МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ОДЕСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
імені І. І. МЕЧНИКОВА
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ РОМАНО-ГЕРМАНСЬКОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ

Л. С. ЯРОВЕНКО

ТЕОРІЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Методичний посібник

Одеса
Букаєв Вадим Вікторович
2021

УДК 811.111’25(072)
Я76

Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою факультету романо-германської філології Одеського національного університету імені І. І. Мечникова.
Протокол № 6 від 22 червня 2021 р.

Рецензенти:

Кравченко Н. О., доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри теоретичної та прикладної фонетики англійської мови ОНУ імені І. І. Мечникова.

Тхор Н. М., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри лексикології та стилістики англійської мови ОНУ імені І. І. Мечникова

Яровенко Л. С.
Я76 Теорія перекладу : метод. посіб. / Л. С. Яровенко. Одеса : видавець Букаєв Вадим Вікторович, 2021. 88 с.

Методичний посібник призначено для здобувачів вищої освіти другого (магістерського) рівня за спеціальністю 035 Філологія. Спеціалізація: 035.041. Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно) для занять з курсу “Теорія перекладу”. Посібник також може бути цікавим всім, хто вчить англійську мову для професійного спілкування. У посібнику розкривається короткий зміст курсу та надаються базові теоретичні засади з теорії перекладу.

УДК 811.111’25 (072)

ЗМІСТ

ПЕРЕДМОВА

Навчальний курс «Теорія перекладу» входить до циклу лінгвістичних дисциплін, що формують загально-філологічну підготовку майбутніх професійних перекладачів. Теорія перекладу є синтезуючою дисципліною, яка сприяє формуванню у студентів мотивації до здійснення професійної діяльності; поглибленню їх теоретичної бази та виробленню навичок перекладацького аналізу різножанрових текстів.

У пропонованому методичному посібнику "Теорія перекладу" висвітлюється широке коло питань щодо відтворення одиниць вихідної мови у мові перекладу. Розглядаються ключові питання лексичного, граматичного та прагматичного аспектів перекладу. Різносистемність двох мов (англійської – аналітичної і української – синтетичної) проявляється на всіх рівнях, тому у посібнику зроблено акцент саме на розгляді способів подолання при перекладі існуючих розбіжностей між двома мовами. Значну увагу приділено процесу перекодування мовленнєвого або текстового матеріалу з однієї мови на іншу.

Мета посібника – допомогти студентам-магістрам засвоїти теоретичні засади курсу з «Теорії перекладу» та ефективно застосовувати їх на практиці.

Мета обумовлює вирішення наступних **завдань**: ознайомити студентів з теоретичними положеннями курсу; сформувати у студентів мовленнєві навички і уміння проводити аналіз способів передачі змісту оригіналу та тих трансформаційних процесів, які мають місце при його відтворенні у мові перекладу.

За результатами вивчення даного курсу студент повинен **знати**: основні закономірності перекладацької діяльності; моделі перекладу; основні види перекладацьких відповідностей та трансформацій; правила дотримування лексичних, граматичних, синтаксичних і стилістичних норм у перекладі; основні способи досягнення еквівалентності у перекладі.

У результаті вивчення даного курсу студент повинен **вміти**: використовувати отримані теоретичні знання на практиці в ході рішення конкретних перекладацьких завдань.

Посібник розроблено згідно з робочою програмою навчальної дисципліни «Теорія перекладу» для здобувачів другого (магістерського) освітнього ступеня спеціальності «Переклад». Повний курс з цієї дисципліни розрахований на 120 академічних годин (4 кредити ЄКТС) та триває один семестр навчання в магістратурі з перекладу (перший). В основі програми лежить системний підхід до вивчення іноземної (англійської) мови.

ЗМІСТОВИЙ МОДУЛЬ 1

1. TRANSLATION AND ITS MAIN OBJECTIVES. TRANSLATION THEORY AND OTHER SCIENCES

Translation is a human activity known since ancient times and an interpreter or a translator is among the oldest of professions, dating back to the biblical era and earlier. Translation is one of the most complex problems that the human intellect may face.

The stated goal of translation is 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, the formal features and functional roles of the original text.

In studying this complex process at work, we are in fact seeking insights towards the whole relationship between language activity and the social context in which it takes place.

The purpose of translation is implementation of speech communication between people speaking different languages. Communication is impossible if there is a distinct non-coincidence between transmitted and received information.

This act of communication is different from communication acts carried out in one language. In the process of translation communicators use different language systems and as a result this communication is always bilingual.

Linguistics of translation focuses on the system of communicatively equal units of two languages which can replace each other in interlinguistic communication.

Translation presupposes communicative similarity of text in different languages, their interchangeability in a definite act of communication.

E.g. It' s a long lane that has no turning.

Перемелеться – мука буде.

In this example, translation provides communicative similarity between the original and translated texts but not their semantic identity.

The essence of translation is to reach communicative equivalence, i.e. to retain functional (communicative) relevance of the original.

Communicative similarity of texts in different languages discovered in translation in an objective phenomenon that reflects universal properties of the language as a means of exchange of ideas.

The study of translation has been dominated and to a degree still is, by the debate about its status as an art or a science.

The linguist inevitably approaches translation from a scientific point of view seeking to create some kind of "objective description of the phenomenon".

Nevertheless, the supposed dichotomy between "art" and "science" is still current enough, as the quintessence of translation as art, is even more patent in literary texts.

The term "translation" presupposes that the content and style of the original text should be preserved as far as possible in the translated text; the aim is to reproduce as accurately as possible all grammatical and lexical features of the SL (source language) original by finding equivalents in the TL (target language). At the same time all factual information contained in the original text must be preserved in the translation.

We would suggest that there are, in fact, three distinguishable meanings for the word “translation”.

It can refer to:

(a) translating: the process (to translate: the activity rather than the tangible object);

(b) a translation: the product of the process of translating (i.e. the translated text)

(c) translation: that abstract concept which encompasses both the process of translating and the product of that process.

Description of the translating process is one of the major tasks of the translation theory. Here we deal with the dynamic processes of translation trying to understand how the translator performs the transfer operation from ST (source text) to TT (target text). The study of the translating process reveals both the translator's strategy and scientific techniques used to solve typical translation problems.

Translation makes possible an exchange of information between the users of different languages by producing in the TL a text having an identical communicative value with the ST. Thus TT isn't completely identical with ST as to its form or content. The relationship between ST and TT is based on the various degrees of equivalence of their meanings.

As any observable phenomenon translation can be the object of scientific study aimed at understanding its nature, its constituents and their interaction, as well as various factors influencing it or linked with it.

The science of translation or translatology is concerned with both theoretical and applied aspects of translation studies. A theoretical description of the translation phenomenon is the task of **the translation theory**. In a narrow sense, translation theory is concerned with the translation methods appropriately used for a certain type of text, and it is therefore dependent on a functional theory of a language. However, in a wider sense, translation theory is the body of knowledge that we have about translating, extending from general principles to guidelines, suggestions and hints. Translation theory is concerned with minutiae (the meanings of semi-colons, italics, misprints) as well as generalities (presentation, the thread of thought underlying a piece) and both may be equally important in the context. 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 due to which the identity of the communicative value of ST and TT is achieved.

The theory of translation provides the translator with the appropriate tools of analysis and synthesis. Translation is a complicated phenomenon involving linguistic, psycholinguistic, cultural, literary and other factors. Different aspects of translation can be studied with methods of respective sciences. Up to now most of the theoretical research has been done within the framework of linguistics. **The linguistic theory of translation** is concerned with translation as a form of speech communication establishing contact between communicants who speak different languages. The basis of this theory is linguistics in the broadest sense of the word, that is macrolinguistics with all its new branches, such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics, communicative linguistics, etc., studying the language structure and its functioning in speech in their relationship in mind, culture and society.

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 human mind. All languages are means of communication, all speech units convey information to the communicants.

The general theory of translation focuses on translation universals and is the basis for all other theoretical study in this area. This theory describes the basic principles which hold good for each and every translation event. In each particular case, however, the translating process is influenced by both common basic factors and by a number of specific variables which stem from the actual conditions and modes of the translator's work.

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 the source text. At the same time it can be easily seen that there's in fact no such identity.

The creation of equivalent texts results in and 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's used in speech. Therefore translation equivalence may be established between units occupying dissimilar places in the system of respective languages.

One more branch of the theory of translation deals with the pragmatic aspects of the translating process. The communicants involved in interlingual communication speak different languages but they also belong to different cultures, have different general knowledge, different social and historical background knowledge. In some cases, the pragmatic value of translation is the major factor in assessing the quality of the translator's performance. Pragmatic aspects of translation come afore especially in literary translation, in which the equivalence of effect on the reader is even of greater importance than the semantic equivalence between the ST and TT.

2. THE MAIN TYPES OF TRANSLATION

Alongside with common features separate types of translations can have essential specific peculiarities.

According to **genre and style classification** of translation, all translations fall into literary (artistic) and informative (special) translation.

Literary translation is aimed at rendering works of fiction, which are opposed to all other texts as to their communicative function: artistic, aesthetic and poetic. All literary texts are characterized by high artistic value, which must be adequately conveyed in the TL. Sometimes the text of the translation can be quite different from that of the original in its form, as the main purpose of translation is to render artistic properties of the original text.

Literary works are known to fall into a number of genres. Literary translations may be subdivided in the same way as each genre calls for a specific arrangement and makes use of specific artistic means to impress the reader.

Translations of prose, poetry and plays have their own problems. Each of these forms of literary activities comprises a number of subgenres and the translator may specialize in one or some of them in accordance with his talents and experience. The particular tasks inherent in the translation of literary works of each genre are more literally than linguistic. The great challenge to the translator is to combine the maximum equivalence and the high literary merit.

Literary translation is a type of translation where source documents are fiction.

Translation of literary text includes: literary translation of books, articles, stories and other types of prose, literary translation of poetry, translation of advertising materials, and translation of other texts that requires a creative and flexible approach.

Translation of literature is fundamentally different from other categories. This is because the main principle of literary translation is the dominance of poetic communicative function. It means that in addition to rendering information to the reader, literary translation also has aesthetic functions. The artistic image created in the particular literary work (be it the image of a character or nature) will certainly have an impact on the reader. For this reason, the literary translator should take into account specific features of the text. It is the poetic focus of the text that makes this type of translation different from, say, texts of an informative type. When reading a story, poem or any other type of literary work translated from a foreign language, we perceive the text itself with its meaning, emotions and characters. It is quite a challenging task to achieve the main goal of the translation – creating a particular image for the reader. Therefore, literary translation might involve some deviations from the standard rules. A literal translation cannot reflect the depth and meaning of the literary work. A literary translator reproduces a non-literal rendition of the original text. It is all about how the translator perceives it. He/she rewrites the text from the beginning to the very end. This applies, for example, when an obvious expression is replaced by synonyms or the structure of sentences is changed.

Translating a literary work is a serious challenge. The translator somehow has to move a text into the target language while preserving as much as possible the quality and character, the 'spirit' of the original. A tall order that involves the translator in the tricky task of carrying the distinctive character and rhythms of a work, its style, tone, imagery and emphases, from the original language into a quite other language that imposes its own demands of style, pace, and rhythms. In literary translation, language has more than a communicative, or social and connective purpose. The word functions as the "primary element" of literature—that is, it has an aesthetic function. Between the inception and the completion of a creative work of translation, a complex process takes place – the “trans-expression” of the life captured in the fabric of imagery of the work being translated. Therefore, the problems of literary translation are within the sphere of art and are subject to its specific laws.

