encodes his mental message into the code of a particular language and the recipient decodes it using the same code (language)." (15:21)

During the last fifty years "the study of language has undergone radical changes: the focus of interest has widened from the purely historical to the contemporary, from the prescriptive to the descriptive, from the theoretical system to the concrete realization, from the micro-level of the sign to the macro-structure of the text." (10: 8)

DEFINITIONS OF TRANSLATION

"Translation is a specific type of bilingual communication since (as opposed to bilingual communication proper) it …involves a third actor (translator), and for the message sender and recipient the communication is, in fact, monolingual." (15:22)

"Translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language." (6)

The following definition has been given in his own translation from French by R.Bell :"Translation is the expression in another language (or **target language – TL**) of what has been expressed in another, **source language – SL**, preserving semantic and stylistic equivalences."

He also defines the goal of translation as "the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text."(1: 5)

"What is translation? Often, though not by any means always, it is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text." (8:5)

“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. Each exercise involves some kind of loss of meaning, due to a number of factors. It provokes a continuous tension, a dialectic, an argument based on the claims of each language. The basic loss is on a continuum between overtranslation (increased detail) and undertranslation (increased generalization).” (7:7)

"Translation is a means of interlingual communication. The translator makes possible an exchange of information between the users of different languages by producing in ...TL...a text which has an identical communicative value with the **source** (or original) **text** (**ST**). This **target text** (**TT**, that is the translation) is not fully identical with ST as to its form or content due to the limitations imposed by the formal and semantic differences between …SL… and TL. Nevertheless the users of TT identify it, to all intents and purposes, with ST – functionally, structurally and semantically.” (12:4)

“Translation as a term and notion is of polysemantic nature, its common and most general meaning being mostly associated with the action or process of rendering /expressing the meaning/content of a source language word, word-group, sentence or passage (larger text) in the target language or with the result of the process/action of rendering. " (13: 10)

THE ROLE OF THE TRANSLATOR

“It is a little ironic that the role of the translator has only recently become a concern in translation studies.” (2: 3)

The translator is a bilingual mediating agent between monolingual communication participants in two different language communities, “i.e. the translator decodes messages transmitted in one language and re-encodes them in another.

It is this re-encoding process which marks the bilingual translator off from the monolingual communicator. As receivers, both have the same involvement in decoding – the difference is one of degree rather than of kind – but their encoding behaviour is in strong contrast.

When taking a turn as a sender, the *monolingual* is obliged

(a) to encode into the language used by the sender,

(b) to encode messages which are different from those received and

(c) to transmit them to the previous sender.

The translator’s acts contrast on all three scores. For the *translator*, the encoding

(a) consists of re-encoding into a different language,

(b) concerns the same message as was received,

(c) is aimed at a group of receivers who are not the same as the original sender." (1:15)

A simplified presentation of translation as a unidirectional and linear process:

"(1) translator receives signal 1 containing message
(2) recognizes code 1
(3) decodes signal 1
(4) retrieves message
(5) comprehends message
(6) translator selects code 2
(7) encodes message by means of code 2
(8) selects channel
(9) transmits signal 2 containing message." (1:19)

TRANSLATION THEORY

"A **theory** is an explanation of a phenomenon, the perception of system and order in something observed. It exists … in the mind. It has no tangible manifestation." (l:24-25)

"As any observable phenomenon, translation can be the object of scientific study aimed at understanding its nature, its components and their interaction as well as various factors influencing it or linked with it in a meaningful way… Theoretical research is to discover what translation is, to find out what objective factors underlie the translator's intuition, to describe the ways and methods by which the identity of the communicative value of ST and TT is achieved. The objective knowledge obtained can then be used to help the translator to improve his performance as well as to train future translators." (1:5)

"The core of the translation theory is the general theory of translation which is concerned with the fundamental aspects of translation inherent in the nature of bilingual communication and therefore common to all translation events, irrespective of what languages are involved or what kind of text and under what circumstances was translated. Basically, replacement of ST by TT of the same communicative value is possible because both texts are produced in human speech governed by the same rules and implying the same relationships between language, reality and the human mind. … In any language communication is made possible through a complicated logical interpretation by the users of the speech units, involving an assessment of the meaning of the language signs against the information derived from the contextual situation, general knowledge, previous experience, various associations and other factors. The general theory of translation deals, so to speak, with translation universals and is the basis for all other theoretical study in this area, since it describes what translation is and what makes it possible." (12:6)

"The general theory of translation describes the basic principles which hold good for each and every translation event. In each particular case, however, the translating process is influenced both by the common basic factors and by a number of specific variables which stem from the actual conditions and modes of the translator's work: the type of original texts he has to cope with, the form in which ST is presented to him and the form in which he is supposed to submit his translation, the specific requirements he may be called upon to meet in his work, etc." (12:7)

S. Bassnett-McGuire states that the purpose of translation theory is "to reach an understanding of the processes undertaken in the act of translation and, not, as is so commonly misunderstood, to provide a set of norms for effecting the perfect translation." (l:22)

"As R. de Beaugrande warns:
it is inappropriate to expect that a theoretical model of translation should solve all the problems a translator encounters. Instead, it should formulate a set of strategies for approaching problems and for coordinating the different aspects entailed." (l:23)

We have to bear in mind that, as W. Wilss puts it,
"Neither psycholinguistics nor neurology can as yet provide reliable information on how linguistic data are stored in the brain, how linguistic matching procedures take place and what mental structures are active in recalling linguistic information."(l:24)

"Translation theory's main concern is to determine appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts or text-categories. Further, it provides a framework of principles, restricted rules and hints for translating texts and criticizing translations, a background for problem-solving.

…translation theory attempts to give some insight into the relation between thought, meaning and language; the universal, cultural and individual aspects of language and behaviour, the understanding of cultures; the interpretation of texts that may be clarified and even supplemented by way of translation." (7:19)

QUESTIONS

1. How does language act as a means of communication?
2. What changes have taken place in linguistic studies over the past fifty years? What impact do you think they have had on translation theory?
3. Compare the definitions of translation proposed by several scholars. How do they differ? Which one seems to be the most encompassing? Can you suggest your own version?
4. What are the differences between monolingual and bilingual communication? What happens if a mediating agent (translator) participates in the bilingual communication process?

5. R. Bell admits that his model of translating is ‘rather crude and vague’ because it is based on the assumption that translation is a unidirectional and linear process. Can you think of situations when decoding becomes cyclic and cooperative rather than linear and unidirectional?
6. In V. Komissarov’s opinion, what makes translation possible?
7. What are the interacting components in translation?
8. What is common between the definitions of translation theory given by S. Bassnett-McGuire and R. de Beaugrande?
9. How can W. Wilss’ observation affect translation studies?
10. What are the aims of translation theory, according to P. Newmark?

L e c t u r e 2. EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

TYPES OF EQUIVALENCE

“Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent) in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc.) and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence).

It is apparent, and has been for a very long time indeed, that the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera. Languages are different from each other; they are different in form having distinct codes and rules regulating the construction of grammatical stretches of language and these forms have different meanings.

To shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally; there is no absolute synonymy between words in the same language, so why should anyone be surprised to discover a lack of synonymy between languages?

Something is always ‘lost’ (or, might one suggest, ‘gained’?) in the process and translators can find themselves being accused of reproducing only part of the original and so ‘betraying' the author’s intentions.” (l: 6)

“Faced by a text - written or spoken - in a language which we know, we are able to work out not only (1) the semantic sense of each word and sentence… but also (2) its communicative value, (3) its place in time and space and (4) information about the participants involved in its production and reception.

We might take, as a light-hearted model of the questions we can ask of a text, the first verse of a short poem by R. Kipling:

"I keep six honest servingmen;
(They taught me all I know);
Their names were What? and Why? and When?
And How? and Where? and Who?

…**What**? is the MESSAGE CONTAINED IN THE TEXT; the content of the signal; the propositional content of the speech acts.

Why? orients us toward the INTENTION OF THE SENDER; the purpose for which the text was issued, the illocutionary forces of the speech acts which constitute the underlying structure of the text, the discourse. These run the whole gamut from *informing* through *persuading* to *flattering* and it is rare for a text to possess a single function. Multiple functions are the norm rather than the exception…

When? is concerned with the TIME OF THE COMMUNICATION realized in the text and setting it in its historical context; contemporary or set in the recent or remote past or future.

How? is ambiguous, since it can refer to:

(a) MANNER OF DELIVERY: the tenor of the discourse; serious or flippant or ironic…

(b) MEDIUM OF COMMUNICATION: the mode of the discourse, the channel(s) - verbal/non-verbal; speech/writing - selected to carry the signal.

Where? is concerned with the PLACE OF THE COMMUNICATION, the physical location of the speech event realized in the text.

Who? refers to the PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNICATION; the sender and receiver(s). Both spoken and written texts will reveal, to a greater or lesser extent, characteristics of the speaker or writer as an individual and also, by inference, the attitude the sender adapts in relation to the receiver(s) and to the message being transmitted." (l: 7-8)

What kind of equivalence should be the translator's aim? A certain balance should be preserved between the overall context-free semantic sense of the text and its context-sensitive communicative value, i.e. between the equivalence of the content of the message and the equivalence of the functional roles of the ST and TT. Other authors speak about translation equivalence at syntactic (formal), semantic and pragmatic levels (Cf. l: 5; 15: 58; 12: 9-10).

THE UNIT OF TRANSLATION

"The idea of translation equivalence is strongly related to that of the **unit of translation**, i.e. the text length required to obtain proper equivalent.

…one word is hardly a common unit of translation. It is especially true for … analytical languages like English in which the words are usually polysemantic and their meaning strongly depends on the environment." (15: 60)

The notion 'unit of translation' has been defined in these terms:

"The smallest segment of an SL text which can be translated, as a whole, in isolation from other segments. It normally ranges from the word through the collocation to the clause. It could be described as "as small as is possible and as large as is necessary"…"(8:285).

"Since the sentence is the basic unit of thought, presenting an object and what it does, is, or is affected by, so the sentence is, in the first instance, your unit of translation, even though you may later find many SL and TL correspondences within that sentence...

Below the sentence, you go to clauses, both finite and non-finite...Within the clause, you may take next the two obviously cohesive types of collocations, adjective-plus-noun or verb-plus-object, or the various groups that are less context-bound." (8:31-32).

"Traditionally and from practical viewpoint the optimal length of text for translation is a sentence." (15: 61)

"It is difficult to imagine a better example of an issue which cries out for empirical investigation. If we ask what the unit is that the translator actually processes in the course of translating, we discover that there is good psychological and linguistic evidence to suggest that the unit tends to be the clause…There is also experimental evidence which supports the notion of co-occurrence between cognitive 'chunk' boundaries and syntactic boundaries within the clause; boundaries between major structural units (Subject, Predicator, Complement, etc.) and the forms which realize them (phrases for the most part). For example,

the United Nations Secretary General reported substantial progress in the peace negotiations in Geneva today

would be likely to be segmented during reading into five or six units:

[the United Nations Secretary General]
[reported]
[substantial progress in the peace negotiations]
[in Geneva]
[today]

or

[the United Nations Secretary General]
[reported]
[substantial progress]
[in the peace negotiations]
[in Geneva]
[today]

and not

[the United]
[Nations Secretary]
[General reported substantial]
[progress in the]
[peace negotiations in]
[Geneva today]..." (l: 29-31)

It seems appropriate, however, to cite an argument against focusing attention on the sentence:

"It is self-evident that language does not exist in isolation from its users nor they from the society in which they live and it is equally evident that language, whether as knowledge or as communication, does not consist of individual, isolated sentences. We must, of necessity, extend our analysis of the code... and go beyond the formal structure of language as a context-free system of usage to its context-sensitive use in discourse and, as a result, take the analysis of the formal aspects of the code beyond the sentence into the text." (l: 161)

TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS

An "important branch of the theory of translation is concerned with the study of ST and TT units which can replace each other in the translating process. The creation of equivalent texts results in, and in part is dependent on, the equivalence of correlated language units in the two texts. In any two languages there are pairs of units which are of identical or similar communicative value and can replace each other in translation. The communicative value of a language element depends both on its own semantics and on the way it is used in speech. Therefore translation equivalence may be established between units occupying dissimilar places in the system of respective languages. It follows that equivalent units cannot be discovered with confidence before a certain amount of TTs have been compared with their STs.