Literary translation differs from literary creativity in that its existence depends on the existence of an object of translation, a work to be translated. However, in the actual literary process, it is not always possible to draw a distinct boundary between translation and all creative literature. In quite a few instances, a work may not be a translation in the usual sense, but it may not be possible to describe it unreservedly as a work of literary creativity. (A number of labels are used to designate these works: “free translation,” “imitation,” “a work on the themes of”, and “based on.” The specific meanings of these designations differ, depending on the language and the period.) Views on literary translation from antiquity to the present reveal a conflict between two demands: to stay close to the text of the original and to approximate the perceptions of the reader. In different historical periods, the extreme expression of either demand may prevail. For example, in medieval Europe, when the Bible and other religious books accounted for most of the works translated into the new languages, literal translation prevailed. In the 16th through 18th centuries translation was ruled by a tendency to adapt to the neoclassical norms characteristic of French literature of the period. Later, an interest in the unique quality of national art was accompanied by a trend emphasizing a maximum approximation of the original. This was a reaction against leveling and reworking. The spread of multifaceted, comprehensive practice in translation and the development of linguistics are gradually leading to the recognition in theory that the centuries-old conflict between loyalty to the text and concern for the reader is not absolute and that a true understanding of literary translation lies at the intersection of the two demands. "A translation should not simply serve in place of an original, but should replace it completely". The determining factors in contemporary views of literary translation are the demand for the most careful attitude possible toward the object of translation and the demand for its re-creation as a work of art, with unity of content and form and with all its national and individual qualities.

The translator of belles-lettres text is expected to make a careful study of the literary trend the text belongs to, the others works of the same author, with the peculiarities of his individual style and manner and so on. This involves both linguistic considerations and skill in literary criticism. A good literary translator must be a versatile scholar and a talented writer or poet.

Informative translation is a type of translation, where the main emphasis is on forwarding the meaning of the text without placing focus on word-for-word accuracy. Informative translation is a good way of making summaries of texts and highlighting the most important parts of the text. Compared to the source text, informative translation has smaller volume and rather serves to give an overview.

Informative translations can be oral as well. The interpreter reads the materials beforehand and when meeting the client, gives an overview of the content and interprets only the most significant passages very accurately. The contractor listens and takes notes, if necessary. This way, quite a voluminous material can be covered within half an hour.

For example, informative translation is suitable for translating study materials, articles, user instructions, correspondence, etc., where communicating the content of the text is more important than following the exact layout. This type of translation helps to save both time and money.

Informative translation is rendering into the target language non-literary texts, the main purpose of which is to convey a certain amount of ideas, to inform the reader. However, if the source text is of some length, its translation can be listed as literary or informative only as an approximation. A literary text may, in fact, include some parts of purely informative character. Contrariwise, informative translation may comprise some elements aimed at achieving an aesthetic effect. A number of subdivisions can be also suggested for informative translations, though the principles of classification here are somewhat different. Here we may single out translations of scientific and technical texts, of newspaper materials, of official papers and some other types of texts such as public speeches, political and propaganda materials, advertisements, etc., which are, so to speak, intermediate, in that there is a certain balance between the expressive and referential functions, between reasoning and emotional appeal.

Apart from the given above types, technical and newspaper materials, it may be expedient to single out translation of official diplomatic papers as a separate type of informative translation.

These texts make a category of their own because of the specific requirements to the quality of their translations.

Such translations are often accepted as authentic official texts when on a par with the originals. They are important documents each word of which must be carefully chosen as a matter of principle. That makes the translator very particular about every little meaningful element of the original which he scrupulously reproduces in his translation.

Journalistic texts dealing with social or political matters are sometimes singled out among other informative materials because they may feature elements more commonly used in literary texts (metaphors, similes and other stylistic devices) which cannot influence the translator's strategy. More often they are regarded as a kind of newspaper materials.

According to **psycholinguistic classification** of translation it's subdivided into **written translation** and **interpretation** which in its turn has a more detailed subdivision. These are all, however, modifications of the two main types of translation.

Written translation is a kind of translation where the original and the result of translation appear as the texts are put down in writing.

In the written translation the original can be read and re-read as many times as the translator may need or like. The same goes for the final product. The translator can re-read his translation, compare it with the original, make all necessary corrections or start his work all over again. He can come back to the preceding part of the original or set the information he needs from the subsequent messages. These are most favorable conditions and here we can expect the best performance and the highest level of equivalence.

The translator must have a thorough mastery of the target language, as well as a very good understanding of the source language with which he/she works. The translator relies mainly on thorough research with background materials and dictionaries in order to produce the most accurate and readable written translation possible.

No translation is ever “perfect” because cultures and languages differ. However, in practice, the translator is usually held to a higher standard of accuracy and completeness (including the ability to reproduce the style of the original).

The translator’s activity is more like that of a writer. Translation isn’t only a new interpretation of the original; it presents an original text in a new way, introduces it to another culture system that features other guidelines. The translation itself is perceived from a new angle in this new coordinate system, in a new independent way that differs from the way the original is perceived.

Interpretation can be defined in a nutshell as conveying understanding.

An interpreter listens to a spoken message in the SL and renders it orally, consecutively or simultaneously, in the TL. The interpreter relies mainly on the ability to get the gist of the message across to the target audience on the spot. A good interpreter must immediately come up with a satisfactory paraphrase or a rough equivalent in order not to keep the audience waiting. The interpreter’s performance is more like that of an actor.

The conditions of interpretation impose a number of important restrictions on the interpreter’s performance. Here the interpreter receives a fragment of the original only once and for a short period of time. His translation is a one-time act with no possibility of any return to the original or any subsequent corrections. This creates additional problems and the users have sometimes to be content with the lower level of equivalence.

There are different types of interpretation. The most common among them are: **consecutive** and **simultaneous interpreting**. Besides, the ones stated above, there are other kinds of interpretation, such as: whispered interpreting, written text interpreting and sign language interpreting. Consecutive interpreting, in its turn, includes: conference interpreting, court interpreting, media interpreting, escort/travel interpreting, public sector interpreting and EU interpreting. One interesting type is also relay interpreting which is performed via intermediate or pivot language understood by every interpreter concerned.

1. Consecutive interpreting

The speaker's text is interpreted usually by time slots of 5 to 15 minutes, depending on the difficulty of the text. Depending on the length of the speech, this may be done all at one go or in several segments. The consecutive interpreter relies mainly on memory, but good note-taking technique is an essential aid. Interpreting by shorter phases is also called parroting. Consecutive interpretation requires no special equipment.

2. Simultaneous interpreting

Interpretation is performed at interpreter's soundproof booth simultaneously with the speaker's presentation and the text in the target language reaches the listeners through special headphones. Because the simultaneous interpreter cannot fall too far behind, this method requires considerable practice and presence of mind. There are normally at least two interpreters in the interpreter's booth since one interpreter cannot interpret for more than half an hour on a continuous basis.

3. Whispered interpreting Similar to simultaneous interpretation in that the interpretation takes place simultaneously with the speaking, but is characterized by no requirement of special equipment and the interpretation is whispered to only a few people.

4. Written text interpreting In this case not spoken text is interpreted, instead, the source-language text is read from sheet and interpretation is given orally.

5. Sign language interpreting

As the name says the text is either interpreted into or from sign language in order to ensure the linguistic equality of all parties involved. In Estonia, this type of interpreting is provided by Estonian Association of Sign Language Interpreters.

6. On-demand phone interpreting On-Demand Phone Interpreting is for individuals or organizations that need to communicate across language barriers immediately. This form of interpreting is performed when a party calls a service, selects the required language pair and is connected to an interpreter. The interpreter then comes on the line and interprets the conversation.

On-Demand Phone Interpreting is often used by customer service call centers, and by companies, organizations, pharmacies, medical and legal institutions who interact with the limited English proficiency (LEP) population and require interpreting on-demand.

The benefit of On-Demand Phone Interpreting is that it makes interpreting available within minutes. However, it is important to note that the interpreter is coming into the conversation blind and may not have the required background information to make the interpretation successful.

Even though written translation and interpretation both deal with putting texts into a different language they differ in various aspects. The most evident differences between them are:

Recorded or not

Interpreter interprets once and nobody will hear, read or analyze it again. Written translation, however, is recorded, it can be repeatedly read, amended, analyzed, retranslated, etc.

Tools

Interpreter's tools are mainly the source text and his or her own knowledge, while it is also important to guess what the speaker might say next. Translator, however, can use various dictionaries, other texts on the same subject and also expert advice and instructions. As the time for contemplation Is very scarce in the case of simultaneous interpreting, interpreters may fall into difficulties when trying to convey e Jokes or idioms, as the detection of equivalents may require more time that is available in the Interpretation process.

Time for contemplation

Simultaneous and whispered interpreting leaves minimum time to think, one must react immediately when the speaker has begun a sentence. Consecutive interpreting offers a bit more time, as interpreting is slightly delayed. Written translation provides as much time as stipulated by the deadline and, as a rule, translator has time to go over the translation.

Team work

This only applies to simultaneous interpretation where each booth has two or three interpreters that help each other if necessary. Translators, however, mostly work alone, although they may consult with specialists, etc.

Client feedback

In case of interpretation client is present and able to comment after interpretation on the merits and drawbacks of specific interpretation. In the case of translation, the feedback does not occur immediately and it may happen that client gives no feedback at all.

3. WHAT IS A TRANSLATOR?

All communicators are translators. All communicators - as receivers, whether listeners or readers, monolinguals or bilinguals - face essentially the same problem: they receive signals (in speech & in writing) containing messages encoded in a communication system which is not identical with their own.

Making sense of a text is to deconstruct and then reconstruct it.

Any model of communication is at the same time a model of translation. In what way then, is the role of the translator (and the interpreter) different from that of a “normal communicator”? The translator has been defined as a bilingual mediating agent between monolingual communication participants in two different language communities, i.e. the translator decodes messages 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.

The translator stands at the center of dynamic process of communication, as a mediator between the producer of a ST and whoever are its TL receivers.

Most obviously, the translator has not only a bilingual ability, but also a bicultural vision. Translators mediate between cultures (including ideologies, moral systems and sociopolitical structures) seeking to overcome those incompatibilities which stand in the way of transfer of meaning. What has value as a sign in one cultural community may be devoid of significance in another and it is the translator who is uniquely placed to identify the disparity and seek to resolve it.

But there is another sense in which translators are mediators; in a way they are privilege readers of the SL text. Unlike the ordinary ST and TT reader, the translator reads in order to produce, decodes in order to re-encode.

Processing is likely to be more thorough, more deliberate than that of the ordinary reader.

Each reading of a text is a unique act, a process subject to the occasion, just as much as the production of the text is.

Inevitably, a translated text reflects the translator's reading and this is yet another factor which defines the translator as a non-ordinary reader: whereas the ordinary reader can involve his or her own beliefs and values in the creative reading process, the translator has to be more guarded.

Ideological nuances, cultural predispositions and so on in the ST have to be relayed untainted by the translator’s own vision of reality. Translators act as intermediaries between ST producers and TT receivers.

The translator while rendering ST into another language has to perform a set of actions. These actions are largely initiative and the best results are achieved by translators who are best suited for the job, who are best trained or have a talent for it.

It seems indisputable that the translator must have all-embracing linguistic knowledge on which all else depends. These should be an integration between the linguistic knowledge of the two languages with specific and general knowledge of the domain and of the world via comparative and contrastive linguistic knowledge.

The translator must possess linguistic competence in both languages and communicative competence in both cultures.

The professional translator has access to at least four distinct kinds of knowledge: SL knowledge, TL knowledge, subject area (real world) knowledge and contrastive knowledge.

Add to this, decoding skills of reading and encoding skills of writing.

What are the main principles of the translator's strategy?

When confronted with the text to be translated, the translator's first concern is to understand it by accessing the meaning of language units in the text against the contextual situation and the pertaining extra linguistic facts. At the same time the translator must take care to avoid thinking into the text, i.e. adding the information which is not, in fact, present in ST.

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 context of the whole original text, whether it's a small an 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 content of the original the translator makes the assessment of the relative value of different meaningful elements. In most cases his professional aim is to achieve the closest approximation to the original, i.e. to reproduce the contents in all the details.

But quite often 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.

In a literary text the poetic or stylistic effect is no less important than the ideas conveyed. The loss of the figurative element may make at least part of the text quite meaningless and it's often considered as the dominant component to be preserved in translation.

The choice of the structure in translation often calls for a good deal of ingenuity and imagination on the part of the translator. He should be able to make an accurate assessment of the semantic possibilities of the given syntactic structure in order to see whether the latter can be used to convey the original meaning. It should be borne in mind that parallel TL structures are as good as any and they should by no means be avoided or considered inferior.

On the contrary, he should use the parallel structure whether possible and resort to syntactic or semantic transformations only if it is unavoidable.

As we see, translation is a creative process of search and discovery and it takes much effort from the translator to apply the general principles of the translation theory to the practical problems.