It is obvious that a description of translation equivalents, as opposed to the methods of the general theory of translation, should be bilingual, that is, it should always relate to a definite pair of languages. Moreover, a bilingual theory of translation should study two separate sets of equivalents, with either language considered, in turn, as SL and the other as TL." (12: 8-9)

"The structural similarity of ST and TT implies that relationships of equivalence are established between correlated units in the two texts. TL units in TT that are used to render the meaning of the respective SL units in ST can be said to substitute for the latter as their functional equivalents (or correspondences)." (12: 20)

"…the choice of translation equivalents depends on the context, situation and background information." (15: 101)

"…in translation *equivalent* means indirectly equal, that is *equal by the similarity of meanings…*

This simple idea is very important for the understanding of translation: *the words that you find in a dictionary as translations of the given foreign language word are not the universal substitutes of this word in your language. These translations (equivalents) are worth for specific cases which are yet to be determined by the translator…*

…translation equivalence never means the sameness of the meaning for the signs of different languages."(15: 59)

"…the semantic analysis of the text must take into account both the immediate surroundings, i.e. the meaning of other words and structures in the same sentence, and the broad context which comprises the contents of the whole original text, whether it is a small extract, an article or a large book.

The information that can be gleaned from the original text should be supplemented by the translator's knowledge of the actual facts of life…

Analyzing the contents of the original the translator makes the assessment of the relative communicative value of different meaningful elements. In most cases his professed aim is to achieve the closest approximation to the original, i.e. to reproduce its contents in all the details. As long as the linguistic or pragmatic reasons make it impossible and the translation involves a certain loss of information, the translator has not infrequently to choose between several evils. As often as not, one meaningful element of the original can be retained in translation only at the expense of omitting some other part of the contents. The translator has to decide what bits of information he is prepared to sacrifice and what elements of the original meaning are of greater communicative value and should be rendered at any cost.

The choice of the dominant aspect of meaning usually depends on the type of the text and the prevailing pragmatic considerations. While translating, for instance, figurative set expressions the translator may try to preserve their basic metaphorical meaning at the expense of other parts of the contents including the figure of speech that makes up the metaphorical structure of the collocation. In most cases the purport of communication is, first and foremost, to express a certain idea while the figurative way of expressing it is a kind of embellishment, a nice and pleasant luxury which can be dispensed with, if necessary. When "a skeleton in the family cupboard" becomes "a shameful family secret" in translation, there is certainly a loss in expressiveness, but the basic sense is well preserved. The metaphorical meaning will be chosen as the dominant component to be preserved in translation." (12: 61-62)

QUESTIONS

1. Why is the notion of equivalence considered to be the central one in the theory and practice of translation?
2. What is formal equivalence? What is functional equivalence? Give your own examples.
3. What point does R.Bell illustrate by quoting R.Kipling's poem? How does it relate to the notion of equivalence in translation?
4. Why is the idea of translation equivalence strongly related to that of the unit of translation?
5. What do you think about P.Newmark's definition of the unit of translation? What aspects of the issue does R.Bell emphasize?

6. How can language units with different linguistic status in SL and TL become translation equivalents?
7. Do you think it is true that "translation equivalence never means the sameness of the meaning for the signs of different languages"? Why/why not? Give your examples.
8. What are the roles of the context, situation and the translator's background knowledge in translation? Give your examples.
9. What is a "lesser evil" strategy? Why do translators have to use it?
10. What can the technical translator infer from the last paragraph quoted from V. Komissarov's text?

L e c t u r e 3. TRANSLATION VARIETIES

As among the functions of language the three main ones are the EXPRESSIVE, the INFORMATIVE and the VOCATIVE functions because these are the main purposes of using language, we will now consider their implications for translators.

LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS, TEXT-CATEGORIES AND TEXT-TYPES

Function	***Expressive***	***Informative***		***Vocative***
Core	Writer	"Truth"		Readership
Author's status	"Sacred"	"Anonymous"		"Anonymous"
Type				
	Serious imaginative	***Topic***	***Format***	Notices
	Authoritative statements	Scientific	Textbook	Propaganda
	Autobiography	Commercial	Paper	Publicity
	Personal correspondence	Industrial	Article	Popular fiction
		Economic	Memorandum minutes	
		Other areas of knowledge or events		

(8: 40)

"The core of the *expressive* function is the mind of the speaker, the writer, the originator of the utterance. He uses the utterance to express his feelings irrespective of any response…

It is essential that you, as translator, should be able to distinguish the personal components of these texts: i.e. unusual ('infrequent') collocations; original metaphors; 'untranslatable' words, particularly adjectives of 'quality' that have to be translated one-to-two or –three; unconventional syntax; neologisms; strange words (archaisms, dialect, odd technical terms) – all that is often characterized as 'IDIOLECT' or 'personal dialect' as opposed to 'ORDINARY

LANGUAGE', i.e. stock idioms and metaphors, common collocations, normal syntax, colloquial expressions and 'phaticisms' – the usual tramlines of language. The personal components constitute the 'expressive' element (they are only a part) of an expressive text, and you should not normalise them in a translation.

The core of the *informative* function of language is external situation, the facts of a topic, reality outside language, including reported ideas and theories. For the purposes of translation, typical 'informative' texts are concerned with any topic of knowledge, but texts about literary subjects, as they often express value-judgments, are apt to lean towards 'expressiveness'. The format of an informative text is often standard: a textbook, a technical report, an article in a newspaper or periodical, a scientific paper, a thesis, minutes or agenda of a meeting.

One normally assumes a modern, non-regional, non-class, non-idiolectal style, with perhaps four points on a scale of language varieties: (1) a formal, non-emotive, technical style for academic papers, characterized in English by passives, present and perfect tenses, literal language, Latinized vocabulary, jargon, multi-noun compounds with 'empty' verbs , no metaphors; (2) a neutral or informal style with defined technical terms for textbooks characterized by first person plurals, present tenses, dynamic active verbs, and basic conceptual metaphors; (3) an informal, warm style for popular science or art books (e.g., coffee-table books), characterized by simple grammatical structures, a wide range of vocabulary to accommodate definitions and numerous illustrations, and stock metaphors and a simple vocabulary; (4) a familiar, racy, non-technical style for popular journalism, characterized by surprising metaphors, short sentences, Americanese, unconventional punctuation, adjectives before proper names and colloquialisms…

The core of the *vocative* function of language is the readership, the addressee. I use the term 'vocative' in the sense of "calling upon' the readership to act, think or feel, in fact to 'react' in the way intended by the text... This function of language has been given a number of other names, including 'conative' (denoting effort), 'instrumental'. 'operative' and 'pragmatic' (in the sense of used to produce a certain effect on the readership). Note that nowadays vocative texts are more often addressed to a readership than a reader. For the purposes of translation, I take notices, instructions, publicity, propaganda, persuasive writing (requests, cases, theses) and possibly popular fiction, whose purpose is to sell the book/entertain the reader, as the typical 'vocative' text.

The first factor in all vocative texts is the relationship between the writer and the readership, which is realized in various types of socially or personally determined grammatical relations or forms of address: T(tu, du) and V (vous, Sie, usted) and other variant forms; infinitives, imperatives, subjunctives, indicatives, impersonal, passives; first and/or family names, titles, hypocoristic names; tags, such as 'please', all play their part in determining asymmetrical or symmetrical relationships, relationships of power or equality, command, request or persuasion.

The second factor is that these texts must be written in a language that is immediately comprehensible to the readership. Thus for translation, the linguistic and cultural level of the SL text has to be reviewed before it is given a pragmatic impact…

Few texts are purely expressive, informative or vocative: most include all three functions with an emphasis on one of the three. However, strictly, the expressive function has no place in a vocative or informative text – it is there only unconsciously, as ‘underlife’.” (8: 39-42)

“…literary translation is an artistic creation and to be successful it must be accepted by the language speakers’ community of the target language as a piece of literary prose in their native language, unlike other translation varieties which may be tolerated by the users even in poor quality (factual information sometimes is more important for the users than grammatical and stylistic correctness).

Besides, there is another factor that makes literary texts so difficult for translators – it is so called *hypertext.*

Hypertext is the collective meaning of a literary text comprising all associations and allusions acquired by the words and word combinations of this text in their previous usage.” (15: 124)

PHYSICAL PARAMETERS OF TRANSLATION PROCESS

“Though the basic characteristics of translation can be observed in all translation events, different types of translation can be singled out depending on the predominant communicative function of the source text or the form of speech involved in the translation process. Thus we can distinguish between l i t e r a r y and i n f o r m a t i v e translation, on the one hand, and between w r i t t e n and o r a l translation (or interpretation), on the other hand.” (12: 51)

“As the names suggest, in written translation the source text is in written form, as is the target text. In oral translation or interpretation the interpreter listens to the oral presentation of the original and translates it as an oral message in TL. As a result, in the first case the Receptor of the translation can read it while in the second case he hears it.

There are also some intermediate types. The interpreter rendering his translation by word of mouth may have the text of the original in front of him and translate ‘at sight’. A written translation can be made of the original recorded on the magnetic tape that can be replayed as many times as is necessary for the translator to grasp the original meaning.” (12: 54)

“…the following kinds or types of translating/interpreting are to be distinguished:

1. **The written from a written matter translating**…The matter under translation may be a belles-lettres passage (prose or poetry work), a scientific or technical /newspaper passage/article, etc.
2. **The oral from an oral matter interpreting**, which is a regular oral sense-to-sense rendering of a speech/radio or TV interview, or recording which can

proceed either in succession (after the whole matter or part of it is heard) or simultaneously with its sounding….

3. **The oral from a written matter interpreting** is nothing else than interpreting at sight. It can also proceed either simultaneously with the process of getting acquainted with the content of the written matter, or in succession (after each part of it is first read through and comprehended…
4. **The written translating from an orally presented matter** is …a rare occurrence. This is because a natural speech flow is too fast for putting it down in the target language (except for a shorthand presentation, which would be then a regular translation, i.e. interpretation from a written matter.” (13: 28-29)

“Interpretation, in its turn, is traditionally divided into *consecutive interpretation* and *simultaneous interpretation. Chuchotage* and *at-sight interpretation* are commonly regarded as alternatives of consecutive interpretation despite minor differences in physical procedures…

In consecutive interpretation the interpretation follows the source utterance, whereas simultaneous interpretation is performed simultaneously with the original speech.

This time lag of the interpreter relative to the speaker is the main distinction of consecutive interpretation, which determines the peculiarities of the approach and translation devices used by the interpreter…

Without special equipment simultaneous interpretation is impossible.” (15:111-112)

"...the consecutive interpreter adheres to predominantly denotative approach in interpretation whereas the basic approach of simultaneous interpretation is transformational…

However, both during consecutive and simultaneous interpretation interpreters use *text compression* and *text development* as basic translation devices.

Text compression aimed at saving interpretation time and removing source text redundancy is one of the main instruments of simultaneous interpretation which allows the interpreter to keep in pace with the source text not sacrificing the content.

In consecutive interpretation text compression is used as well – it allows to get rid of the source text redundancy, but the main instrument of consecutive interpretation is text development.

Ability to compress the source text and develop the target one from the core structure are the basic skills of an interpreter…

Text development in the course of interpretation is the restoration of the full composition of a source sentence starting from its syntactic and semantic core accompanied by restructuring of the source sentence in compliance with syntactic and semantic standards of the target language.

Text development is performed either with note-taking or without it. It usually starts from the Subject-Predicate pair and then other sentence elements are organized around this core.

Text development is the optimal method of interpretation because it allows to organize the translation in accordance with the target language style and grammar standards rather than copy the source sentence structure.” (15: 138-140)

QUESTIONS

1. How do the three main functions of language interrelate with text-types?
2. Why should the translator be aware of the characteristic ‘expressive’, ‘informative’ and ‘vocative’ text-types?
3. What are the characteristics of an informative text? What are the stylistic differences of informative text formats?
4. Which vocative text-types do you think the modern technical translator has to deal with most of all?
5. What makes literary translation a specific variety? What qualities and skills are expected of a literary translator? Give examples of hypertext allusions and associations.
6. What are the two principles of translation classification, according to V. Komissarov?
7. What forms the basis of I. Korunets’ classification?
8. Why is interpretation usually made at a lower level of accuracy?
9. How can interpretation be classified?
10. What are some of the interpreter’s translation devices?

L e c t u r e 4 . TRANSLATION METHODS & PRAGMATICS

Translation methods in the form of a flattened V diagram

SL emphasis	**TL emphasis**
Word – for – word translation	Adaptation
Literal translation	Free translation
Faithful translation	Idiomatic translation
Semantic translation	Communicative translation

Word-for-word translation

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

Literal translation

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

Faithful translation

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

Semantic translation

Semantic translation differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text, compromising on 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version… The distinction between 'faithful' and 'semantic' translation is that the first is uncompromising and dogmatic, while the second is more flexible, admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original.

Adaptation

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

Free translation

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

Idiomatic translation

Idiomatic translation reproduces the 'message' of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where they do not exist in the original…

Communicative translation

Communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership…

…only semantic and communicative translation fulfil the two main aims of translation, which are first, accuracy, and second, economy… In general, a semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level, a communicative at the readership's. Semantic translation is used for 'expressive' texts, communicative for 'informative' and 'vocative' texts." (8: 45-47)

"Literal translation ranges from one word to one word ('hall', *Saal, sale, sala, zal*) through group to group ('a beautiful garden', *un beau jardin, ein* *schoner Garten*), collocation to collocation (‘make a speech’, *faire un discourse*), clause to clause…, to sentence to sentence…

I believe literal translation to be the basic translation procedure, both in communicative and semantic translation, in that translation starts from there…Literal translation above the word level is the only correct procedure if the SL and TL meaning correspond, or correspond more closely than any alternative; that means that the referent and the pragmatic effect are equivalent, i.e. that the words not only refer to the same ‘thing’ but have similar associations (*Mama*,’mum’…) and appear to be equally frequent in this type of text; further , that the meaning of the SL unit is not affected by its context in such a way that the meaning of the TL unit does not correspond to it.” (8: 69-70)

“PRAGMATIC: Affecting the readership; the communicative, emotive element in language, as opposed to the referential, informative element (cf. the contrast between ‘mind’ and ‘reality’). The two elements are always present in language, but in varying degree.” (8: 284)

“Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. It shows how much more gets communicated than is actually said.” (14: 24-25)

“ Every act of speech communication is meant for a certain Receptor, it is aimed at producing a certain effect upon him. In this respect any communication is an exercise in pragmatics…

To begin with, the pragmatics of the original text cannot be as a rule directly reproduced in translation but often require important changes in the transmitted message. Correlated words in different languages may produce dissimilar effect upon the users.” (12: 43)

“ The communicative effect of a speech unit does not depend on the meaning of its components alone, but involves considerations of the situational context and the previous experience…

Here again, a great role is played by differences in the historical and cultural backgrounds of different language communities, in their customs and living conditions…

It seems imperative, therefore, that translation should involve a kind of pragmatic adaptation to provide for the preservation of the original communicative effect…

The pragmatic adaptation of the translation must also see to it that TR understands the implications of the message and is aware of its figurative or situational meaning… It is obvious that there can be no equivalence if the original text is clear and unequivocal while its translation is obscure and hard to understand…

The pragmatics of the text, which are linguistically relevant and depend on the relationships between the linguistic signs and language users, are part of the contents of the text. It is a meaningful element whose preservation in translation is desirable at any level of equivalence. It is reproduced in translation if TR gets the whole information about the pragmatic aspects of the original text and the pragmatics of the original text are just as accessible and understandable to him as they are to SR. This does not imply that he will be actually influenced by this information or react to it in the same way…

A translation event is pragmatically oriented in two directions. On the one hand, it is translation, which means that its primary purpose is to give the closest possible approximation to the original text. This orientation towards a foreign text is one aspect of its pragmatics.

But on the other hand, a translation event is a concrete speech act in the target language… This involves two important implications. First, a translation event may be pragmatically oriented toward a concrete TR, and, second, it is the result of the activities of a concrete translator who may have some additional pragmatic motivation, may pursue some aims beside and beyond the true reproduction of the original text." (12: 44-45)

E. Nida reformulated the problem of equivalence by distinguishing **formal equivalence** (closest possible match of form and content between ST and TT) and **dynamic equivalence** (principle of equivalence of effect on reader of TT) "which should be judged not against the original but against the Receptor's reactions…So, translation of the maintenance instructions is considered good if, after reading it, a technician will be able to operate the appropriate piece of machinery correctly." (12:46)

"Formal equivalence is, of course, appropriate in certain circumstances. At crucial points in diplomatic negotiations, interpreters may need to translate exactly what is said rather than assume responsibility for reinterpreting the sense and formulating it in such a way as to achieve what they judge to be equivalence of effect." (3:7)

"The translator is assigned his task and paid for it by the people for whom his work is not an end in itself but an instrument for achieving some other ends. Aware of this, the translator tries to make his work meet these "extra-translational" requirements, introducing appropriate changes in the text of translation… The specific goal, which makes the translator modify the resulting text, often means that, for all practical purposes, he assumes an additional role and is no longer just a translator. He may set himself some propaganda or educational task, he may be particularly interested in some part of the original and wants to make a special emphasis on it, he may try to impart to the Receptor his own feelings about the Source or the event described in the original. In pursuance of his plans the translator may try to simplify, abridge or modify the original message, deliberately reducing the degree of equivalence in his translation.

It is clear that such cases go far beyond the inherent aspects of translation and it is not the task of translation theory to analyse or pass judgement on them…

In many types of translation any attempt by the translator to modify his text for some extra-translational purpose will be considered unprofessional conduct and severely condemned. But there are also some other types of translation where particular aspects of equivalence are of little interest and often disregarded.

When a book is translated with a view to subsequent publication in another country, it may be adapted or abridged to meet the country's standards for printed matter…

In technical or other informative translations the translator or his employers may be interested in getting the gist of the contents or the most important or novel part of it, which may involve leaving out certain details or a combination of translation with brief accounts of less important parts of the original…

A specific instance is consecutive interpretation where the interpreter is often set a time limit within which he is expected to report his translation no matter how long the original speech may have been. This implies selection, generalizations, and cutting through repetitions, incidental digressions, occasional slips or excessive embellishments.

It is obvious that in all similar cases the differences which can be revealed between the original text and its translation should not be ascribed to the translator's inefficiency or detract from the quality of his work. The pragmatic value of such translations clearly compensates for their lack of equivalence." (12: 46-47)

"…the status of the source text as a social product, its intended readership, the socio-economic circumstances of its production, translation and reception by TL readers are all relevant factors in the study of the translation process." (3:13)

QUESTIONS

1. How does the V diagram specify the translation methods?
2. Where is word-for-word and literal translation mainly used?
3. Which method do you think will a professional consecutive interpreter prefer? Why?
4. Why is semantic translation used for 'expressive' texts and communicative for 'informative' and 'vocative' texts?
5. Why should the pragmatic effect be among the primary concerns of the translator?
6. What does the communicative effect of a speech unit depend on?
7. What is 'formal' and 'dynamic' equivalence according to E.Nida? What terms do you think they correspond to in P.Newmark's classification?
8. What is the pragmatic value of translation?
9. What factors may necessitate the pragmatic adaptation of TT?
10. How is sociolinguistics related to the theory of translation?

Lecture 5. BASIC TRANSLATION THEORIES (1)

"Of particular interest is that branch of the theory of translation which is concerned with the translating process itself, that is, with the operations required for passing over from ST to TT. It is a great challenge to the translation theory to discover how the translator does the trick, what are his mental processes which ensure production in TL of a text of identical communicative value with the given ST. True, these processes are not directly observable but they can be studied, even though with a certain degree of approximation, in various indirect ways. This direction of the translation theory is of considerable practical value for it makes possible the description of particular methods of translation that can be used by the translator to ensure the equivalence between ST and TT. The study of the translating process reveals both the translator's general strategy and specific techniques used to solve typical translation problems." (12: 9)

"Roughly, the human translation theories may be divided into three main groups which quite conventionally may be called *transformational approach, denotative approach,* and *communicational approach.*" (15: 40)

TRANSFORMATIONAL APPROACH

"The transformational theories consist of many varieties which may have different names but they all have one common feature: the process of translation is regarded as **transformation**." (15: 40)

According to G.Miram (16: 43), translation is the transformation of objects and structures of SL into those of TL. In order to translate we perform a set of multi-level transformations of SL text into TL text using specific transformation rules.

The approach is based on the ideas of transformational grammar as formulated by R.Jakobson (4). Transformational grammar studies rules for generating different syntactic structures with invariant lexical entities and logical and syntactic relations, e.g. "*Columbus discovered America","America was discovered by Columbus","America (which was) discovered by Columbus", "The discovery of America by Columbus"*. Transformational grammar singles out certain structures as nuclear ones from which other structures (transforms) may be obtained, e.g. {actor + material process + goal}: *"I am looking for my book*".

(1) One variety of the transformational approach assumes that transformations within the language and translation from SL into TL follow the same rules. Each SL entity has a corresponding translation equivalent in the form of a TL entity. The process of translation is viewed as a search for these equivalent entities, which places an emphasis on the form rather than the meaning.

“In the transformational approach we shall distinguish three levels of substitutions: morphological equivalencies, lexical equivalencies, and syntactic equivalencies and/or transformations.

In the process of translation:
- at the morphological level morphemes (both word-building and word-changing) of the target language are substituted for those of the source;
- at the lexical level words and word-combinations of TL are substituted for those of SL;
- at the syntactic level syntactic structures of TL are substituted for those of SL.” (15: 41)

G Miram gives the following example of translation by transformation:

"The source sentence being:

"The meaning of any sign is determined by the context"

and its syntactic structure having the form:

Art., N1, Prep., A, N2, V (Passive Voice), Prep., Art., N3

to obtain the target (Russian) text by transformation one has to perform the following transformations:

- at the lexical level:

the -> O equivalent, meaning ->значение,of -> O equivalent, any - > любой, sign -> знак, is -> O equivalent, determined ->определять, by -> O equivalent, the -> O equivalent, context -> контекст;

- at the syntactic level:

Art., N1 ,Prep., A, N2, V (Passive Voice), Prep, Art., N3 ---> N3, V (Active Voice), (Accusative)N1, (Genitive) N2

- at the morphological level:

*of -> люб-**ого**,знак-**а**; is determined -> определя-**ет**.*

Then the target text will be:

"Контекст определяет значение любого знака"". (16: 43)

(2) In another approach transformational grammar is adapted by proposing several model kernel sentences as transitional stages between source and target language structures (17:7-8). The basic assumption is that there is full equivalence between these kernel structures in SL and TL.

“The transformational model postulates that in any two languages there is a number of nuclear structures which are fully equivalent to each other. Each language has an area of equivalence in respect to the other language. It is presumed that the translator does the translating in three transformational strokes. First – the stage of analysis – he transforms the original structures into the nuclear structures, i.e. he performs transformation within SL. Second – the stage of translation proper – he replaces the SL nuclear structures with the equivalent nuclear structures in TL. And third – the stage of synthesis – he develops the latter into the terminal structures in the text of translation.