The best translators of works of literature are often said to be those who are most "in tune" with the original author. The translator must possess the spirit of the original, make his own the intent of the SL writer.

The translator “invades, extracts and brings home”. The view that intention should be relayed in translation is no longer controversial.

The intentions of the translator add a second dimension to the process.

The translator’s motivations are inextricably bound up with the socio-cultural content in which the act of translating takes places.

Before there is translation, for example, there has to be a need for it. The need may be client driven, as when someone commissions, asks for or otherwise requires a translation.

It's often market-driven, when publishers perceive demand for a work of foreign literature; it may even be translator-driven, as when a work of ancient literature is translated or re-translated because someone feels that, by doing so, he or she can communicate something new.

The translator, perhaps more than any other practitioner of a profession, is continually confronted with choices. In making his choice, he is intuitively or consciously following a theory of translation. Translation calls on a theory in action; the translator reviews the criteria for the selection as a procedure in his translating activity.

Good interpreters are people who have an open mind and no fear of standing and talking in front of a large crowd of people. Interpreters should also be relatively modest, for they must not outshine the public speaker. Furthermore, an interpreter has to leave his/her own principles and notions aside and deliver the thoughts of a speaker as if they were the interpreter's own, otherwise the listeners will receive a modified message. Apart from that, simultaneous interpreting particularly requires good concentration and high stress tolerance.

To summarize, the translator's profound knowledge of all the nuances of SL and TL lexis, grammar and stylistics is of paramount importance in his/her professional activities.

4. HUMAN TRANSLATION THEORIES

Roughly, the human translation theories may be divided into three main groups which quite conventionally may be called:

Transformational approach

Denotative approach

Communicative approach

A) Transformational approach

This group of translation theories consists of many varieties which may have different names, but they all have one common feature: the process of translation is regarded as a transformation. The representatives of this scientific direction are . L. Barhudarov, L. Latishev, Y.Retsker and others.

According to the transformational approach translating is viewed as transformation of objects and structures of the SL into those of the Target one.

Transformation in translation is any replacement of a SL unit by its equivalent in the Target one.

There can be distinguished three levels of substitution: morphological equivalences, lexical equivalences and syntactic equivalences and/or transformations.

At the morphological level morphemes of the SL are substituted for those of the Target one.

English word-building suffixes "tion" and "sion" may be transformed into Ukrainian suffixes “аніе”, “еніе”, “ка", “ація”.

At the lexical level words and word combinations of the SL are substituted for those of the TL.

room – кімната, простір

In blue mood – ні в гуморі

At the syntactic level semantic structures of the SL are transformed into those of the TL.

The syntactic transformations comprise a broad range of structural changes in the TT, starting with the reversal of the word order in a sentence and finishing with the division of the source sentence into two or more target ones.

The above examples of translations at various levels are the simplest.

Real translation transformations are more complex. Every now and then a syntactic pattern in the SL is transformed into its equivalent in the TL at the morphological level and vice versa. This kind of transformation is especially frequent when translation involves an analytical and a synthetic language.

For ex. Ukrainian case forms are rendered in English by means of relevant prepositions.

(лопатою – with a spade) hence in such instances we observe transformation between different levels (morphological, lexical and syntactic).

According to the Transformational approach translation is a set of multilevel transformations of a text in one language into a text in another governed by specific transformation rules.

Of course there are dictionaries, grammars of the languages involved, perhaps, some matching word-building patterns, which are helpful. All translators use them to a greater or lesser extent, but the question is whether they are sufficient.

In accordance with the transformational approach there are both primary and deduced observed events in translation (word forms are primary observed events), whereas lexical meanings and grammar rules are those deduced from the primary ones.

The observed events are interrelated – words and word forms of different languages are experimentally interrelated through the equivalence of their concepts and the relations are shown in bilingual dictionaries. The interrelation of grammar forms and rules is also established in experiments and shown in the relevant translation manuals.

The selection of equivalents of words and grammar rules is governed by the context (text environment) which is also a set of observed events.

All this means that within the framework of the transformational approach one may build a formal model of translation using observed events and rules for their interrelation and a formal model makes the translation problem a well-defined one.

The transformational approach has been confirmed by the operation of machine translation systems.

In some cases, the transformational approach may come handy, but sometimes it is not appropriate for translation.

For instance, the translation of almost any piece of poetry or high-style prose cannot be explained by mere substitution of TL units for SL units.

B) Denotative approach

According to this approach during translation we deal with similar objects, events (word forms of the matching languages) and concepts deduced from these observed events, however, as opposed to the transformational approach the relationship between the S and T word forms is occasional rather than regular.

To illustrate this difference let us consider the following two examples:

The sea is warm tonight. Сьогодні ввечері море тепле.

A stitch in time saves nine. Дорога ложка до обіду.

In the first instance that equivalences are regular and the concept, pertaining to the whole sentence may be divided into those relating to its individual components (words and word combinations).

In the second instance, however, equivalence between the original sentence and its translation is occasional. (i.e. worth only for this case) and the concept pertaining to the whole sentence cannot be divided into individual components.. The invisible nature of the concept pertaining to the second example may be proved by literal translation of both S and T sentences – “Стібок, зроблений вчасно, економить дев’ять”.

It is much more difficult to model translation based on denotative approach. Conceptual (semantic) models are more ambiguous than those based on verbal equivalences and in machine translation models. The semantic component is usually a disambiguation tool for verbal equivalence. There is only one case where denotative theory does explain translation: that of occasional verbal expressions related to indivisible concepts such as idioms, poetry, etc.

C) Communicational approach

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

Communication may be defined as an act of sending and receiving some information which is called a message.

It's necessary to 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.

It's very important to understand that the thesaurus of message sender and recipient may be different to a greater or lesser degree and that is why we sometimes do not understand each other even when we think we are speaking one and the same language.

So in monolingual communication there are two actors: sender and recipient and each of them uses two thesauruses.

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

The translator has two language thesauruses (S and T) and performs two functions: decodes the S message and encodes the T one to be received by the recipient (end user of the Translation).

The following sentence can have different translation versions depending on translation situation:

Several **new schools** appeared in this area.

В районі з’явилося кілька **нових косяків риби**.

В районі з’явилося кілька **нових шкіл**.

Let us assume then that the message sender being a fisherman and using relevant subject thesaurus by "schools" meant large number of fish swimming together rather than institutions for educating children and the correct translation of them had to be 1.

Whereas the translator, who presumably didn't have the relevant information in his subject, translated schools as institutions for educating children, which naturally leads to misunderstanding (miscommunication). (2)

The above example shows a case of miscommunication based on insufficiency of extra linguistic information. However, there are also cases of miscommunication caused by the insufficiency of linguistic information. These are: inadequate translation of verb tenses, incorrect choice of lexical equivalents and other errors well represented in translation manuals.

This example is, of course, an exaggeration but it clearly illustrates a dividing line between linguistic and extra linguistic information in translation as visualized by the communicational approach to translation.

The communicational approach to translation highlights a very important aspect of translation: translation is a message sent by a translator to a particular user and the adequacy of translation depends on similarity of the background information rather than only on linguistic correctness.

Generally speaking, all theories of human translation try to explain the process of translation to a degree of precision required for formalization, but no explanation is complete so far.

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.

The transformational approach forms the basis of machine translation design – almost any machine translation system uses the principle of matching the observed events (language forms) of the languages involved in translation. The difference is only in the forms that are matched and the rules of matching.

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.

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 this subject matter of the translation well enough, for example 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.

Any theory recognizes three basic components of translation, and different approaches differ only in the accents placed on this or that component.

1. Meaning of a word or word combination in the SL (concept or concepts corresponding to this word or word combination in the minds of the SL speakers).

2. Equivalence of this meaning expressed in a word or word combination of the TL (concept or concepts corresponding to this word a word combination in the minds of the TL speakers).

3. Extra linguistic information pertaining to the original meaning and/or its conceptual equivalent after the translation.

The hierarchy of these methods may be different depending on the type of translation.

Thus, in oral consecutive interpretation the priority is given to denotative method because a translator is first listening to the speaker and only after some time formulates the translation which is very seldom a structural copy of the Source speech.

In simultaneous translation as opposed to consecutive, priority is given to direct transformations since a simultaneous interpreter simply has no time for conceptual analysis.

The matching language forms and concepts are regular and irregular, that seemingly the same concepts are interpreted differently by the speakers of different languages and different translation users.

5. THE CATEGORY 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 semantics, grammar, lexis etc.) and different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence).

It's apparent that the idea 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 to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally; there's no absolute synonymy between words in the same language, let alone in translation.

Translation is a specific kind of interlinguistic communication. This fact proves a leading role of semantic aspect in functioning two linguistic systems.

The phenomenon of translating equivalence is a mayor task of linguistics of translation.

Most of the researchers interpret equivalences as a basic characteristic and condition of translation distinguishing it from other ways of conveying contents of a foreign language text: annotation and others.

Translation equivalence is defined as a measure of semantic similarity between ST and TT, closest possible approximation to ST meaning.

There are different linguistic trends concerning the problem of equivalence which is a kingpin of translation theory.

Jager and Nida focus on the category of equivalence, but view it differently.

So Jager thinks that the task of translation is to achieve **communicative equivalence**, i.e. to retain communicative significance of the original. According to Jager, part of the contents of the original can and must be retained in translation, which involves first, actual significative meaning of the texts (presented by semantic and syntactic meanings of the signs actualized in a sentence), second, actual partitioning of sentences (rheme extraction) and interlinguistic pragmatic meanings providing for stylistic nature of signs – emotional, aesthetic and estimating.

In his opinion, if all these components of text contents coincide in the original and translation, this translation can be considered equivalent.

This linguistic trend is very prolific for further development of semasiology, but it doesn't give possible solution to the problem of translation equivalence.

Eugene Nida distinguishes **formal equivalence** as closest possible match of form and content between ST and TT, as word-for-word translation (translating the meanings of words and phrases in a more literal way), keeping literal fidelity, and **dynamic equivalence** as sense-for-sense translation (translating the meanings of phrases and whole sentences with readability in mind preserving the principle of equivalence of effect on a reader of TT) as basic orientations.

Formal equivalence approach tends to emphasize fidelity to the lexical details and grammatical structure of the original language, whereas **dynamic equivalence** tends to employ a more natural rendering but with less literal accuracy.

The terms dynamic equivalence and formal equivalence, coined by Eugene Nida, are associated with two dissimilar translation approaches that are employed to achieve different levels of literalness between the ST and TT.

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. Formal equivalence is in other words, a means of providing some degree of insight into the lexical, grammatical or structural form of a ST.

Formal equivalence is often more goal than reality, if only because one language may contain a word for a concept which has no direct equivalent in another language. In such cases, a more dynamic translation may be used or a neologism may be created in the TL to represent the concept (sometimes by borrowing a word from the SL).

The more the SL differs from the TL, the more difficult it may be to understand a literal translation without modifying or rearranging the words in the TL. On the other hand, formal equivalence can allow readers familiar with the SL to analyze how meaning was expressed in the original text, preserving untranslated idioms, rhetorical devices and diction in order to preserve original information and highlight finer shades of meaning.

But the theory has serious drawbacks: copying grammatical and lexical units very often leads to the violation of the norms of the TL.

E. Nida claims that the present direction is toward increasing emphasis on **dynamic equivalence** which has a different orientation. According to E. Nida, dynamic equivalence is the quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the Receptor language that the response of the receptor is essentially like that of the original receptors. The desire is that the reader of both languages would understand the meaning of the text in a similar fashion. In later years, Nida distanced himself from the term dynamic equivalence and preferred the term **functional equivalence**. What the term functional equivalence suggests is not the equivalence between the function of the Source text in the Source culture and the function of the Target Text (translation) in the Target culture, but that “function” can be thought of as a property of the text. Translation isn't preoccupied with the coincidence of message in SL with that of the TL; its main task is the achievement of equivalence of reader's response. The idea of dynamic (functional) equivalence seems to be contradictory. The need for maximum proximity and naturality of translation doesn't agree with the necessity to bring about a definite type of Receiver’s behaviour.

A certain presumption of equivalence is built in the mechanism of translation. Such a presumption is based on factual proximity of the content of the original and translation. But its degree in any specific case is determined by a number of objectives and subjective factors and can't be equal and given for all translations.

Equivalence means semantic relations between the two languages established in the process of their correlated functioning. The translator should provide not only semantic proximity between the ST and the TT, equivalent effect on the TT receptor, but the translation should correspond to the norms of the TL, as well. It is not an easy task, but a professional translator is supposed to cope with it.

V. Komissarov has a different vision of equivalence.

According to V. Komissarov, there are five levels of equivalence, each of which has its own peculiarities.

He believes that the equivalence between ST and TT may be based on the reproduction of different parts of the ST contents.

Translations in which the degree of semantic similarity with ST seems to be the lowest can be referred to **the first level**.

Eg. A rolling stone gathers no moss.

Кому вдома не сидиться, той добра не наживе.

That's a pretty thing to say.

Посоромився б!

Here we cannot discover any common semes or invariant structures in the original and its translation. An absolute dissimilarity of language units is accompanied by the absence of any logical link (association) between the two messages which could lead to the conclusion that they are “about of the same thing”, i.e. that they describe one and the same situation, but semantically they are absolutely different. Yet, it is evident that the two sentences have something in common as to their meaning.

Moreover, it comprises the information which must be preserved by all means even though the greater part of the contents of the original is lost in the translation.

From the examples we can see that common to the original and its translation in each case is only the general intent of the message.

The implied or figurative sense, in other words, the conclusions that receptor can draw from the total contents or the associations they can evoke in him, or the special emphasis on some aspect of communication. The translation does not convey either “what the original text is about” or “what is said in it” or “how it's said” but only “what it is said for”, i.e. ”what the source meant”, “what the aim of the message is”.

This part of the contents which contains information about the general intent of the message, its orientation towards a certain communicative effect can be called **“the purport of communication”**. Thus, we can deduce, that in the first type of equivalence it is only the purport of communication that is retained in translation.

The second group of translations can be illustrated by the following examples:

He answered the phone.

Він зняв трубку.

You can see one beer, you have seen them all.

Всі ведмеді схожі один на одного.

It was late in the day.

Наближався вечір.

These examples are similar to previous ones, as the equivalence of translation here does not involve any parallelism of lexical and structural units. Most of the words or syntactical structures of the original have no direct correspondences in the translation. At the same time, it's obvious that there is a greater proximity of contents than in the preceding group. Besides the purport of communication, there is some additional information contained in the original that is retained.

Thus, in the group of translations **of the second type** the equivalence implies retention of two types of information contained in the original – **the purport of communication** and **the identification of the situation.**

In the **third group** of translations the part of the contents which is to be retained is still larger. This type of equivalence can be exemplified as follows:

Scrubbing makes me bad-tempered.

Від миття підлог у мене настрій псується.

London saw a cold winter last year.

У тому році зима у Лондоні була холодная.

You are not serious?

Ви шуткуєте?

In this case the translation retains the two preceding informative complexes as well as the method of describing the situation. In other words, it contains the same general notions as the original. This means that the translation is a semantic paraphrase of the original preserving its basic semes and allowing their free reshuffle in the sentence. The use of identical notions in the two texts means that the basic structure of the message they convey remains intact.

We can now say the third type of equivalence exemplified by the translations of the third group implies retention in the translation of the three parts of the original contents which we have conventionally designated as **the purport of communication, the identification of the situation** and **the method of its description.**

The fourth group of translations can be illustrated by the following examples:

He was never tired of old songs.

Старі пісні йому ніколи не набридали.

I didn't see that I need to convince you.

Не бачу потреби доводити це вам.

He was standing with his arms crossed and his bare head bent.

Він стояв, склавши руки на грудях і опустивши непокриту голову.

In this group the semantic similarity of the previous types of equivalence is reinforced by the invariant meaning of the syntactic structures in the original and in translation. In such translations the syntactic structures can be regarded as derived from those in the original through direct or backward transformations. This includes cases when the translation makes use of similar or parallel structures.

An important feature of this and the subsequent type of equivalence is that they imply the retention of the linguistic meaning, i.e. the information fixed in the substantial or structural elements of language as plane of content.

Thus, the fourth type of equivalence presupposes retention in the translation of the four meaningful components of the original: **the purport of communication, the identification of the situation, the method of its description** and **the invariant meaning of the syntactic structures.**

Last but not least, **the fifth group** of translations that can be discovered when we analyze their relationships with the respective originals. Here we find the maximum possible semantic similarity between texts in different languages. These translations try to retain the meaning of all the words used in the original text. The examples cited below illustrate this considerable semantic proximity of the two correlated words in the two sentences:

I saw him in the theatre.

Я бачив його у театрі.

The house was sold for $10,000.

Будинок був проданий за десять тисяч доларів.

Here we can observe all five meaningful components of the original: **the equivalence of semes** which make up the meaning of correlated words in the original text in translation; **parallelism of syntactic structures** implying the maximum invariance of their meanings; **the similarity of the notional categories** which determine the method of describing the situations; **the identity of**

the situations; **the identical functional aim of the utterance** or the purport of communication. The relative identity of the contents of the two texts depends in this case on the extent to which various components of the word meaning can be rendered in translation without detriment to the retention of the rest of information contained in the original.

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. A translation can be good at any level of equivalence.

6. SEMANTIC ASPECT OF TRANSLATION

It's widely known that semantic systems of different languages and meanings of words comprising these systems don't coincide.

Every language has lexical units which don't have equivalents in the other language; discrepancy in the set of semes constituting a polysemantic word used for nomination of similar objects can be easily traced in the process of translation. We deal with discrepancy of content of lexical units in different languages:

1. Corresponding meanings can be differently grouped inside a polysemantic word in various languages. As a rule, polysemantic words are synonymic to each other in one meaning only and can be absolutely different in others.

“Table” has the correspondences in Ukrainian: **1) таблиця** or **2) стіл.**

In many cases a word is used in one of its meanings and the rest of them become irrelevant for this very act of communication.

The words in the SL and TL must be equivalent only in the meanings they are used in the texts.

2. But there's another tendency: similar semes can be different in their number and can designate various objects.

The Ukrainian verb “носити” can be used for nominating clothes, beard, moustache, hairdo, but it can't be applied in

Ukrainian for perfume, makeup, though its English equivalent is widely used in this meaning.

Eg. She was wearing a new kind of perfume.

The Ukrainian adjective “кип’ячений” (boiled) can be used with words “water and milk” both in English and Ukrainian, but we say “boiled eggs” in English and in Ukrainian its equivalent is “варений”.

boiled water – кип’ячена вода

boiled eggs - варені яйця

So the texts of the original and translation comprise units with non-identical content.

Very often a translator uses the correlations in TL quite different from those in SL.

She knew he had risked his **neck** to help her.

Вона знала, що він ризикував **головою**, щоб її допомогти.

His life is hanging **by a thread**.

Його життя висить **на волосині**.

The children clapped **hands** with joy.

Діти плескали **в долоні** від радості.

They stood their **faces** held up

Вони стояли з високо піднятою **головою**.

She slammed the door **in his face**.

Вона зачинила двері у нього **перед носом**.

Translation is one the most important aspects and methods of comparative study of languages. One of the obstacles to a ready equivalence between two languages is the difference in their semantic structures.

Apart from some few specific areas different speech communities have approximately the same experience of extralinguistic reality, i.e. human experience in general is common to all humans. However in language this common experience finds different expression. For example, Ukrainian” квитанція” has the following parallels in English: receipt, acknowledgement, luggage/baggage ticket or check, pawn ticket, etc.

The point, which we are trying to make, is that the national peculiarities of general semantic segmentation manifest themselves in a specific grouping of notions, in the way these notions are arranged, and result in specific semantic structures of words.

Thus, some notions can be expressed by one word in some language and by different words in another. For example, ”дерево” and “tree’’ are partial equivalents, because “дерево” as “building material” corresponds to the words “wood” and “timber”. Here we can speak of the absolute equivalence of the Ukrainian word towards the English words and of partial equivalence of each of them in relation to the Ukrainian word.

Extralinguistic reality is the basis of something which may be called an invariant meaning variantly expressed in different languages.

Actually in a confrontation of a word in one language with what is usually considered its parallel in another we do not deal with words as a global semantic structure. An English lexeme finds a parallel in a Ukrainian lexeme only if it’s a monosemantic word. Thus the English word “valour” corresponds to the Ukrainian

“відвага”.

In most cases no correspondence between a lexeme in one language and a lexeme in another can be established. Rather we have a lexeme in one language and elements of different lexemes in the other.

One of the most important principles of comparative study of languages is the principle of equivalence. It implies a special sort of correspondence between the words of the two languages rather than absolute identity. The degree of equivalence depends mainly on the peculiarities of the lexical and grammatical systems of the language.

The original lexical units are rendered in translation in three ways: by means of **1) equivalents**; **2) variational (dictionary) correspondences**; **3) occasional correspondences (all kinds of translation transformations).**

The first type of correlations refers to the level of the language, the other two belong to the sphere of the speech.

Equivalents are independent of the contextual surroundings and the translator is deprived of the opportunity to choose between the two alternatives. They include geographical and proper names, terms belonging to different spheres of science and technology.

Equivalents can be **complete** and **partial**; **absolute** and **relative.**

Complete equivalents can be illustrated, as follows: direct current – постійний струм; portal crane – портальний звід. If we take the words "crane" and "звід", they can't be considered complete equivalents, as the word "crane" can also mean "журавель".

"Shadow" and "тінь" are partial equivalents, as the English word "shadow" also means "напівтемрява," "привид."

Absolute equivalents are the words which coincide both in referential and stylistic meanings. The word combination "the shadow of the gods" has an absolute equivalent in the Ukrainian translation "сутінки богів".

Relative equivalents coincide in referential meaning and differ in stylistic meaning. For example:

Absolute		**Relative**	
Enemy	ворог	Foe	ворог
Policeman	поліціант	Cop	поліціант
Fog	туман	Mist	туман
Dollar	долар	Buck	долар

Variational correspondences are established between the words when there are several words in translation to render the original meaning. The English word "soldier" has at least four correspondences in Ukrainian – солдат, рядовий, військовий, військовослужбовець. Such words as "sincere", "writing", "soldier", "justice" are not polysemantic words, but the words having a number of variatonal correspondences among which the translator has to choose an appropriate one.

In quite a number of cases the translator doesn't use any of the preceding translation devices. He has to resort to translation transformations of different types in order to render the lexical unit of the original. This translation correspondence acquires the status of the occasional correlation, the rendering of which is entirely dependent on the context. Translation transformations include all types of transformations, lexical transformations being predominant among the others.

7. THE PRAGMATIC ASPECT OF TRANSLATION

The pragmatic aspect of translation presupposes conveying all the facets of the Source Language message in translation satisfying the requirements of formal correctness and preserving its aesthetic qualities.

Linguistic analysis of a text cannot be considered valid unless three correlated aspects which make up for the text's integrity and create wholeness, globality, which is typical of it, are taken into account. These three aspects are semantics, syntactics and pragmatics. As a rule, justice is done to semantics and syntactics, whereas the last aspect is very often ignored, although it is here, in pragmatics, that the purport of the text is manifested.

Pragmatics is defined as the aspect of linguistic investigation which singles out and analyses linguistic units in their relationship to the user(s) of language. Thus, pragmatics is by definition most important for translation. This, however, does not mean that when translations are analysed they are always viewed from the standpoint of pragmatics. For instance, recently a logical trend closely linked up with linguo -philosophical theories has become quite popular. According to the postulates of this school, a sentence is a certain realization of a universal abstract logical-semantic scheme which makes it possible to regard the process of translation as a substitution of one linguistic model for another. In this theory as in all other more or less formal theories of translation disregard for the pragmatic aspect leads to the exclusion from the target text of the vivid emotional or imaginative element. Indeed, writing, when it is a work of art, can be comprehended only as a global whole, and in translation - when translation is regarded as a literary art - one must bear in mind that there are other functions, apart from the denotative, which must be conveyed. And here the pragmatic aspect comes to the fore.