Thus if the English sentence ***“It is very strange, this domination of our***

intellect by our digestive organs" (J.K.Jerome) is translated into Russian as ***«Странно, до какой степени пищеварительные органы властвуют над нашим рассудком»*** we presume that the structures *"domination of our intellect"* and *"domination by our digestive organs"* were first reduced to the nuclear structures *"organs dominate"* and *"they dominate intellect",* respectively. Then they were replaced by the equivalent Russian structures *«органы властвуют»* and *«они властвуют над рассудком»,* after which the nuclear structures were transformed into the final Russian variant." (12: 31)

Therefore, the process of translation is divided into three stages:

- analysis: ST structures are transformed into SL model kernel structures;
- interlanguage transformation (universal semantic representation): SL kernel structures are substituted with the equivalent TL kernel structures;
- synthesis: TL kernel structures are transformed into the TL terminal structures (TL text).

"The transformational approach quite convincingly suggests that in any language there are certain regular syntactic, morphological, and word-building structures which may be successfully matched with their analogies in another language during translation."(15:50)

Transformational theory, however, fails to explain cases of situational equivalence:

"Fragile" -> "Осторожно, стекло".

However, as V.Komissarov rightly points out, it does not work in a number of instances where equivalence is established between seemingly inequivalent kernel structures:

"The split in the Democratic Party elected Lincoln".

"В результате раскола в демократической партии к власти пришел Линкольн" .

DENOTATIVE APPROACH

A denotatum is an object. In F.de Saussure's model of the relationship between the linguistic sign and the denotatum it stands on the right:

$$\text{SIGN} = \frac{\text{CONCEPT}}{\text{ACOUSTIC IMAGE}} \qquad \text{OBJECT (denotatum)}$$

"An example of this, for English, might be the relationship between the word 'tree' and the actual tree perceived by the senses which is referred to by using the word."(1:85)

TREE (concept)

'tree' = -------------------------------

(word) /TRI:/ (phonemic transcription)

The assumption is that the main content of communication, bilingual including, lies outside the boundaries of language. Therefore, translation is the description, by means of TL, of the objects described in SL. A crude model of translation may look as follows:
(1) translator receives signal 1 containing message
(2) recognizes code 1
(3)decodes message by identifying denotatum and concept and comprehending real-life situation behind message
(4) selects code 2
(5) encodes message by means of code 2
(6) selects channel
(7) transmits signal 2 containing message. (Cf. 1: 19)

Diagrammatically, the process of translation can be viewed as shown below:

source text → source concept (denotatum) → target concept (denotatum) → target text

"…as opposed to the transformational approach, *the relationship between the source and target word forms is occasional rather than regular.*" (15: 42)

Denotative theory works very well in a number of translation situations:
(1) when TL does not possess a linguistic sign corresponding to the SL item: *Jacksonphobia, America-firster*. In this case the translator either creates a new TL sign (*джексонфобія*) or chooses a sign which has a similar denotatum (*ура-патріот*) or just describes the denotatum.
(2) Another example is related to different ways of presenting a situation in SL and TL: *to sit up late - пізно лягати спати; instant coffee - розчинна кава.*

There exist numerous cases when the translator needs to check the real life situation in order to select the right TL word. For example, the SL sentence is "*X was baited by the right*". The usual equivalent for "to bait" is "цькувати, переслідувати", so we may expect something like:"*Праві цькували X", "X зазнавав переслідувань правих"*. In fact, however, X in this sentence refers to President F.D.Roosevelt, an outstanding, very popular and powerful public figure. In reference to him, we might prefer a 'softer' version:*"зазнавав різких нападів з боку правих*" [Examples taken from V.Komissarov's published works].

"The denotative approach treats different languages as closed systems with specific relationships between formal and conceptual aspects, hence in the process of translation links between the forms of different languages are established via conceptual equivalence." (15:51)

In spite of its obvious strong points, the denotative theory has it weaknesses. For example it does not distinguish among various degrees of formality:

"Officialese: 'The consumption of any nutriments whatsoever is categorically prohibited in this establishment.'

Official: 'The consumption of nutriments is prohibited.'

Formal: 'You are requested not to consume food in this establishment.'

Neutral: 'Eating is not allowed here.'

Informal 'Please, don't eat here.'

Colloquial: 'You can't feed your face here.'

Slang: 'Lay off the nosh.'

Taboo: 'Lay off the fucking nosh.' "(8:14)

Reference to the denotatum is not sufficient because we also need to establish and describe the relationship between the linguistic signs of SL and TL. Denotative theory is not strong enough to model the process of translation.

QUESTIONS

1. The scholars cited in lectures and use the terms 'theory', 'approach' and 'model' interchangeably. In what meaning?
2. What is the practical aspect of studying the translating process?
3. What underpins the transformational approach to translation?
4. What are the basic steps in translation according to the first variety of the transformational approach?
5. What is the role of kernel (=nuclear) structures in the second variety of the transformational approach?
6. G. Miram writes that the transformational approach fails to explain the cases where "the original text corresponds to one indivisible concept which is rendered by the translator as a text in another language also corresponding to the relevant indivisible concept" (16:46). Can you give an example to illustrate this point?
7. What are the basic assumptions of the denotative approach to translation?
8. What is the main difference between transformational equivalence and denotative equivalence?
9. Which of the two models is based on the identity of the situations described in ST and TT?
10. Which of the two models is predominantly used (a) by simultaneous interpreters? (b) by consecutive interpreters?

L e c t u r e 6 . TRANSLATION THEORIES (2)

S E M A N T I C A P P R O A C H

Since translation theory is to disclose the essence of equivalence between the meaning of ST and TT, it seems natural to assume that the model of translation process should be based on the analysis of the meaning of these texts. Theoretically, the semantic equivalence of ST and TT presupposes the identity or at least close similarity between all or some of the elements of the textual meanings. Therefore the translating process is aimed at distinguishing these elements in ST and finding the TL units that carry the same information.

Meaning is "the kingpin of translation studies. Without understanding what the text to be translated means for the L2 users the translator would be hopelessly lost. This is why the translation scholar has to be a semanticist over and above everything else. But by semanticist we mean a semanticist of the text, not just of words, structures and sentences. The key concept for the semantics of translation is TEXTUAL MEANING." (l: 79)

"An important part of the general theory of translation is the theory of equivalence aimed at studying semantic relationships between ST and TT. It has been noted that there is a presumption of semantic identity between the translation and its source text. At the same time it is easily demonstrable that there is, in fact, no such identity, for even a cursory examination of any translation reveals inevitable losses, increments or changes of the information transmitted… Part of this information, lost or added in the translating process, may be irrelevant for communication, another part is supplemented or neutralized by the contextual situation, but it is obvious that translation equivalence does not imply an absolute semantic identity of the two texts. The theory of equivalence is concerned with factors which prevent such an identity, it strives to discover how close ST and TT can be and how close they are in each particular case." (12: 6-7)

Componential analysis

Any semantic theory of translation involves the analysis of meaning, i.e. both "pattern recognition and, most importantly, the segmentation of the data into discrete, codable elements. This is as true of 'making sense' of language as it is of analysing chemical substances. For example, for the chemist, *water* and *hydrogen peroxide* share the common components H and O (hydrogen and oxygen) but differ in the amount of oxygen they contain; H_2O as against H_2O_2, i.e. the 'meaning' of each depends on the components they possess and the way those components are organized.

A very similar 'atomic' and 'molecular' approach to the description of word-meaning was developed in the 195Os by anthropologists working on … kinship systems and soon extended to other systems - colour categories, plant taxonomies, diseases, etc. - and to semantics as a whole. As a *theory* which sought to isolate *universal* semantic features (features which would apply in any language) componential analysis has been a disappointment. But as a *technique* for describing at least part of the semantic system of particular languages, it is still worth considering particularly as a means of gaining insights into the similarities and differences between languages; insights which cannot but be of value to the translator and the language learner…

The essential assumption of componential analysis is that the meaning of a word is the sum of a number of elements of meaning which it possesses - semantic **distinctive features** - and that these elements are **binary**, i.e. marked as present or absent (+ or -).

We might take, for example, a set of English words such as *man, woman, boy, girl* and show how a componential analysis can be used to specify the **lexical entry** for each...

First of all, it is clear that the four words (or, more correctly, the four concepts they realize) do, indeed, form a set of items. They share the characteristic or feature **human.** *Man* and *woman* share the feature **adult** and *man* shares with *boy* the feature **male**. For this set, these three features are sufficient to create definitions for each which distinguish them unambiguously. The lexical entries would be:
man {+human+adult+male}, *woman* {+human+adult-male}, *boy* {+human-adult+male}, *girl* {+human-adult-male.”(l: 87-88)

“From the translator’s point of view, componential analysis has considerable attractions as a practical technique even if … it suffers from a number of defects as a theory.

Consider the problem of lack of fit between the lexical items of two languages; an issue which continually faces the translator. Take the difficulty of translating the German noun *Uhr.* Without help from the context, the translator cannot know whether the appropriate English equivalent is *watch, clock, hour* or *time (Die Uhr ist... = The time is...).* Clearly, the lexical entry for *Uhr* does not contain 'size' as a significant component as it must be in English to distinguish *watch* from *clock*...

There are two major problems with componential analysis, both of which reduce its usefulness:

(1) that the 'features' proposed for the analysis of any item are arbitrary - not, in itself, necessarily a problem - and, hence, what may be criterial for one user may turn out to be trivial or secondary for another and

(2) the binary nature of the features (possession or non-possession). This limits the application of the analysis to items which are clearly distinguishable in such terms and makes it difficult to create satisfactory lexical entries for several categories of items, those which:

(a) belong to MULTIPLE rather than binary TAXONOMIES - metals, for example: *gold, silver, tin, copper, lead, zinc;*

(b) are in HIERARCHICAL RELATIONSHIPS with each other - measuring scales, for example, *inch, foot, yard;*

(c) OVERLAP - *house, home, dwelling, place; share, divide;*

(d) relate to each other by reference to some ASSUMED NORM - *short/tall, hot/cold.*

For the translator, each of these is (potentially, at least) significant. Do users of both languages, for example, categorize the same metals as ‘precious’? How do they perceive units of measurement – time, space, volume, weight, etc. – or distinguish, for example, *house* from *home*? What norms do they use; is 1.5 meters tall or short? Is 25^{o} C hot, warm, cool or cold?” (l: 90-91)

Meaning postulates

“A fundamental problem for the translator is that the relationships of similarity and difference between concepts (and the words that express them) do not necessarily coincide in the languages involved in the translation. However, it is not difficult to express such relationships for a particular language in terms of simple set theory and the key notions of INCLUSION and EXCLUSION; the first focusing on what concepts have in common, the second on what distinguishes them.

We can isolate three key types of relationship between concept and concept (and, therefore, between word and word).
At one end of the scale we place *inclusion* (hyponymy) and on the other *exclusion* (antonymy). As might be expected, between the two and exhibiting features of overlap - partial inclusion and partial exclusion - we find a middle term - synonymy.

The first of these, **hyponymy**, involves total inclusion: one concept (or the meaning of one word) is included in another. For example, *animal* includes *tiger* or *wine* includes *hock*, i.e. distinguishing EXAMPLE from CLASS or, in traditional terminology, the *subordinate* (hyponym) from the *superordinate*…

Naturally, where systems are in agreement, hyponymy presents no problems for the translator. The difficulties start when they differ…[For example, you can find] even in contemporary dictionaries, *foxhunting* and *bullfighting* within the class *sport*.

The second, **synonymy**, is particularly problematic, since it involves overlap rather than total inclusion or exclusion and assumes that, in principle, either item may be selected, in any context. Absolute, 100 per cent synonymy is, as might be expected, very rare and perhaps impossible, since it would require each item to be totally interchangeable and collocate not only with the same sets as the other but with all members of these sets. Two close English synonyms - *hide* and *conceal* - illustrate this.