An analysis of a translation with a pragmatic slant implies a very thorough knowledge of the subtleties of both cultures, sets of customs, etc. of both languages. It implies an awareness of how much of what is said in the source language is comprehended by the recipient in the target language. At best there is no loss, no violation of the pragmatic information, although it is not passed on directly. Here between the usual two participants in the act of communication stands a third one, an intermediary who alone makes the act of communication possible. His first and foremost task is to achieve a correct, an optimal perception on the part of the recipient, i.e. the second participant of the act of communication. This is how the "problem of pragmatic adequacy" arises. To make the problem clearer we shall discuss some cases of pragmatic inadequacy. They occur primarily when the translator resorts to what is called "free" translation, because at the bottom of it there always is an element of his subjective response to the source text.

Another kind of pragmatic inadequacy is observed when the translator succumbs to the temptation to make- the stress laid on this or that part of the sentence stronger, or takes upon himself to redistribute emphases, etc. The translator is not supposed "to think into the text", to add information that is not present in it, to show his/her attitude to the protagonists of the ST text. Some authors' strength and effectiveness lie in their ability to speak in a matter-of-fact way about the most emotional things. With the utmost economy of linguistic means they produce an unforgettable impression. The translator should be very professional to convey the gist and spirit of the original. The translation should do justice to the author's text. The pragmatic aspects of translation are very closely linked with the problems of conveying the author's individual style, his original stylistic gift. Even an unhappy choice of just one word might result in a distortion of an image and thus in a violation of the author's purport. The author does not use words haphazardly, he does not just pick out words at random and string them together. His choice is always pragmatically conditioned. In the following two cases the translator copes with the task:

Дозволь мене потиснути твою чесну руку.

Let me press your honest hand. (Translated by J.Coulson)

Ця людина пригничує мене своєю великодушністью.

This man persecutes me with his generosity. (Translated by J.Coulson).

Numerous investigations show that it is much easier to convey the general idea in a foreign language than to preserve the necessary stylistic flavour.

The translator can face a number of problems even when conveying denotative meanings of words in a literary text. Pragmatic inadequacy becomes very obvious in the less successful attempts to translate what is called “cultural realia.” The “national colouring” of a work of fiction is achieved, as a rule, by depicting the structure of that particular society, its institutions and customs and fashions, its clothing and food, etc. which produce local colour and remind the reader that he is in an alien reality were termed key words.

Suffice it to say that realia are one of the richest sources of “pragmatic inadequacy”. The specific character of the translation of artistic prose calls for an elucidation of innumerable points.

In the process of re-creation of a literary work a certain sacrifice in the sphere of denotation, some loss or change of denotative meaning is permissible. It is very often compensated for by introducing an emotive word or finding an equivalent in a word with a vivid stylistic colouring. If an author uses a word both for its explicit meaning and for its additional overtones and associations, it is for the translator to decide what to sacrifice and what to preserve in translation, as long as his basic criterion is the author's intention. In other words, where a certain loss is inevitable, the translator should strive to observe the principle of stylistic compensation in order to bring out the author's intention and individuality more precisely. An adequate rendering of the connotative or associative value of a word is very important for the text as a whole, i.e. for the whole of its poetic structure which bringing together all the artistic elements conveys the author's message. All the components which go into the making of what can justifiably be called artistic prose are equally important. Thus, we see that an element of description is a sort of backbone which holds up the whole psychological characterization. It is part of the framework of the story, part of its poetic structure. The associative power of a word is not in general registered in the dictionaries, it hovers beneath the surface and one must pierce into the structure to perceive it. For example, let us compare the connotative value of such words as ingenuous and наївний. The word ingenuous connotes many pleasant attributes, such as generous, artless, frank, sincere, open-hearted, straightforward, innocent, etc. (c.f. щирий, прямий, невинний, душевний), whereas наївний borrowed from the French language merely connotes the attribute of being природний, звичайний (cf. natural, plain, simple, unsophisticated). As we can see, this translating equivalent is not a proper word for conveying the meaning of the original.

We have dealt with different extremely complex and subtle questions. This is justified by the fact that in a work of imaginative literature form and content are in the final analysis indivisible. Language, or rather the written word, is the material substance of literature, and the writer uses its denotative, connotative and associative powers to achieve his purpose. That is why the interrelation of straight pure meaning and various associations, implications and overtones of words is of special importance in artistic prose. And this is what makes the translation of a literary text with all its artistic effects, with the whole of its poetic structure extremely difficult. A word's connotative meanings are one of the worst stumbling-blocks to an adequate translation. And yet the undaunted translator tackles the most difficult of texts because he knows that there are techniques of adjustment which will come to his assistance and help him to cope with 'whatever difficulty arises in connection with connotations. Alteration, or modification is the most common technique used in the process of translating. In fact, alterations are so common and so varied that they can hardly be systematically described. One of the types of alteration, most frequently resorted to when connotations come into play, is stylistic compensation. In linguistic literature the principle of stylistic compensation has not received the attention it deserves.

The general problem discussed can be formulated in the following: adequacy in style is sometimes unattainable. All this raises a number of questions. How does one compensate the reader for the many kinds of loss which take place between the original and its version in another language? In other words, what is it possible to do to make up for the lack of connotational correspondence between the languages?

The best and most convincing answer to these questions will be found when we examine how the translator manages to render colloquial substandard and incorrect speech of characters which obviously present the greatest difficulty connotationally. The first point to be made is the obvious impossibility of reproducing accurately the colourfully illiterate words. But the translator may try to portray the speaker's illiteracy indirectly: by h-dropping, by contracting ought to into oughter, by using double negative ("don't you pay no attention"), by making the character say ain`t for isn't. Thus, by skilful use of a few deviations from standard English, not exactly equivalent to the Ukrainian substandard - stylistic compensation-the translator may succeed in portraying the illiterate speaker. Many Ukrainian words get much of their colloquial flavour from the intensifying particle – TO which is virtually untranslatable. The English reader none the less must be given some idea of its connotative value.

In a work of imaginative literature the two meanings, denotative and connotative, interrelate in a peculiar manner. It is not always possible to render adequately both meanings. In such cases the translator will seek to reproduce the general tone, or the emotional atmosphere.

The translator can use the method of stylistic contextual consistency. By this term we mean being consistent not necessarily in details and separate words but in the general stylistic atmosphere, i.e. in rigidly keeping to the spirit of the text rather than the style of the word.

The above-mentioned method of stylistic contextual consistency serves mainly to help the translator to reveal the author's intention. It is designed to bring together all the particulars concerning the author's attitude to what he describes and also speech portrayals. In G.B.Shaw's play "The Devil's Disciple" Anderson, the clergyman, says:

Sister, the Lord has laid his hand very heavily upon you.

Сестра, **тяжко л**ягла на тебе **правиця господня.**

In the translation here the use of three non-neutral words with obvious elevated stylistic overtones (тяжко, правиця, господня) for the neutral ones in the source is fully justified. The appropriate religious register is what was needed to convey the message. The examples given above show how the principle of stylistic compensation works. It may be concluded that certain minor and seemingly insignificant components, derived from the context, bring out the author's purport when incorporated into the translation.

8. THE PRINCIPLE OF NOTIONAL COMPENSATION

When we see how the same thought is expressed in one way in Ukrainian and in another in English, we get a vivid picture of the delicate shades of variation in the two languages. Any compensation of languages implies an examination of their mutual translatability. Indeed, the same information may be conveyed in completely dissimilar language form.

What is done by a translator to overcome differences in semantic structures, cultural diversities, national characteristics, differences in syntactic structures and combinability of words?

If two purely information sentences in English and in Ukrainian such as “**Wet Paint**” and “**Обережно, зафарбовано**” are compared, we cannot fail to notice that they are not identically phrased, though they contain identical advice. “**Обережно**” is not the word for the English “**Wet**” but when the Ukrainian phrase is translated into English in this way it will undoubtedly be correctly understood by all listeners or readers or passers-by, whoever they may be. An Englishman and a Ukrainian react to this phrase in the same way and possibly with the same sensations.

Once upon a most early time there was **a Neolithic man**. (R. Kipling "Just so stories")

Давним-давно, **ще в кам’ яному столітті**, жила та була одна людина.

The word combination a Neolithic man would sound very strange if translated literally, word for word, therefore the translator in order to produce a semantically equivalent structure rearranges the words in his own characteristic fashion and provides instead the combination в камя’ному столітті The translator used one of the techniques he has at his disposal to help him recreate the original. This most common **technique of adjustment** which consists in **redistribution of semantic components**, is, in fact, the simplest way of realizing notional compensation.

It must at once be said, however, that this device, though effective from the point of view of conveying denotative meanings of words is sometimes unnecessary and even dangerous: it can ruin the imagery, rhythm and music of the original.

Another very common **technique of adjustment** employed by the translator in order to reproduce more fully and more precisely the denotation of the original word is that of **addition.** Here very much depends on those to whom the translation is addressed. For instance, if it is for those who have little or no background knowledge concerning the subject matter, then the additions incorporated in the translation are fully justified.

It is interesting to compose the following passage from a peasant's speech with the English translation:

Я ходоком до Сибіру ходив, і на Амурі був, і на Алтаї, і в Сибір переселився, землю там пахав.

I went as a delegate from my village to Siberia and I have been to the Amur **River** and the Altai **Mountains** and I settled in Siberia; I worked the land there. (Translated by C. Garnett)

What happens here may be called ”**specification**”. The Amur River and the Altai Mountains were necessary in a translation made at the beginning of the century. The translator took it upon himself to guide the foreign reader round an unknown country.

Sometimes the original text is explained in order to make explicit what is implicit in it.

There are the following interpretations of the word ”ходок “:

I've walked on foot over the whole of Siberia.

I was in Siberia as a village delegate.

I went to Siberia as a pioneer on foot.

I went as a Scout from my village to Siberia.

I went on foot all the way to Siberia.

All the cases show expansion, the necessity of which is obviously caused by the twofold character of the word's denotation, of its semantic contents. On the one hand, it denotes somebody, who walks on foot, on the other hand, it denotes a scout, a person who is sent by the community to look for a suitable place for the village to resettle.

Lexical expansions are sometimes determined by differences in combinability of words in English and Ukrainian.

One and the same word, the verb **to fail**, for example, in combination with different nouns should be translated differently, although its denotative value hardly changes. For example:

His friendship **will not fail** me , nor his council, nor his love. (B. Shaw)

Його дружба мене не змінить. Його поради мене не обдурять. Його кохання мене не зрадить.

Using almost the same syntactic structure, the translator added new words (verbs) to stress the denotative meaning of the original verb.

It must be noted here that additional elements supplied by the translator do not always add to the semantic content, and it would be better, perhaps, if in some cases they were given as marginal notes or as a commentary.

The instances of lexical reduction, which are also called **substractions,** are not as numerous and varied as those of lexical expansion but they are nevertheless highly important. They occur when it is possible to omit certain lexical items, or when repetition in the original text leads to a misleading tautology.

This point may be illustrated by the following translations:

He jerked away in **fear and dismay**.

У страху він позадкував.

Fear and dismay are synonymous in English showing different degrees of a person's reaction.

Я зізнаюсь, **підозрюю, сильно підозрюю** цю людину.

To tell the truth, there is a man whom I **very strongly suspect.**

As we see, certain elements are omitted when some fact, action or relation is quite obvious without further specification, when further details in the other language would be superfluous and ineffectual. Such losses are not usually regarded as a violation of the principle of fidelity because by subtracting certain elements one can preserve a greater degree of correspondence.

It is clear that subtraction as a special kind of technique has nothing to do with those cases when words, phrases or even sentences relevant to the text are deliberately omitted.

So, we may conclude that the translator has a number of techniques of notional compensation at his disposal to adjust the target text to that of the original, with some losses being inevitable. The translator should bear in mind that in actual practice of translating, semantic, stylistic and pragmatic aspects run parallel.

9. THE PRINCIPLE OF TRANSLATABILITY

The basic principle upon which the theory of translation rests is **the principle of translatability**, the tenet which reads: anything that can be said in one language can be said in another..

The first serious theoretical approaches to translation, that implied translatability through examining informational and stylistic functions of this or that linguistic element and then establishing the means that could fulfill the same functions in another language, were made by Mathesius, Fiser, Jakobson and Levy. They based their theories on substitution and compensation.

It's well-known that different cultures, i.e. different speech communities segment extralinguistic reality in their own way. This makes for a specific semantic structure characteristic of this or that language and is reflected in the semantic structures of words.

The phenomenon of different semantic segmentation acquires a special significance when a translator is confronted with the problem of conveying into another language a message which contains mention of something that is unknown to the receptors, i. e. outside their experience. For example, how can people who have not seen any snow understand the expression "white as snow"? Of course, we may resort to the use of a non-metaphor ”very, very white”.

Indeed, things that may be associated with white are varied as can be illustrated by the following Ukrainian units:

біла ворона	white crow
біла пляма	white spot
But:	
білий, як мармур	white as snow
біла кость	blue blood
білий світ	wide world
це казка про білого бичка	here we go again
поміж білий день	in broad day light
чорним на білому	in black & white
це шито білими нитками	that is too thin

The natural associations of an Englishman, apart from those which correspond to the Ukrainian, are:

white hair	сиве волосся
white lie	брехня на спасіння
white tie	вечірня сукня
white man	шляхетна людина
white elephant	марна річ
white feather	боягузтво
white Christmas	Різдво зі снігом
stand in a white sheet	публічно каятися.

It may be seen from the examples above that the difficulty of the unknown extralinguistic referent may be overcome not without a certain loss, of course, but the loss is not so great as to warrant the renunciation of the principle of translatability.

Indeed, there are many far more difficult cases in the sphere of national or "cultural" realia. What is one to do with such concepts as **sauna** (steam bathhouse, as in Finland), with the names of the following items of clothing: **kilt** (Scotland), **sarong** (Malay) and others.

Catford suggests what we have here is something that cannot be translated because of the cultural discrepancy, therefore he introduces the term **"cultural untranslatability".**

It should not be thought that only "exotic" units can serve to exemplify what has been called "cultural untranslatability". There are simple everyday words whicc also possess a specific national or "cultural" character: e.g. **home, pet, pub** are no less difficult to translate into Ukrainian than **sauna.**

Each language is particularly rich in vocabulary for its own area of cultural focus: it is well known and often remarked upon that Alaskan Eskimoes have words to denote different states, colour, texture of snow. In Peru the vocabulary for such areas as hunting and fishing is highly developed, as is vocabulary for cattle, etc. in Sudan.

Apart from this difficulty there is another one connected with the problem of establishing denotative equivalence. Very often equivalence between English and Ukrainian lexical items is barely provisional. The fact that the global semantic structures of the so-called equivalent words are different sets many pitfalls in the way of one-to-one correspondence. Words do not coincide in their structures, in most cases they do not even overlap; they display an elaborate ramification of non-coincident elements.

The words are said to be translatable in the sense that their basic denotative meanings (in contrast with their emotive charge, i.e. connotative meanings) can be transferred into the other language. Such expressions as на чужій стороні, рідне повітря are denotatively equivalent to their counterparts in a strange country, in a strange place, the familiar air, the familiar atmosphere, found in English translations of some stories. It would be just to say that from the point of view of certain subtle additional implications of these Ukrainian adjectives the above-mentioned translations are not, perhaps, fully satisfactory.

The same problem of denotational equivalent can be viewed on a much broader scale. Supposing the word denotes something that is completely absent from the culture of the country of the receptor language, which consequently has no word for it. What is the translator to do with the so-called untranslatable words or realia?.

The absence of names for quite a number of objects, things, actions and processes in each language brings us to what is usually considered the most difficult and still unsolved problem of translation.

How do translators solve this problem? How do they render non-equivalent Ukrainian words such as дача, дачники, селюки, льох, оглядини?

Дача – dacha – villa – cottage– country cottage

Дачники – dachniki – summer visitors

Льох – lioh – peasant hut – peasant cottage

Селюки –selyuki – peasants – rough peasants – country people

Оглядини – oglyadini – a visit of inspection – bride show/ing

Some resort to transliteration, others translate using English words which denote something similar though not absolutely identical. It appears that there cannot be an ideal, universally acceptable solution. To achieve a high standard of verbal precision, the translator dealing with untranslatable items has to choose among many means in conformity with the situation, period and frequency of usage. When the translator faces the difficulty of establishing an exact single-word equivalent he must also keep in mind that what he is translating is artistic prose where language is raised to the status of art.

But these are also cases when the translator finding other ways of conveying the idea does not use the Ukrainian equivalents given by the dictionaries. And this is quite natural because in dealing with fiction the translator cannot and must not confine himself to the registered equivalents only. Transfer of any work of literary merit in one language into a literary achievement in another, sets various problems and also makes a number of demands for the translator. Firstly, he faces all the problems involved in choosing the words. Secondly, the translator should escape formal fidelity and try to translate "dynamically", e.i., he must produce an effect comparable to that of the original work. His task is to strive for semantic & stylistic preservation, to do his utmost to convey the slightest shade of meaning, subtlest connotation of a word. At the same time, he cannot violate the collocational & grammatical norms of TL. So he can resort to equivalents unobservable in a dictionary entry. For example:

And there must, of course, be more in him than **met** the sense of hearing.

І , звичайно, він має що-то більше, ніж **можна** почути у бесіді..

I haven't been in the habit of **meeting** with suspicion and ingratitude.

Я не звик до підозри та невдячності.

Whom do you think to **meet** him, besides Elison?

Як ти вважаєш, кого **запросити** заради нього, крім Елісон?

In the last example the verb запросити seems to be a more suitable equivalent than other possible versions.

The data discussed make it quite evident that the equivalents registered in dictionaries do not and cannot cover all possible cases. The translator shouldn't restrict himself to the equivalents given by the dictionaries.

A general rule may be established: when a translator looks for an equivalent he must not only take into consideration the peculiarities of the TL but proceed from the semantic structure of the SL as well. The equivalent must correspond to (1) the context of situation; (2) to the same stylistic layer as the original word and (3) to the accepted speech norm.

Thus, comparing translations of the word "**say**" we can state that the range of its syntagmatic properties is much wider than that of its paradigmatic features.

said:
виголосив з гідністю
холодно відрізав
погодився засмучено
заперечив боязко
шепотілися
не вимовила
запнувся в нерішучості
образив необережним словом

The given above translation versions of the verb "to say" on the syntagmatic level (during its actualization) very patently show that the translation procedure is very much dependent on the context that gives rise to a great number of occasional correspondences. The latter considerably enrich the semantic potential of lexical units.

The principle of translatability rests on the following: anything that can be said in one language can be said in another in spite of the many obstacles that stand in the translator's way. These obstacles are overcome in many ways by different types of compensation, substitution, etc.

<u>ЗМІСТОВИЙ МОДУЛЬ 2</u>

10. TRANSLATION TRANSFORMATIONS. LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN TRANSLATION

In some cases the translator manages to preserve the original lexical and grammatical structures, but in most cases it is absolutely impossible, as two compared languages are mainly of different types. To overcome these divergences the translator has to resort to **translation transformations** of different kinds.

Translation transformation is any change of ST at any level of the language (lexical, syntactic, stylistic) during translation.

There are different classifications of translation transformations and different translation devices are attributed to a definite translation transformation type.

As V. Garbovski puts it: "Transformation is a process of converting the system of ST meanings into the system of TT meanings."

R. Minyar-Beloruchev considers that "Transformation is a change of formal (lexical or grammatical transformations) or semantic (semantic transformations) components of the ST with the preservation of the information to be rendered in translation".

Linguists attribute different translation devices to a certain type of a translation transformation . They also single out a different number of these transformation types.

A. Shveitser suggests dividing transformations into four groups:

1) transformations on the componential level; 2) transformations on the pragmatic level; 3) transformations on the referential level; 4) transformations on the stylistic level.

Y. Retsker finds only two transformation types: grammatical (substitution of parts of speech and parts of the sentence) and lexical (concretization, generalization, differentiation, antonymous translation, compensation, modulation and contextual modification).

L. Barkhudarov, I. Olexieva, U. Pivueva & K. Dvoinina name four types of transformations: transpositions, substitutions, omission and addition.

V. Komisarov singles out lexical, grammatical and complex transformations.

In his opinion, lexical transformations fall into: transliteration, transcription, calquing, modulation, concretization and generalization. Grammatical transformations include literal translation, grammatical substitutions of sentence members, word forms, parts of speech) and proposition partitioning. Complex transformations encompass descriptive translation, antonymous translation and compensation.

As far as we can judge from the mentioned above, linguists offer different classifications of translation transformations and attribute various translation devices to a certain type of a transformation, but all of them think that a translation transformation is a conversion of a ST into a TT in compliance with the norms of the TL.

Specification of contextual meanings in translation is subject to definite semantic and logical laws. Similarity of word meanings in the SL and TL depends upon similarity of notions expressed by these words.

Lexical transformations take place when a definite translated lexical unit is substituted with a word or word combination having a different inner form. The equivalent in the TL has semes different from those constituting a dictionary meaning

A lot of linguists have conducted their research of translation transformations, including lexical transformations. There are quite a number of classifications of lexical transformations, each of which has its own peculiarities, but they all have one common feature: the translation of SL lexical units is made on the level of occasional correspondences. Some of the classifications will be considered bellow:

So, I. Oleksieva singles out the following types of lexical transformations:

1) partial substitution of semantics of the SL lexeme;
2) redistribution of semantic contents of the SL lexeme;
3) concretization;
4) generalization.

T. Kazakova proposes to use the term lexical-semantic modifications (transformations), which include:

1) transcription/transliteration
2) calquing;
3) narrowing of meaning;
4) widening of meaning;
5) strengthening of meaning;
6) weakening (neutralization) of meaning;
7) functional replacement;
8) descriptive translation.

A. Shveitser distinguishes the following transformations

1) antonymous translation;
2) generalization;
3) concretization;
4) substitutions.

According to Y. Retsker's classification there are the following types of lexical translations:

1) differentiation and concretization;
2) generalization;
3) logical development (modulation);
4) antonymous translation;
5) compensation;
6) contextual modification

Differentiation and Concretization

The devices of differentiation and concretization are interrelated in the process of translation from English to Ukrainian especially when the translator deals with words of wide semantics in TL. Words of wide semantics are expressed by nouns, adjectives, verbs.

a) thing, point, stuff, affair, place;
b) great, bad, fine;

c) to say, to go, to get, to put, to come, to do

The meaning of such verbs can be properly rendered only in the context. No dictionary can cover all the variety of meanings arising in the context. Translation of words of wide semantics is very much dependent upon the context: E.g.

1. This is a terrible **thing**, he said.

Кепська **історія**: проговорив він.

2. He ordered **a drink.**

Він замовив **віскі.**

Drink – питво, спиртний напій

In translation the word "drink" is specified and rendered as "віскі".

"Віскі" is a part of the notion "спиртні напої. The general is substituted by particular. And here we can trace both differentiation and concretization.

Differentiation can take place without concretization but the latter is always accompanied by differentiation.

One of the flight attendants offered him **a drink** before they took off, and he declined.

Стюардеса, яка йшла по салону, запропонувала Чарлі **вино, віскі чи шампанське**, але він відмовився.

You bet! I can't to get out of this **place.**.

Бажаеш? Так, я сама мрію про те, щоб вибратися **з вашого лігва.**

In this translation besides specifying the word of wide semantics **"place",** the translator also resorts to the stylistic transformation : a stylistically neutral lexeme **"place"** acquires a pejorative meaning.

When the **man** came round to collect the money she had to insist on paying her bill.

Коли до них підійшов **офіціант** з рахунком, їй довелося наполягти на тому, щоб заплатити за свій обід.

All the above mentioned examples confirm that this device is med at substituting general by particular in translation.

Generalization of meaning in translation is absolutely different from concretization and differentiation. Its aim is to substitute particular by general.

This device is less frequent in use taking into account peculiarities of English and Ukrainian vocabulary. English words have a more abstract character than Ukrainian words referring to the same notion. Sometimes generalization is applied in accordance with stylistic norms of the Ukrainian language and literature. For instance, it's not peculiar to translation of fiction from English into Ukrainian to specify the character's weight and height: if in the original it's very precise, in translation it is an approximate formula, giving the main idea:

A young man of **6 feet, 2 inches.**

Молода людина **вище середнього зросту.**

She was letting her temper go **by inches.**

Вона **потроху** втрачала терпіння.