Leaving aside the fact that *hide* can also be a noun and assuming, therefore, that both are verbs, we find the two to be virtually interchangeable (though the game of **conceal and seek* is clearly unacceptable!), except for correlations with less formal and more formal style respectively, i.e. it is the CONTEXT OF USE rather than the CO-TEXT OF USAGE which constrains the selection between them…

[There are] even more intractable problems where overlap is involved.

The Italian *canale* includes two concepts which are distinguished in English - *canal* and *channel* - by, in componential terms, the distinctive feature (artificial) which is [+] in the first case and [-] in the second. Presented with the statement by the Italian astronomer Schiaparelli in 1877 that he had seen a complex network of 'canali' on Mars, it was only a matter of time - a mere three years - before these 'canals' provided the rationale for the first story about ancient (extinct?) Martian civilization; a mythos which has spawned countless science fiction stories over the last century or more…

It would, as translators are well aware, be simple (and rather unrevealing) to proliferate examples of this kind.

The third, **antonymy**, concerns exclusion rather than inclusion and, as might be expected, exclusion involves a number of relationships which can be illustrated by considering the following words:

1. true-false
2. gold-silver-copper-iron-tin
3. large-small
4. teacher-student
5. one-two-three-four
6. become - stay/remain

It is clear that each word is not only in CONTRAST with the rest of the words in the set but also that some sets consist of items which are in OPPOSITION and that, of these, some are GRADEABLE OPPOSITES.

Each of these examples serves to distinguish six major types of opposition:
(1) taxonomic:
(a) binary, (b) multiple and (c) hierarchical; (2) polar; (3) relative; and (4) inverse.” (l: 91-93)

The semantic theory has a considerable explanatory power. It uncovers those aspects of the translating process which are not open to direct observation. It explains numerous causes and areas of differences between ST and TT. However, in V. Komissarov’s words, it rests on the assumption that all language elements are semantically categorized, which is not the case and may not be the case in any foreseeable future.

COMMUNICATIONAL APPROACH

“Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.

In theory, there are wide differences between the two methods. Communicative translation addresses itself solely to the second reader, who does not anticipate difficulties or obscurities, and would expect a generous transfer of foreign elements into his own culture as well as his language where necessary. But even here the translator still has to respect and work on the form of the source language text as the only material basis for his work. Semantic translation remains within the original culture and assists the reader only in its connotations if they constitute the essential human (non-ethnic) message of the text. One basic difference between the two methods is that where there is a conflict, the communicative must emphasize the 'force' rather than the content of the message. Thus f‘or *Bissiger Hund* or *Chien mechant,* the communicative translation *Beware of the dog!* Is mandatory; the semantic translations (‘dog that bites’, ‘savage dog’) would be more informative but less effective. Generally, a communicative translation is likely to be smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional, conforming to a particular register of language, tending to undertranslate, i.e. to use more generic, hold-all terms in difficult passages. A semantic translation tends to be more complex, more awkward, more detailed, more concentrated, and pursues the thought-processes rather than the intention of the transmitter. It tends to overtranslate, to be more specific than the original, to include more meanings in its search for one nuance of meaning.

However, in communicative as in semantic translation, provided that equivalent-effect is secured, the literal word-for-word translation is not only the best, it is the only valid method of translation. There is no excuse for unnecessary ‘synonyms’, let alone paraphrases, in any type of translation.” (7:39)

“The communicational theory of translation was suggested by O.Kade and is based on the notions of communication and thesaurus…

We shall distinguish between two kinds of thesauruses in verbal communication: *language thesaurus* and *subject thesaurus*.

Language thesaurus is a system of our knowledge about the language which we use to formulate a message, whereas subject thesaurus is a system of our knowledge about the content of the message…

… in regular communication there are two actors, sender and recipient, and each of them uses two thesauruses. (Although they use the same language their underlying knowledge bases may differ).

In special bilingual communication (i.e. translation), we have three actors: sender, recipient, and intermediary (translator).

The translator has two language thesauruses (source and target one) and performs two functions: decodes the source message and encodes the target one to be received by the recipient (end user of the translation)…

According to communicational approach, translation is *a message sent by a translator to a particular user and the adequacy of translation depends on similarity of their background information rather than only on linguistic correctness*." (15: 43-45)

"The communicational approach highlights a very important aspect of translation – the matching of thesauruses. Translation may achieve its ultimate target of rendering a piece of information only if the translator knows the users' language and the subject matter of the translation well enough (i.e. if the translator's language and subject thesauruses are sufficiently complete). This may seem self-evident, but should always be kept in mind, because all translation mistakes result from the insufficiencies of the thesauruses.

Moreover, wholly complete thesauruses are the ideal case. No translator knows the source and target languages equally well (even a native speaker of both) and even if he or she does, it is still virtually impossible to know everything about any possible subject matter related to the translation" (15:51-52)

"One may note that the communicational approach pays special attention to the aspects of translation relating to the act of communication, whereas the translation process as such remains unspecified, and one may only presume that it proceeds either by a transformational or denotative path." (15: 44)

THE THEORY OF EQUIVALENCE LEVELS

"…there are five different types of semantic relationships between equivalent phrases (texts) in two languages. Thus all translations can be classified into five types of equivalence which differ as to the volume and character of the information retained in each. Each subsequent type of equivalence retains the part of the original contents which includes the information preserved in the previous types.

Every translation can be regarded as belonging to a certain type of equivalence. Since each subsequent type implies a higher degree of semantic similarity we can say that every translation is made at a certain level of equivalence. Each level of equivalence is characterized by the part of information the retention of which distinguishes it from the previous level. The list of levels, therefore, includes:

1. the level of the purport of communication;
2. the level of (the identification of) the situation;
3. the level of the method of description (of the situation);
4. the level of syntactic meaning
5. the level of word semantics.

It is worth noting that the information characterizing different levels is inherent to any unit of speech. Indeed, a unit of speech always has some communicative intent, denotes a certain situation, possesses a certain notional structure, and is produced as a syntactically patterned string of words.

Thus, a translation event is accomplished at a definite level of equivalence. It should be emphasized that the level hierarchy does not imply the idea of approbation or disapprobation. A translation can be good at any level of equivalence." (12:15)

"Komissarov (1973) sees translation theory moving in three directions: the denotative (information translation), the semantic (precise equivalence) and the transformational (transposition of relevant structures). His theory of equivalence distinguishes five levels: (1) lexical units, (2) collocations, (3) information, (4) the situation, and (5) the communication aim." (7:9)

According to the ""theory of translation equivalence level (TEL)" developed by V. Komissarov… the translation process fluctuates passing from formal inter-language transformations to the domain of conceptual interrelations.

V. Komissarov's approach seems to be a realistic interpretation of the translation process, however, this approach fails to demonstrate when and why one translation equivalence level becomes no longer appropriate and why, to get a correct translation, you have to pass to a higher TEL." (15:49)

"It may disappoint you to learn that there is no one theory that is entirely adequate for building a comprehensive formal model of translation." (16: 8)

QUESTIONS

1. What two approaches are mentioned as used within the semantic theory of translation? What are they used for?
2. How does componential analysis represent word semantics?
3. Why is componential analysis a valuable practical technique for the translator?
4. What are the limitations of componential analysis?
5. How can meaning postulates complement componential analysis in translation studies?
6. How does the concept of antonymy in the meaning postulates model differ from the common notion of 'words which have opposite meanings'?
7. What are the differences between semantic and communicative translation according to P. Newmark? Which is the principal one?
8. What distinguishes the communicational approach from the denotative and transformational models?
9. What idea forms the basis of V. Komissarov's theory of translation equivalence levels?
10. In what way does V.Komissarov's approach generalise the translating process models?

L e c t u r e s 7 & 8. TRANSLATION PROCEDURES

While translation *methods* relate to whole texts, translation *procedures* or *techniques* are terms used for sentences, clauses, phraseological units and words.

"Though each word in the language has its own meaning, the actual information it conveys in a text depends, to a great extent, on its contextual environment… Some words, however, are less sensitive to the contextual influence than others. There are words with definite meanings which are retained in most contexts and are relatively *context-free*… They usually have *permanent equivalents* in TL which, in most cases, can be used in TT. The translator is thus provided with reference points helping him to choose the appropriate translation variants." (12: 71)

TRANSLATING CONTEXT-BOUND WORDS

However, the meaning of most words "in any sentence largely depends on the context in which they are used. True, all words have meanings of their own which are defined in dictionaries but the context may specify or modify the word's meaning, neutralize or emphasize some part of its semantics. And before looking for an equivalent, the translator has to make a careful study of the context to identify the contextual meaning of the word that should be rendered in translation. This meaning is the result of the interaction between the word semantics and the methods of its actualization in the speech act.

Most of the words are *polysemantic*, that is, they have several meanings. As a rule, the word is used in the sentence in one of its meanings and the context must show what meaning has been selected by the speaker and cut off all other meanings irrelevant for the particular act of communication…

We know that in most cases, the meaning of a SL word can be rendered in TL by a number of *regular equivalents*. *Variable equivalents* can be found not only to the polysemantic words but also to the *monosemantic* words as well as to a semantic variant of a polysemantic word, that is, to one of its meanings which can be actualized in the course of communication…

It is clear that the translator has to find the appropriate *occasional equivalent* in each particular context.

The context may modify the meaning of a word to such an extent that its regular equivalents will not fit TT...

The contextual modification may extend to the connotative meaning of the word. The translator is greatly concerned about the adequate reproduction of this part of the word semantics since it has an impact upon the whole text…

Professional skill in using both the dictionary data and the information extracted from the context to solve his translation problems is the hallmark of a good translator." (12: 75-78)

TRANSLATION PROCEDURES FOR LEXICAL UNITS

"**Transference (… loan word, transcription)** is the process of transferring a SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure. It … includes transliteration, which relates to the conversion of different alphabets: e.g. Russian (Cyrillic), Greek, Arabic, Chinese, etc. into English. The word then becomes a 'loan word'…

The following are normally transferred: names of all living (except the Pope and one or two royals) and most dead people; geographical and topographical names including newly independent countries such as (le) Zaire, Malawi, unless they already have recognized translations…; names of periodicals and newspapers; titles of as yet untranslated literary works, plays, films; names of private companies and institutions; names of public or nationalized institutions, unless they have recognized translations; street names, addresses, etc…

In all the above cases, a similar type of readership is assumed and, where appropriate, a culturally-neutral TL third term, i.e. a functional equivalent, should be added…

Cultural equivalent …is an approximate translation where a SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word: thus … *Palais Bourbon* [is translated] as '(the French) Westminster'; *Montecitorio* as '(the Italian) Westminster'…; *notaire* – 'solicitor'. The above are approximate cultural equivalents. Their translation uses are limited, since they are not accurate, but they can be used in general texts, publicity and propaganda, as well as for brief explanation to readers who are ignorant of the relevant SL culture. They have a greater pragmatic impact than culturally neutral terms…

Functional equivalent. This common procedure, applied to cultural words, requires the use of a culture-free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralises or generalises the SL word; and sometimes adds a particular thus: *baccalaureat* – 'French secondary school leaving exam'; *Sejm* – 'Polish parliament'…

This procedure, which is a cultural componential analysis, is the most accurate way of translating i.e. deculturalising a cultural word…

Descriptive equivalent. In translation, description sometimes has to be weighed against function... *Samurai* is described as 'the Japanese aristocracy from the eleventh to the nineteenth century'; its function was 'to provide officers and administrators'. Description and function are essential elements in explanation and therefore in translation.

Synonymy. I use the word 'synonym' in the sense of a near TL equivalent to an SL word in a context, where a precise equivalent may or may not exist. This procedure is used for a SL word where there is no clear one-to-one equivalent, and the word is not important in the text, in particular for adjectives or adverbs of quality (which in principle are 'outside' the grammar and less important than other components of a sentence)…Here economy precedes accuracy…

Through-translation. The literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations, the components of compounds (e.g. 'superman', *Ubermensch*) and perhaps phrases (*compliments de la saison*, 'compliments of the season') is known as **calque** or **loan translation**. I prefer the more transparent term 'through translation'.

In theory, a translator should not 'initiate' a through-translation. In fact, through-translations in contiguous cultures sometimes fill in useful gaps…" (8: 81-84)

V. Komissarov speaks about 'operations','transformations' or 'manipulations' that the translator performs:

"… the process [of translation] is viewed as a number of manipulations with the form or content of the original, as a result of which the translator creates the text in the target language. The type of operation is identified by comparing the initial and the final texts.

The f i r s t group of operations (or transformations) is characterized by i m i t a t i o n o f t h e f o r m of a word or of a collocation. In the first case the translator tries to represent the pronunciation or the spelling of the foreign word with the TL letters. Thus we get such translations as "битник", "стриптиз", "эскалация", etc. This method is usually called **translational transcription**...
In the second case the translator creates a blueprint collocation in TL by using a **loan translation**. This results in such forms as "мозговой трест"(brain trust), "работа по правилам"(work-to-rule), "люди доброй воли"(people of good will).

The s e c o n d group of operations includes all types of l e x i c a l t r a n s f o r m a t i o n s i n v o l v i n g c e r t a i n s e m a n t i c c h a n g e s. As a result, the meaning of a word or word combination in ST may be made more specific, more general or somewhat modified as a way to discovering an appropriate equivalent in TL." (12: 32)

OTHER TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

"Another type of lexical transformations is often called "**modulation**". It involves the creation of an equivalent by replacing a unit in SL with a TL unit the meaning of which can be logically deduced from it and which is just another way of referring to the same object or an aspect of the same situation…

The t h i r d group of translation procedures comprises all types of t r a n s f o r m a t i o n s i n v o l v i n g u n i t s o f S L g r a m m a r. The translator may solve his problems by preserving the syntactic structure of the source text and using the analogous TL grammatical forms or "a word-for-word translation". This may be called "**a zero transformation**"…

In other cases the translator may resort to various types of grammatical substitutes.

First, we may mention two types of transformations which change the number of sentences in TT as compared to ST. As a rule, the translator renders the original text sentence by sentence and the number of sentences remains the same. However, it may so happen that the structural and semantic problems of a translation event can be best solved by breaking an original sentence into two parts, i.e. translating it with two sentences in TL. Another type of such **partitioning** is to replace a simple sentence in the original with a complex one in the translation, comprising one or several subordinate clauses.

The problems that can be solved through this technique are varied. First it may come handy in dealing with the English syntactic complexes which pack in two subject-predicate units, each making up a sentence or a clause in the Russian translation…

The opposite procedure means **integrating** two or more original sentences into one or compressing a complex sentence into a simple one. This technique is also used for structural and semantic reasons.

Sometimes one of the sentences is grammatically too incomplete to warrant its separate reproduction in translation…

The integration procedure may be necessitated by close semantic ties between adjacent sentences…

The partitioning and integration procedures may be used together, resulting in a kind of **syntactic and semantic reshuffle** of sentences in translation…

Another type of grammatical transformations is characterized by the translator's **refusal to use analogous grammatical units in TT**. He tries to render the meaning of SL units by changing the grammatical form of a word, the part of speech or the type of the sentence…

Finally, there is a group of transformations which ensure the required degree of equivalence by a number of changes of both lexical and grammatical nature. They involve a different arrangement of ideas, a different point of view and other semantic modifications whenever a direct translation of a SL unit proves impossible. A typical example of such a procedure is the so-called **antonymous translation** describing the situation, as it were, from the opposite point of view and rendering an affirmative SL structure by a negative TL one or vice versa…

A complex change also occurs in **explicatory translations** in which a SL unit is replaced by a TL word combination describing or defining its meaning…

In conclusion, we should mention one more specific procedure which may come handy to the translator when he is baffled by an apparently unsolvable translation problem. It may be called the **compensation** technique and is defined as a deliberate introduction of some additional elements in translation to make up for the loss of similar elements at the same or an earlier stage…

The compensation method is often used to render the stylistic or emotional implications of the original." (12: 33-38)

Another group of authors suggests the following classification:
"…the basic set of translation devices (a kind of 'translator's tool kit') comprises partitioning and integration of sentences, transposition of sentence parts, replacement, addition and omission of words and word combinations as well as a special type of transformations called antonymous translation.

Partitioning is either replacing in translation of a source sentence by two or more target ones [**outer partitioning**] or converting a simple source sentence into a compound or complex target one [**inner partitioning**]…

Integration is the opposite of partitioning, it implies combining two or (seldom) more source sentences into one target sentence…

Transposition is a peculiar variety of inner partitioning in translation meaning a change in the order of the target sentence syntactic elements (Subject, Predicate, Object, etc.) as compared with that of the source sentence dictated either by peculiarities of the target language syntax or by the communication intent.

Replacement is any change in the target text at the morphological, lexical and syntactic levels of the language when the elements of certain source paradigms are replaced by different elements of target paradigms.

Antonymous translation is replacement in translation of a negative statement by an affirmative one or vice versa.

Addition in translation is a device intended for the compensation of structural elements implicitly present in the source text or paradigm forms missing in the target language.

Omission is reduction of the elements of the source text considered redundant from the viewpoint of the target language structural patterns and stylistics." (15: 90-96)

QUESTIONS

1. What are permanent equivalents? How are permanent equivalents related to the notion of context-free words? Give examples.
2. What is the relationship between permanent, variable, regular and occasional equivalents? Can you show it diagrammatically?
3. What is a connotative meaning? How does it influence the translator's choice?
4. What distinguishes transference from other translation procedures? What is the difference between transcription and transliteration?
5. Why do you think "through-translations should be used only when they are already recognized terms"?
6. What kinds of semantic changes can occur in the translation of lexical units? Why are the logical operations of generalization, specification and modulation used in the translating process?

7. What are the main types of grammatical transformations? Give examples.
8. What do you think is meant by ‘complex translation transformations’? Give examples.
9. Why is the technique of antonymous translation used?
10. How are compensational devices used in translation?

L e c t u r e 9. TRANSLATION COMPETENCE

> “…any old fool can learn a language... but it takes ... an intelligent person to become a translator."
> Peter Newmark

“Translation studies has only recently become translator-oriented, rather than centred on the target text or the languages themselves. This shift of perspective has run parallel to developments in applied linguistics concerned with the study of bilingualism, contrastive analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition.” (2: 20)

First we are going to “describe translation competence in terms of generalizations based on inferences drawn from the observation of translator performance.” (l: 39)

The competence of the human translator can be described in terms of an expert system.

"An expert system contains, in essence, two basic components:
1. A knowledge base which contains the combined knowledge and expertise of the domain (or, more likely, the sub-domain). In medicine, for example, this would include lists of illnesses together with their associated symptoms. 2. An inference mechanism … software which can use the knowledge base to reason or make inferences about the information contained there. In medicine this mechanism would compare symptoms reported to it with those listed in the database and match symptoms with likely illnesses…

We would envisage a translator expert system containing the [following] kinds of knowledge and skills:

(1) a knowledge base consisting of:

(a) SL knowledge; the syntactic rule systems of the code, its lexicon and semantics and its text-creating systems;
(b) TL knowledge; equivalent to that in the SL;
(c) text-type knowledge;
(d) domain knowledge;
(e) contrastive knowledge of each of the above;

(2) an inference mechanism which permits:

(a) the decoding of texts, i.e. reading and comprehending SL texts;
(b) the encoding of texts, i.e. writing TL texts, e.g. a writer's assistant system which helps with the writing.(l: 39-40)

The second "alternative … would be to deny the competence-performance dichotomy which we have been implicitly accepting and redefine our objective as the specification of a multicomponent 'communicative competence' which would consist, minimally, of four areas of knowledge and skills: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence…

1. Grammatical competence: knowledge of the rules of the code, including vocabulary and word-formation, pronunciation/spelling and sentence structure, i.e. the knowledge and skills required to understand and express the literal meaning of utterances.
2. Sociolinguistic competence: knowledge of and ability to produce and understand utterances appropriately in context, i.e. as constrained by topic, the status of the participants, purposes of the interaction, etc.
3. Discourse competence: the ability to combine form and meaning to achieve unified spoken and written texts in different genres. This unity depends on cohesion in form (the way in which utterances are linked structurally to facilitate interpretation of text) and coherence in meaning (the relationships among the different meanings in a text; literal meanings, communicative functions or social meaning).
4. Strategic competence: the mastery of communication strategies which may be used to improve communication or to compensate for breakdowns (caused by limiting factors in actual communication or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other components of communicative competence). (l: 41)

R. Bell then adapts D. Hymes' definition and specifies translator communicative competence as "the knowledge and ability possessed by the translator which permits him/her to create communicative acts – discourse – which are not only (and not necessarily) grammatical but … socially appropriate." (l: 42)

Lastly, in the behavioural framework, translational competence is viewed as:

1. The ability to generate a target-text series of more than one viable term (target text 1, target text 2 … target text 3) for a source text.
2. The ability to select only one target text from this series, quickly and with justified confidence, and to propose this target text as a replacement of source text for a specific purpose and reader." (9: 281)

TRANSLATION INTO THE SECOND LANGUAGE

"…the business of translating into a second language is clearly very different from translating into the first language.

The two activities are in a way mirror images. In translating from a second language, the main difficulty is in comprehending the source text; it is presumably much easier to marshal one's first language resources to come up with a natural looking target text. In translating into a second language, comprehension of the source text is the easier aspect; the real difficulty is in producing a target text in a language in which composition does not come naturally. It is probably wise to assume at the outset that perfectly balanced bilinguals are so rarely found that virtually all human translation activity falls into one of two categories - into or from the second language...

…native writers can manipulate all the devices that go to make up natural-looking texts. The same case could be argued at finer levels of linguistic analysis; first language writers are, presumably, less likely to make grammatical errors and unfortunate vocabulary choices than second language writers." (2: 57)

"Let us assume that translation competence into the second language is somehow tangled up with second language proficiency. It is, however, a very special variety of second language proficiency: the second language translators have to work within the limitations of their second language repertoire, and the stages of individuals' language development must be reflected in the quality of their translation. But the translators also have to work within the limitations of the source text, and it is this that makes translation into the second language a very special variety of second language writing.

One aspect of this is that translation closely circumscribes writers' output, reducing their ability to produce optimum quality output. Writers of primary texts are free to a greater or lesser extent to control the content in accordance with their productive ability…

Another aspect is the special character of written language itself, and the fact that high levels of second language proficiency in writing reflect control over these special features of written language. … much of what is professionally translated is at the more formal end of the stylistic scale, and … the ability to produce language more characteristic of writing than speaking is a built-in requirement for translators." (2: 58-59)

TRANSLATORS AND THE 'CRAFT' OF TRANSLATNG

"Bear in mind, however, that knowing a foreign language and your subject is not as important as being sensitive to language and being competent to write your own language dexterously, clearly, economically and resourcefully…

Being good at writing has little to do with being good at 'essays', or at 'English' as you may have learned it at school. It means being able to use the appropriate words in the appropriate order for the object or process you are attempting to describe; continuously trying to improve your writing (a translation is never finished); and increasing your own English vocabulary co-extensively with your knowledge of new facts and new foreign-language words. And it means making flexible use of the abundant grammatical resources of your language, which are enriched by contemporary speech. It is something which, like translation, you can learn: you are not born a good writer; you do not have to be one now; you have to be determined to become one, to relate new experience to fresh language…

A translator has to have a flair and a feel for his own language. There is nothing mystical about this 'sixth sense', but it is compounded of intelligence, sensitivity and intuition, as well as of knowledge. This sixth sense, which often comes into play…during a final revision, tells you when to translate literally, and also, instinctively, perhaps once in a hundred or three hundred words, when to break all the 'rules' of translation…" (8: 3-4)

"A satisfactory translation is always possible, but a good translator is never satisfied with it. It can usually be improved. There is no such thing as a perfect, ideal or 'correct' translation. A translator is always trying to extend his knowledge and improve his means of expression; he is always pursuing facts and words. He works on four levels: translation is first a science, which entails the knowledge and verification of the facts and the language that describes them – here what is wrong, mistakes of truth, can be identified; secondly, it is a skill, which calls for appropriate language and acceptable usage; thirdly, an art, which distinguishes good from undistinguished writing and is the creative, the intuitive, sometimes the inspired, level of the translation; lastly a matter of meritorious translations is the reflection of individual differences." (8: 6)

QUESTIONS

1. What is translation competence comprised of according to R.Bell?
2. What are the implications of the translator expert system model for translator training?
3. How does the communicative competence characterization relate to the translator expert system model?
4. What does the behavioural model of translator competence tell us about the variety of translations?
5. What factors make translation into the second language inevitable? Desirable? Do you think the situation is going to change?
6. What are the differences between translation into a first and second language?
7. Why is learning to write in a stylistically authentic way considered to be an important part of translator training?
8. What is the relationship between second language competence and second language translation competence?
9. Do you agree with P.Newmark's prioritization of translator's skills and aspects

of knowledge? Why/why not?
10. Do you think the four-level description of translation can be applied to technical translation? Why/why not?