There were **dozens of** articles about them.

Писали про нього **багато.**

Logical development

Another type of lexical transformations is often called "modulation". It involves the creation of an equivalent by replacing a unit in SL by 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 aspect of the same situation. In such cases the substitute often has a cause-and-effect relationship with the original. This type of relationship results in metonymic or metaphoric transfer of meaning.

She recognized Tom's neat, commercial **hand** and tore the envelope open.

Вона впізнала акуратний, чіткий **почерк** Тома й відкрила конверт.

The night **was all in pieces.**

Ніч **була розбита.**

Misha **swam to his heart's content** in the broad ice-hole.

Пінгвін **наплавався вдосталь** у широкій ополонці.

But I’m **in the dark** really about penguins.

Я, власне, **нічого** про пінгвінів **не знаю.**

The examples illustrate metonymic and metaphoric transfer of meaning in translation. Most of the researchers consider them to be the basis for logical development.

Antonymous translation is mainly based on the logical category of contradictoriness. It means replacement if some notion in the original by the opposite notion in translation involving rearrangement of the whole utterance. In most cases the usage of opposite notions results in replacement of an affirmative SL structure by a negative TL one, or vice versa. But the main idea is to keep the contents unchanged.

Julia did **not** wake till after eleven.

Коли Джулія **прокинулась**, була дванадцята година.

This example shows that the translator resorts to two kinds of transformations: lexical and grammatical. Antonymous translation is accompanied by the change of sentence types: a simple sentence is substituted in translation by a complex one.

The chef left his cell with **no** protest.

Вождь покинув камеру **без** криків.

It is long since I **frequented** it.

Давно вже я **не бував** там.

The given examples show the change of the sentence type: a negative sentence becomes an affirmative one, and vice versa.

Compensation

One more specific procedure which may come handy to the translator is called compensation technique. It's defined as a deliberate introduction of some additional elements in translation to make up for the loss of similar elements at the same or earlier stage. Semantic compensation is characterized of non-equivalent vocabulary, especially, realia.

First of all, it is used for defining relations peculiar to the country of SL and alien to that of TL. It emphasizes differences in background knowledge.

I've bought **a Christmas** present for Dad.

Це **новорічний** подарунок для тата.

I took Strickland's temperature. It was **a hundred and four**.

Я вимірював температуру Стрікленду.. Градусник показав **сорок й три десятих.**

He puffed luxuriously at the long **Corona** he was smoking.

Він із задоволенням затягнувся **дорогою сигарою**.

I packed my two **Gladstones.**

Я упакував свої дві **шкіряні валізи**.

Compensation technique is sometimes used by very experienced translators to render the speech of illiterate people. For instance, Eliza in B. Shaw's "Pygmalion" being a cockney makes a mistake typical of the speech of an uneducated person (cockney). .

I'm nothing to you - not so much as **them** slippers.

And professor Higgins corrects her saying "these slippers".

The linguistic error in the episode is understandable. But the translator finds a good solution to the problem. In translation he doesn't make emphasis on the wrong usage of the pronoun. He renders the mistake by changing the noun ending (making it wrong).

Я для вас ніхто, навіть гірше за ці **туфелів.**

The communicative effect upon the reader is similar to that of the original.

Contextual modification is a universal means of conveying phraseological units. There is no semantic proximity in lexical units and translated ones. The translator renders senses, but not words. Here we can trace pragmatic adaptation of the translation to the original. This translation technique demands, besides good SL and TL knowledge, also profound background knowledge on the part of the translator.

It can be illustrated, as follows:

Even the most perfunctory account of the plain facts would **blow the myths sky-high.**

Навіть побіжний розгляд чинників **не залишить каменя на камені від мифу**, який було створено істориками. міфу.

It's not very frequent in use. It may come handy mainly for translation of proverbs, idioms and set expressions.

11. GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS

Differences in the types of the two languages (analytical and synthetic) and in their structures result in grammatical transformations which take place in the process of translation.

A grammatical transformation is the change of the original syntactic structure in translation. In very rare cases, the translator manages to preserve the ST syntactic structure by using the analogous TL grammatical forms or a word-for-word translation. This can be called a zero transformation. The latter usually concerns short simple sentences with equivalent grammatical forms in the TL.

She came into the room.

Вона війшла до кімнати.

Omission of articles, linking verbs and other secondary elements of the English sentence in translation does not involve the change of the sentence structure.

In most cases the translator has to implement a grammatical transformation of a certain type or even their combination. There are the following factors that can affect grammar transformations: 1. Absence of the corresponding grammar unit in the TL; 2. Non-coincidence of syntactic functions of analogous grammar units in the SL and TL; 3. Non-coincidence of semantic structures of the lexical units in the SL and TL.

A transformation can be either complete or partial. A complete transformation takes place when there is a substitution of main sentence members and partial if secondary parts are replaced in the TL.

There are different classifications of grammatical transformations.

L. Barhudarov, I. Oleksieva, V. Alimov, U. Pivvueva & K. Dvoinina attribute the following four types to grammatical transformations:

Transposition (permutation)
substitutions
addition
omission

Y. Retsker divides all the types of grammatical transformations into five categories: substitution of word order, substitution of sentence structure (complete and partial), substitution of parts of speech and sentence members, addition and omission.

As a rule, the translator resorts to a few types of transformations at a time as they are very much correlated (transposition + substitution; addition + substitution, etc.).

Transposition (Permutation)

Transposition is a very frequent type of grammatical transformations. Its high frequency can be easily accounted for. We should bear in mind that there are differences in the word order and in information structures (theme-rheme arrangement) in the two languages. The translator uses transposition to preserve the functional sentence perspective.

Lui Chasse was sitting on that bench in her good blue fall coat.

На лавці в добротному блакитному пальті сиділа **Луїза Чесс.**

Permutation in this translation is predetermined by differences in theme-rheme arrangement in the SL and TL, i.e. by the rules of the communicative partitioning of the sentence.

McGovern looked up as he climbed the steps.

Коли Ральф піднявся на ганок, **Мак-Говерн відірвався від газети.**

In translating this SL complex sentence the translator changed the sequence of the main and subordinate clauses, so that the TL sentence would correspond to the norms of the Ukrainian language.

He stepped away **as I stepped forward.**.

З кожним моїм кроком він відступав.

Besides transposition, the change of word order, the translator uses one more type of grammar transformation – substitution – he resorts to substitution of three kinds:

1. Substitution of parts of speech, the verb "stepped" is transformed into the noun "шаг". 2. Substitution of sentence types, an English complex sentence is replaced by a simple sentence in

translation. 3. Substitution of sentence members , the subject “I” is transformed into the attribute “мій”. **Substitutions** Substitution is a quite common type of transformation. Substitutions can affect particularly all types of the linguistic units: sentence members, word forms, parts of speech, parts of sentence, sentence types and types of syntactic relations.

Substitution of word forms

This type of translation encompasses substitution of singular by plural, and vice versa, tense forms (past by present; passive by active, and vice versa).

By the time he **was finished, the dishes** were done.

На той час, коли Ральф **виговорився, посуд** був вимитий.

This translation shows two subtypes of substitutions of word forms: substitution of passive voice with active and substitution of plural with singular in translation.

Substitutions of word forms can be caused either by systemic differences between the two languages (**dishes – посуд**) or by context conditions (**was finished – виговорився**).

I thought i **was losing** my mind.

Я гадала, що **втрачаю** розум.

In this translation the substitution of past tense form by present is made according to the rules of the sequence of tenses.

Substitution of parts of speech

Replacement of English nouns by Ukrainian verbs is especially typical. The English language makes a great use of the so-called nominalization (verbal nouns are used to denote actions).

Eg. It's our **hope** that...

Ми **сподіваємося**, що...

She's very **rapid packer.**

Вона дуже **швидко упаковує** речі.

The adjective "rapid" is substituted with an adverb "швидко", and the verbal noun ” packer” is transformed into the verb “упаковує“.

Lachesis was looking **earnestly** at Ralph.

Лахесіс **із надією** дивився на Ральфа.

The adverb "earnestly" is replaced by the noun with preposition.

The translator has to resort to this type of transformation so that the TL sentence might correspond to the norms of the Ukrainian language. A word-for-word

Substitution of Sentence Members (Parts of the Sentence)

Substitution of sentence members presupposes replacement of subject by object, and vice versa; adverbial modifier by subject, and vice versa. These two kinds of substitutions of sentence members are usually accompanied by other types of substitutions (transformation of active voice into passive, and vice versa):

Mc Govern's friend was surrounded **by a plum-coloured aura.**

Приятеля Мак-говерна отчувала **аура сливового кольору.**

Change of passive predicate by active one results in substitution SL subject with TL object, and vice versa and substitution of SL indirect prepositional object with TL subject.

The room turned totally silent.

У кімнаті наступила повна тиша.

The subject of the SL sentence is transformed into the TL adverbial modifier in order to preserve the functional sentence perspective in translation. The translator resorts to this kind of substitution so that the TL sentence would correspond to the norms of the target language.

Substitution of sentence types

This type of substitution encompasses several subtypes:

a) substitution of a SL simple sentence with a TL complex one, and vice versa;

b) substitution of SL coordination with TL subordination, and vice versa.

c) substitution of syndetic relationship with asyndetic one, and vice versa;

d) sentence joining and sentence partitioning (fragmentation).

a) Substitution of a simple sentence in the original with **a compound** or **a complex sentence** in translation is always accompanied by **decompression** and mainly caused by systemic differences between the two languages:

Now the driver of the Datsun was revving his engine like a kid in a muscle-car waiting for the light to turn green.

Тепер водій “датсуна” тиснув на акселератор, як дитина, що тисне на важіль силоміра, чекаючи, коли загориться зелене світло.

This simple extended sentence complicated by Participle 1 and For-to-infinitive construction is rendered in the TL by means of a complex sentence. In conveying non-finite forms of the verb, and especially their complexes, the original simple sentence, in most cases, decompresses.

Substitution of a SL complex or **compound sentence** with a **TL simple one** is accompanied by a different technique, namely, by **compression.**

A sad little whine came to his ears and Ralph looked down the hill.

Ральф, почувши сумовите пищання, подивився у бік пагроба.

b) A SL subordinate clause can be replaced by **a TL coordinate clause**, and vice versa:

There was a clacking sound from under the hood **that** he didn’t like very much.

З під капота чулися постукування й скрегіт, **і** це не сподобалося Ральфові.

The complex sentence of the original changes into the compound in translation (subordination is substituted by coordination).

c) Both languages make ample use of **syndetic** and **asyndetic** relatioship, but their frequency within the two languages is different; English prefers syndetic structures, whereas Ukrainian gives preference to asyndetic.

All I have in it is my two dresses **and** my shoes **and** my underwear **and** my socks **and** some other things.

У ньому тільки дві сукні, туфлі, білизна, шкарпетки **та** ще деякі дрібниці.

But there can be a different pattern: the English asyndetic sentence is transformed by the translator into the Ukrainian syndetic one:

She was hardly breathing, inch by inch, foot by foot, the craft came downwards.

Вона ледве дихала, **поки** корабель повільно, дюйм за дюймом, фут за футом, спускався додому.

This subtype of substitution of sentence types is very much dependent on the contextual situation.

d) Sentence joining and **sentence fragmentation (partitioning)** are used by translator quite often and the translator's final decision depends on many factors – both objective and subjective.

When I was in the bathroom, I tried to make the auras come back. This time I couldn't do it.

У туалетній кімнаті я намагався викликати аури, але не зміг.

The translator very efficiently joins two English sentences (a complex sentence and a simple one) into a compound sentence in translation at the expense of changing sentence types. The TL sentence conveys all the information of the SL sentence and at the same time it is easier for perception by a TL recipient.

And although some of the joy has gone out of the afternoon, some is still there; he has seen the line, and that always makes him feel good.

І хоч день позбувся деякої частки радості, дещо приємне лишилося. Він бачив жовту лінію, а це завжди піднімає настрій.

The translator partitions a SL long sentence into two in translation by emphasizing part of essential semantic information.

The techniques of sentence integration and fragmentation are characterized by a high degree of subjectivism, because it is the translator who decides whether it is expedient to use it or not.