L e c t u r e 1 0. TECHNICAL TRANSLATION

"Translation of scientific and technical materials has a most important role to play in our age of the revolutionary technical progress. There is hardly a translator or an interpreter today who has not to deal with technical matters. Even the "purely" literary translator often comes across highly technical stuff in works of fiction or even in poetry. An in-depth theoretical study of the specific features of technical translation is an urgent task of translation linguistics while training of technical translators is a major practical problem.

In technical translation the main goal is to identify the situation described in the original. The predominance of the referential function is a great challenge to the translator who must have a good command of the technical terms and a sufficient understanding of the subject matter to be able to give an adequate description of the situation even if this is not fully achieved in the original. The technical translator is also expected to observe the stylistic requirements of scientific and technical materials to make text acceptable to the specialist." (12: 52-53)

"Technical translation is one part of specialized translation; institutional translation, the area of politics, commerce, finance, government etc., is the other. I take technical translation as potentially (but far from actually) non-cultural, therefore 'universal'; the benefits of technology are not confined to one speech community...

The profession of translator is co-extensive with the rise of technology, and staff translators in industry (not in international organizations) are usually called technical translators…

Technical translation is primarily distinguished from other forms of translation by terminology, although terminology usually only makes up about 5-10% of a text. Its characteristics, its grammatical features (for English, passives, nominalizations, third persons, empty verbs, present tenses) merge with other varieties of language. Its characteristic format … is the technical report, but it also includes instructions, manuals, notices, publicity, which put more emphasis on forms of address and use of the second person…

Further, unless its non-technical style is jazzed up and popularized, it is usually free from emotive language, connotations, sound-effects and original metaphors, if it is well written… Part of a good translator's job often consists in rephrasing poorly written language and converting metaphors to sense…

However, the central difficulty in technical translation is usually the new terminology…

… the main problem is likely to be that of some technical neologisms in the source language which are relatively context-free, and appear only once.” (8:151-152)

“*Terminological words* are … relatively context-free though the context often helps to identify the specific field to which the term belongs. In the sentence “These rifles are provided with a new type of foresight”, the context clearly shows that the meaning of “foresight” is that of a military term and therefore all other meanings of the word can be disregarded…

As a rule, English technical terms … have their permanent equivalents in the respective Russian terminological systems…

Many Russian equivalents have been formed from the English terms by transcription or loan translation…Quite a few of them are international terms… In some cases there are parallel forms in Russian: one formed by transcription and the other, so to speak, native…

The translator makes his choice considering whether ST is highly technical or not, for a borrowed term is usually more familiar to specialists than to laymen. He has also to take into account the possible differences between the two forms in the way they are used in TL. For example, the Russian “индустрия” is restricted in usage and somewhat old-fashioned…

Dealing with context-free words the translator must be aware of two common causes of translation errors. First, English and Russian terms can be similar in form but different in meaning…Such words belong to the so-called false friends of the translator… Second, the translator should not rely on the “inner form” of the English term to understand its meaning or to find a proper Russian equivalent for it is often misleading. A “packing industry” is not “упаковочная” but “консервная промышленность”…

Translation of technical terms puts a premium on the translator’s knowledge of the subject –matter of ST.” (12: 72-73)

BEGINNING TECHNICAL TRANSLATION

“I think that the basic technology is engineering and the basic branch of engineering is mechanical; if you want to become a technical translator, that is where you start. However, you should not specialize at the start, but … get as much practice as possible in a range of technologies, in particular the ones that are thriving, which, at present, means computer applications in the spectrum of commerce and industry. Again, bear in mind that you are more interested in understanding the description, the function and the effect of a concept such as enthropy rather than in learning laws, particularly axioms, theorems, theories, systems in some of which enthropy is involved. In a sense, you are learning the language rather than the content of the subject… When you translate a text, you have to be able to stand back and understand roughly what is happening in real life, not just, or as well as, convincing yourself that the sentence you have just translated makes sense linguistically … Even though much scientific and technological language and terminology can be translated ‘literally’ and in newer subjects contains an increasing number of internationalisms and fewer false friends, you have to check the present validity in the register and dialect (viz. usually British or American English) of the terms you use. But here again, there are priorities. Technical terms that appear on the periphery of a text, say relatively context-free in a list or a foot note, are not as important as those that are central; their nomenclature can be checked without detailed reference to their function or the description. In a word, to translate a text you do not have to be an expert in its technology or its topic; but you have to understand that text and temporarily know the vocabulary it uses.

In science, the language is concept-centred; in technology it is object-centred: in, say, production engineering, you have to learn the basic vocabulary with the translations – e.g. ‘lathe’, ’clutch’, ‘clamp’, ’bolt’, ‘mill’, ‘shaft’, ‘crank’, etc. – in diagrams as in ... Oxford Illustrated dictionaries and obtain a clear idea of outline, composition, function and result, as well as learn the action verbs with which they normally collocate: 'a cam rotates'." (8: 154-155)

TRANSLATION METHOD

“When you approach a technical text… you read it first to understand it (underline difficult words) and then to assess its nature (proportion of persuasion to information), its degree of formality, its intention (attitude to its topic) the possible cultural and professional differences between your readership and the original one. Next, you should give your translation the framework of a recognized house-style, either the format of a technical report adopted by your client, or, if you are translating an article or a paper, the house-style of the relevant periodical or journal.

You have to translate or transfer or, if not, account for *everything*, every word, every figure, letter, every punctuation mark. You always transfer the name of the publication, a periodical. You translate its reference (‘Vol.1., No.5’)and date, and the general heading or superscript … using the standard formulae of the corresponding English [TL – N.D.] periodical. For authors, delete the *par* or *von* , reproduce names and qualifications, and transfer the place of the author’s appointment (e.g. *Ecole des Hautes Etudes* is not normally to be translated) – the reader may want to write to the author. However, you can translate any transferred word in a footnote, if the house-style permits, if you think the clients or readership would find it particularly useful, particularly if it is not a ‘transparent’ word.” (8: 156)

“Normally, as a translator, you are entitled to ‘change’ the TITLE of your text. All titles are either descriptive or allusive; in a non-literary text, a descriptive title that succinctly names the subject and states its purpose is appropriate. (Allusive titles are suitable for some imaginative literature and popular journalism, and may have to be changed.)

The advantage of the title of a scientific article is that it normally states the subject, but not always the purpose or intention of the process described…

The title of the SL article is often too long by English standards and … [some words – N.D.] could be omitted." (8: 156-157)

"In a technical translation you can be as bold and free in recasting grammar (cutting up sentences, transposing clauses, converting verbs to nouns, etc.) as in any other type of informative or vocative text, provided the original is defective. Here particularly you, who are a professional writer, should produce a better text than the writer of the original, who is not. However, with the terminology take no risks; play for safety.

As a technical translator you vary your format in relation to your customer. If he wants a 'cover-to-cover' translation, you normally keep the house-style of the original. If you translate for a publication, you adopt its house-style, and you should peruse its back-numbers to see what this is. A publication such as the *British Medical Journal* has a 'marked' house-style, including rather pronounced use of passives ('examinations are done', 'a decision was required'), restrained double-noun compounds ('endoscopy plan'), frequent use of suffixed or non-suffixed deverbals collocated with equative verbs or ... all-purpose verbs (e.g., 'the answer is', 'the outcome was', 'take action', 'have effect', 'medication was given', 'management was changed'), occasional use of 'we'…

Lexically, the main characteristic of technical language is its actual richness and its potential infinity – there are always unnamed bones and rocks. In many areas of science, Graeco-Latin terms are used for classification purposes, and in translation they serve as internationalisms, and can be used as functional equivalents when a SL term for a natural object … is missing in the TL… You ensure equivalent level of register by transferring standardized Latin and/or Greek terms and by translating SL Graeco-Latin terms by English Graeco-Latin terms, unless/until the words are so frequent that they have a more common Germanic variant ('bleeding', 'heart failure', 'stroke', 'chicken-pox', 'mumps'), where you also bear in mind that English with its phrasal verbs and nouns, and monosyllables, tend to use a more informal style of its own than Romance languages and, in particular, German." (8: 159-160)

CONCLUSION

"My last point is obvious. Technology being an explosion, escalating exponentially, ongoing, this is the field, on the frontier of knowledge, where you have to be most up to date. Data banks, terminology bureaus, informants, the latest editions of all text- and reference books – nothing else will do; tell your client/employer or your librarian that you have to have these available where possible. Do not hesitate to ring relevant firms and ask for their research or their information departments. If you get a chance, go on or press for refresher courses and visits to research conferences, a tour of plants and factories…

However, I end as I started. Terminology makes up perhaps 5-10% of a text. The rest is 'language', usually a natural style of language; and here you normally find an authoritative text aspires to such a style; if it does not, you gently convert it to natural and elegant language – the writer will be grateful to you. So write it well." (8: 160)

QUESTIONS

1. How does the main goal of technical translation affect the requirements the translator is to meet?
2. What text characteristics distinguish technical translation from other varieties? Do you think they are universal for all languages?
3. According to P. Newmark, what is the characteristic format of technical translation? Does he leave out any typical formats? Why?
4. Why does P. Newmark single out context-free technical neologisms which appear only once in ST as the main terminological problem the technical translator is likely to encounter?
5. What rules for dealing with terminology in English-Russian translation does V. Komissarov offer?
6. Do you agree with P. Newmark's arguments against the technical translator's early specialization? Why/why not?
7. How do you understand his statement:"*…to translate a text you do not have to be an expert in its technology or its topic; but you have to understand that text and temporarily know the vocabulary it uses.*"?
8. What are the stages in the initial assessment of a technical text that P. Newmark distinguishes?
9. What 'changes' does he say the technical translator is entitled to make?
10. Which, if any, of P. Nemark's recommendations do you find particularly useful? Why/why not?

Lecture 11. TRANSLATION STUDIES: DOING A COURSE PROJECT

"A **project in linguistics** is a problem-solving and product-oriented activity. A linguistic study has the following framework:
the goal of the study (a language area that is being addressed in the study);
a puzzle (something that can't be explained or is not known in the language with the available knowledge); objectives of the study (new knowledge about the

chosen language area represented in descriptive or explanatory, verbal or graphical models);
the product of the study (research paper, article/s, report/s, lecture/s, teaching material/s etc.);
the result of the study is a transformation of initial ignorance into final competence.” (14: 118)

“Most research investigates a **hypothesis**, which is a thoughtful guess about the way things in the language might be. A hypothesis is a prediction about the outcome of the language studies. Hypotheses can be logical (arising from literature review), descriptive (predicting certain features in a phenomenon) and explanatory (anticipating plausible explanation of a puzzle)…

Hypotheses are made in the light of theories. **Theory** is a synthesis of what is known about the object under research. A theory can include a set of inferences based on previous research or hypothetical assumptions that are expected to be proved in the future. A theory can exist as a set of laws in the area under study (a collection of dogmas) or as a “cause-and-consequence” chain (a corpus of experimental data). A theory is an attempt to explain a phenomenon through reasoning. Reasoning can be data-based or data-free, i.e. abstract…

In order to prove the hypothesis, a researcher uses certain **methods** of research…Linguistic research can deal with different kinds of research data, such as:

- **Quantitative data** are usually rich in statistical observations, word counts, distribution models, tests etc. Quantitative data are numerical and claim objectivity. They are represented in tables, graphs, diagrams etc.
- **Qualitative data** focus on particular cases of language use and their interpretation. They are based on individual perception of linguistic phenomena and one’s individual intuition and insights. Qualitative data are non-numerical and do not claim objectivity as they apply to the particular rather than the general. This type of data is descriptive.” (14:119-120)

Since there are always two languages involved in the process of translation, the researcher is necessarily engaged in a comparative and contrastive description of SL and TL data.

“…linguists are divisible into those who choose to study one, or each, language in isolation, and those whose ambition and methods are comparative... The comparativist, as the name implies, proceeds from the assumption that, while every language may have its individuality, all languages have enough in common for them to be compared and classified into types…

Contrastive analysis is a linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (i.e. contrastive, not comparative) two-valued typologies (a CA is always concerned with a *pair* of languages).” (5: 1-3)

“Executing a CA involves two steps: *description* and *comparison*: and the steps are taken in that order…

The minimum requirement of 'parallel description' is that the two languages be described through the same **model of description**." (5: 63)

"A model is an abstract logical structure which describes an object or a system by analogy and is intended for the explanation of their behaviour. The model is a structure *outside* the object or system being modeled…

Language modeling is a method of formulation of certain general hypotheses about the structure of a language as an abstract semiotic system as well as a method of experimental evaluation of the correctness of these hypotheses." (16: 26-27)

We are familiar with structuralist, transformational, case grammar models, componential analysis and meaning postulates. Among many others, translation scholars use the thesaurus, semantic field and functional semantic class models.

"The **thesaurus** provides us with a model for storing groups of words (and phrases) in a number of ways: where they are (a) synonyms or (b) antonyms or (c) related in other ways." (l: 95)

It enables the researcher to account for "the essential fuzziness of lexical systems…: the fact that it is impossible to separate and circumscribe the several groups by absolutely distinct boundary lines…

A typical entry illustrates this:

Optimism n. hopefulness, HOPE, CHEERFULNESS, encouragement, brightness, enthusiasm; confidence, assurance. *Ant*. PESSIMISM.

The items in upper case (HOPE, CHEERFULNESS, PESSIMISM) provide cross-references to additional entries, e.g. HOPE lists (i) nouns (44 items in four sub-groups), (ii) verbs (36 items in four sub-groups) and (iii) adjectives (28 items in two sub-groups) plus the antonym 'dejection'." (l: 96)

The thesaurus approach forms the foundation of multilingual terminology databases, takes the researcher beyond the constraints of binary componential analysis showing "that it is the possession of shared semantic characteristics that accounts for the occurrence of each of …[the lexical items] under the same thesaurus heading." (l: 96-97)

"A **lexical or semantic field** is broader in scope than the thesaurus, since it links words to words not only in terms of … meaning postulates such as synonymy, hyponymy and antonymy but also in terms of … syntactic occurrence (collocation)…

Similarity of occurrence - collocation – is the basic formal relationship in lexis: the chain (or syntagmatic) relationship between items… A word tends to occur in relatively predictable ways with other words; certain nouns with particular adjectives or verbs, verbs with particular adverbials, etc." (l: 97)

" ...modern scholars make attempts to work out the classification of words into **functional semantic classes**: substantives, predicatives, determiners, etc. The origin of words fulfilling the same function and constituting a certain functional semantic field can be traced back to different parts of speech… [For example,] the functional semantic class of *qualifiers* comprises words with the function of qualifying properties, states and actions as to the degree of their manifestation.

Qualifiers fall into 3 subclasses: *intensifiers* (denoting high degree, e.g. very, too, highly, extremely, etc.); *moderators* (denoting moderate degree, e.g. almost, rather, enough, kind of, etc.); *limiters* (denoting low degree, e.g. a little, a bit, faintly, hardly, etc.)." (11: 90-91)

A few recommendations may be given concerning the methodology of writing and presenting research results.

"Quality research based on theory depends a lot on a deep processing of available literature. This goal is achieved by **literary review**. The following methods of literature review can be used towards these ends:

- Finding in published literature support for one's own ideas and developing one's own ideas with the support of quotations from published resources.
- Finding in published literature the ideas that contradict your own propositions and engaging in a debate with the authors of published works.
- Finding in published literature views and positions that contradict each other and engaging in the analysis of the existing contradictions…

The key message of the research is expressed in the project **summary**. A summary is a short text conveying the main research message, in which there is little room for words but a vast potential for inferences and anticipations." (14: 121-122)

"**Research discourse** is using language for communicating one's research ideas and findings. Research discourse has a number of specific features that makes it different from other registers of discourse:

- a sense of potential audience (readers) that are not necessarily experts in the field;
- a plan of presenting research ideas and findings;
- technical (field-specific) terminology;
- grammar consistent with the norms of written English;
- transparent statement of purpose;
- clearly marked steps of research;
- adequate paragraphing with each paragraph containing only one idea;
- convincing conclusions (supported by previously introduced data;
- cohesion and coherence of the text." (14: 123)

"Academic discourse consists of **paragraphs**. A paragraph is a distinct division of a written text, with a sequence of sentences on a single thesis expressed in the initial sentence, logical development of the thesis in a series of connected sentences, and the concluding sentence, clarifying the thesis of the paragraph. A good paragraph is cohesive through connective devices and coherent through logical development of one and only one thesis. A thesis is not necessarily present in the paragraph in one concrete sentence, but may be inferred from the text. Written discourse will have the following types of paragraphs:

- expository (giving a rationale and introducing settings);
- evaluative (judging the ideas and views expressed);
- descriptive (giving a non-judgemental account of facts);
- argumentative (proving a point);
- manipulative (making audience believe without proof).” (14: 124)

“Before we make a full script of our future presentation, we need to identify where we stand as to the style and the language we are going to use. …presentation at the public defense is not a casual talk to a friend, but it is neither a synonym for a written essay...

In terms of functional styles, the style of presentation is a subdivision of publicistic style. The basic goal of it is to exert a deep and lasting influence on the audience, to convince the listeners that the ideas and interpretation given by the presenter are correct and to get them to accept the presenter's point of view. To achieve this goal a presenter uses both logical argumentation and emotional appeal. These most effective tools find their expression in the language and the structure of presentation:

- coherent and logical structure with an expanded system of connectives and paragraphing helps to keep the attention of the audience;
- the use of words with emotive meaning, imagery and other stylistic devices appeals to the audience and creates the response to the message.

The best you can do is to try and *build your own style and manner of presentation*.” (18: 189-190)

QUESTIONS

1. What is the first step in translation research? What sources of data can be used?
2. Which of the following stages of research is/are done inductively: a) data processing; b) formulating a hypothesis; c) constructing a theory?
3. Where is deductive reasoning applied?
4. C. James singles out description and comparison as two essential stages in contrastive analysis. How are you going to conduct these stages in your research?
5. Which models of description are you going to use in your project? Why?
6. Why is the notion of fuzzy sets popular in linguistics? Give examples of fuzzy sets you are going to introduce in your research.
7. How are the methods of statistics used in linguistic studies?
8. What is a summary? What should it include? What should it leave out?
9. How are the paragraphs connected in an academic discourse?
10. Do you find the recommendations concerning the oral presentation of your project helpful? Why/why not?

REFERENCES

1. Bell R.T. Translation and translating: theory and practice. – London: Longman, 1991.
2. Campbell S. Translation into the second language. – Longman, London and New York, 1998.
3. Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the translator. – Longman, London and New York, 1990.
4. Jacobson R. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: R.A.Brower (ed.). On translation. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966, p. 232 - 239.
5. James C. Contrastive analysis. - Longman, London and New York, 1980.
6. Meetham A.R., Hudson R.A. Encyclopaedia in linguistics, information and control. – Pergamon, Oxford, 1969.
7. Newmark P. Approaches to translation. – Pergamon, Oxford, 1981.
8. Newmark P. A textbook of translation. – Prentice Hall, London, 1988.
9. Pym A. Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In: C.Dollerup and A. Loddegaard (eds). Teaching translation and interpreting. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992, p. 279 - 288.
10. Snell-Hornby M. Translation studies: an integrated approach. – Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988.
11. Квеселевич Д.І., Сасіна В.П. Практикум з лексикології сучасної англійської мови. - Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003.
12. Комиссаров В.Н., Коралова А.Л. Практикум по переводу с английского языка на русский. – М.: Высш. шк., 1990.
13. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад). – Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003.
14. Мильруд Р.П. Введение в лингвистику. – М.: Дрофа, 2005.
15. Основи перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дайнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А. та ін. – К.: Ельга, Ніка-Центр, 2005.
16. Мирам Г. Алгоритмы перевода: Вступительный курс по формализации перевода. – К.: Эльга, Ника-Центр, 2004.
17. Найда Ю. Наука перевода // Вопросы языкознания. – 1970. – №4. – С. 7 – 8.
18. Самохина Т.С., Дианова Е.М. Пусть ваш английский станет еще лучше!: Практикум по устной и письменной речи для старших курсов языковых факультетов вузов. – М.: Р. Валент, 2003.

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE

1. Алимов В.В. Теория перевода. Перевод в сфере профессиональной коммуникации. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2005.
2. Карабан В.І., Борисова О.В., Колодій Б.М., Кузьміна К.А. Попередження інтерференції мови оригіналу в перекладі. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003.
3. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистика перевода. – М.: Междунар. отношения, 1980.
4. Комиссаров В.Н. Общая теория перевода. – М.: ЧеРо, 1999.
5. Комиссаров В.Н. Слово о переводе. – М.: Междунар. отношения, 1973.
6. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода. – М.: Высш. шк., 1990.
7. Коптілов В. Теорія і практика перекладу. – К.: Юніверс, 2002.
8. Латышев Л.К. Курс перевода. Эквивалентность перевода и способы ее достижения. – М.: Междунар. отношения, 1981.
9. Миньяр-Белоручев Р.К. Теория и методы перевода. – М.: Высш. шк., 1996.
10. Мирам Г., Гон А. Профессиональный перевод. – К.: Эльга, Ника-Центр, 2003.
11. Пиввуева Ю.В., Двойнина Е.В. Пособие по теории перевода. – М.: Филоматис, 2004.
12. Ревзин И.И., Розенцвейг В.Ю. Основы общего и машинного перевода. – М.: Высш. шк., 1963.
13. Рецкер Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. – М.: Междунар. отношения, 1974.
14. Сдобников В.В., Петрова О.В. Теория перевода. – М.: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2006.
15. Семенов А.Л. Основные положения общей теории перевода. – М.: РУДН, 2005.
16. Федоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода. – СПб.: Филологический факультет СПбГУ; М. : ООО «Изд. дом «ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ТРИ», 2002.
17. Швейцер А. Д. Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты. – М.: Наука, 1988.

CONTENTS

Дорошенко Наталія Сергіївна

ОСНОВИ ТЕОРІЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Технічний редактор Л.О. Кузьменко

Зв. план, 2007
Підписано до друку 02.07.2007
Формат 60х84 1/16. Папір офс. №2. Офс. друк
Ум. друк. арк. 3. Обл.-вид. арк. 3,43. Наклад 100 прим.
Замовлення 320. Ціна вільна.

Національний аерокосмічний університет ім. М.Є. Жуковського
„Харківський авіаційний інститут”
61070, Харків-70, вул. Чкалова, 17
http://www.khai.edu
Видавничий центр „ХАІ”
61070, Харків-70, вул. Чкалова, 17
izdat@khai.edu