Additions

Some implicit elements of the original text must be rendered in translation by additional lexical or grammatical units.

Eg. He **had taken** his hickory baton out of the custom-made holster he carried it in.

Кийок він **вже** дістав з чохла.

Addition "вже" renders the meaning of priority expressed by the English past perfect tense form, the latter being a grammar-lacking category in Ukrainian.

A new American Secretary of State has proposed a world conference on food supplies.

Новий державний секретар США запропонував скликати всесвітню конференцію **з питань** продовольчих ресурсів.

The translator adds the word "питань", so that the translated sentence might correspond to the stylistic norms of the TL.

One of the reasons for using an addition technique in translation is formal lack of expression of semantic components of a SL word combination. For example, the sentence "I began the book" must be rendered by adding such words as "to read or to write" in translation in order to make the translated sentence semantically completed.

Omission

This device is just the opposite to that of addition; it's aimed at eliminating redundancy of the units which are irrelevant in the context. Omission is predetermined by differences in the semantic structures of lexical units in the two languages.

Eg. He jerked away with an expression of **fear and dismay**, and tripped over one of Brutal's big feet.

У страху він позадкував і спіткнувся об ногу Зверюги.

The government resorted to **force and violence.**

Уряд вдався до **насильства**.

The second word in a word combination (dismay, force) is redundant viewed through the prism of semantic combinability of words in Ukrainian.

The translator resorts to omission, because a literal translation wouldn't correspond to the stylistic norms of the Ukrainian language.

12. THE DENOTATIVE MEANING OF A WORD AND HOW TO CONVEY IT IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE

It has been repeatedly stated that the main purpose of language is to serve as means of communication. Practically any kind of information can be conveyed, since language has names for all objects, phenomena and actions; it is capable of expressing human reactions, feelings, states of mind and judgement. Units of communication, i.e. linguistic units or words, denote concrete thing, actions, etc. as well as concepts of things and actions.

These meanings which directly refer to things in extra linguistic reality, i.e. the nominative meanings of words may be viewed as denotative meanings. (This meaning depending on the linguistic school, may be termed "cognitive", referential", "intellective", etc. meaning). Denotative meaning is the basic or literal meaning of any notional word.

At first sight it may appear that the rendering of denotative meanings does not present a problem for translation. However, when we deal with the immediate denotative meaning of the original word or utterance and the problem of its transference into another language, we have to face the fact that it is the exception rather than the rule that a specific form evokes only one precise meaning. It is a well-known fact that some scholars and commentators who deal with Shakespeare's originals, for example, are still not clear as to the meanings of certain words and phrases in his work. Thus, the Cambridge edition of "Hamlet" provides about eighty possible interpretations of the word-combination "the dram of eale".

Which one should the translator pick out among them? It’s quite a challenge.

Shakespeare's commentators are still doubtful about the word questionable. Some of them interpret it as ”capable of answering questions”, others as” wishing to ask questions” or “provoking questions”.

Here the denotative meaning of the word presents difficulties for translators because it is impossible to determine and understand the actual meaning of the original word, as it was intended by the author, and not because of the impossibility of finding an equivalent in the other language. In his translation M.M Morozov chooses the meaning “provoking questions” in Hamlet's mind.

To translate is to understand, as someone cleverly defined the essence of the process. When it is hard to say what the author wanted his word to denote or mean, the translator has to rely only upon his individual understanding.

It may be mentioned here that some notorious translation mistakes are made due to the translator's failure to see what the word denotes rather than to his failure to find a proper equivalent.

It must not be forgotten that even in ordinary everyday speech an utterance may be ambiguous, may have a number of “readings” or meanings. In actual speech it is the context or the situation that indicates quite clearly which of the meanings of a polysemantic word is intended. Supposing something is referred to as “ tough”. Is the speaker talking about a piece of meat? Does he mean “it's too bad”, speaking sarcastically or sympathetically of some incident (It was tough on you)? Is he describing a dangerous criminal? When we hear the word, it is the concrete situation or the context that will determine the answer.

In works of literature the situation is different. As has just been shown with the examples from Shakespeare, contextual specification of the word's denotation is not always possible. The role and relevance of the surrounding context is rather limited, hence the difficulty of interpretation and, consequently, translation.

Apart from this difficulty there is another one connected with the problem of establishing denotational equivalence. Very often equivalence between English and Ukrainian lexical items is merely provisional. The fact that the global semantic structures of the so-called equivalent words are different sets many pitfalls in the way of one-to-one correspondence. Words do not coincide in their structures, in most cases they do not even overlap; they display an elaborate ramification of non-coincident elements. To give but one more example, the Ukrainian word “рідний” means not only "native, familiar, kindred, pertaining to the family" in the literal sense, but also someone or something with whom real intimacy is possible, it pertains to an inner affinity that is a prerequisite for real communication. This makes the Ukrainian adjective рідний and also its antonym “чужий” one of the most heavily laden words in the Ukrainian language. The question immediately arises: are these two Ukrainian adjectives translatable? These words can be said to be translatable in the sense that their basic denotative meanings (in contrast with their emotive charge, i.e. connotative meanings) can be transferred into the other language. Such expressions as на чужий стороні, рідне повітря are denotatively equivalent to their counterparts in a strange country, in a strange place, the familiar air, the familiar atmosphere, found in English translations of some stories. It would be just to say that from the point of view of certain subtle additional implications of these Ukrainian adjectives the above-mentioned translations are not, perhaps, fully satisfactory.

The same problem of denotational equivalence can be viewed on a much broader scale. Supposing the word denotes something that is completely absent from the culture of the country of the receptor language, which consequently has no word for it. What is the translator to do with the so-called untranslatable words or realia? The absence of names for quite a number objects, things, actions and processes in each language brings us to what is usually considered the most difficult and still unsolved problem of translation.

Translators use different techniques of transferring the non-equivalent Ukrainian words. Some of them transliterate them even if they are absolutely unfamiliar to the English reader. Others invariably translate using English words which denote something similar or familiar though not absolutely identical. There also exists another approach which might be termed "mixed" or "synthetic": they transliterate some realia and render others by their half or near-equivalents. Each of the existing methods of conveying untranslatable words has its advantages and disadvantages which are discussed, time and again, in the literature on the subject. It appears that there cannot be an ideal, universally acceptable solution. To achieve a high standard of verbal precision, the translator dealing with untranslatable items has to choose among many means in conformity with the situation, period and frequency of usage.

When the translator faces the difficulty of establishing an exact single-word equivalent he must also keep in mind that what he is translating is artistic prose where language is raised to the status of beauty beyond mere information.

Having regarded some of the general questions of denotational equivalence, we may conclude that in spite of certain limitations the message or content of the original word nevertheless can always be conveyed in the target language.

13. THE CONNOTATIVE MEANING OF A WORD AND HOW TO CONVEY IT IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE

The denotative meaning, while it is the basic meaning of a word, is not its only or whole meaning. When we want to put the simplest fact into words, our feelings immediately get in the way. Words appeal to more than one's mind. Different people interpret the same event in the light of their feelings towards something or somebody. Accordingly, our selection of words can subtly influence the thinking, emotions and opinions of other people. If you speak, for instance, of somebody's notoriety, not reputation or fame, the word will work on your listeners` response because he/she not only understands the denotation of this word, but also responds to it emotionally. The implications of this statement are that besides denoting a concrete thing, action or concept, a word may also carry various additional overtones generally described as **connotations.** They are made up of different components: those that express one's attitude to the thing spoken about (this is called an emotive component of meaning), or those that indicate the sphere in which the discourse takes place (this is known as the stylistic reference of a word), e.g., the words father, dad, daddy, pop, old man all have the same denotation (i.e. they are synonyms), but they certainly have different emotive meanings. The same can be said about the Ukrainian words батько, тато, таточко, таточку, старий, etc.

Again, the word **home**, apart from its denotation, is associated in our minds with family relations, cosiness and domestic comfort, etc., i.e. it has these connotations. In the combination **feminine** logic, the word **feminine** acquires a slightly pejorative connotation, while separately both feminine and logic are stylistically neutral (cf. feminine helplessness, charm, beauty).

As we see, these additional meanings, or components of the general meaning, may be part of the word's dictionary meaning, i.e. they may be present in the word when it is taken in isolation. They may, on the other hand, be part of the word's contextual meaning, i.e. they may appear as a result of the word's correlation with other words. This distinction, usually spoken of in terms of inherent vs. adherent connotations, is rather significant for translation.

Connotation is one of the keys to the power of words. Once we see that there is a hidden power in the most innocent-looking word, that almost every word has a certain tone, we realize that its rendering into another language can present the greatest difficulties for translation. The translator may or may not realize that there is a certain connotation in this or that word, or he may not find an adequate way of rendering it.

As for the recognition of connotations, there is a case when emotional overtones find linguistic expression. For instance, nearly all Ukrainian nouns have diminutive forms. Often this has nothing to do with size rather with the affectionate feelings of the speaker. The diminutive suffix is capable of transforming even a vulgar word into a term of endearment.

Obviously if we were to translate both Ukrainian words into English, where no parallel diminutive forms exist, we would have to find other means to render their emotive meanings and stylistic reference which is not a very easy thing to do as can be seen from the following:

Як повисмикував він з сирої землі оту **морковочку,** повисмикуй йому, царице милосердна і повикручуй йому **ручечки і ніжечки,** поламай йому , свята владичице, **пальчики й суставчики.**.

This SL sentence shows a very emotional utterance of one of the novel's .protagonist. The translator uses descriptive translation adding adjective **"little"** to the nouns – hands and feet; fingers and joints. When translating the noun **"морковочка"** the translator omits this diminutive affectionate suffix, thus lowering the stylistic register.

The diminutive form embraces different connotations. It conveys the connotation of contempt which is obvious to any Ukrainian, irrespective of whether the word is taken separately or in context:

Це Варін **женишенько.**

... he's Varya's **fiancé.**(Translated by C.Garnett).

That's Varya's **suitor.** (Translated by Ch.Daniels and G.R.Noyes)

...he's Varian's **precious fiancé.** (Translated by E.Fen)

he' s Varya's **young nazi.** (Translated by A.Dunnigan)

It is clear that only E.Fen's translation bears nearly the same connotation as the original. Connotative potentialities of different suffixes are extremely wide.

А що,**Тихонцю?**

What's the matter, **my dear Tikhin?**

Де це ти, **мій мірошничку**, та забарився?

Why**, my dear miller,** where have you been all this time?

To render diminutive affectionate suffixes the translators use a number of adjectives such as: **little, small, dear, dearest, sweet, young** , etc.

Лук' яну, братику, чого ж ти мовчиш?

Lukian, my dear little brother, why have you kept your mouth shut about it?

The original sentence shows very tender, kind attitude of one brother to the other expressed by the Ukrainian suffix. To render it in the translation the translator uses three lexemes – **my, dear, little**, which enable him to convey the connotative effect of the source sentence. He uses a descriptive translation.

As the English language, being an analytical one, does not have such a great variety of suffixes as Ukrainian, being a synthetic one, the translator has to make up for it by other means, first of all, by lexical means.

Доню, а се що ти кажеш – скрикнув він.

What are you saying, **my daughter,** cried he.

In this example a descriptive translation is used to render parents' caressing address to their child. The diminutive affectionate suffix is conveyed by means of a word combination – a noun with the possessive pronoun "my", being a widely spread translation method for a form of address.

The diminutive affectionate suffixes can be rendered in the following ways: by means of the descriptive translation, functional analogue, omission and transcription.

The suffixes of the so-called subjective evaluation (cf. очі, оченьки, очиська) add a specific emotional colouring to speech by reflecting the speaker's perception of reality. The use of various suffixes is a powerful device of characterization, e.g. bringing out someone's social and individual features, revealing his or her humbleness, humility, shyness, etc.

In order to produce the same or nearly the same effect upon the foreign reader the translator has to find emotive words or words of striking stylistic reference. In other words, to achieve adequacy in style the translator is obliged to make certain changes. Having analyzed the emotive component of meaning, realized in language with the help of suffixes, we can now proceed to a discussion of those emotive meanings which have no specific linguistic expression. The overtone of stylistic reference is present in the word in addition to its denotative meaning.

She was **beautiful,** too.

А ще вона була **дуже красивою.**

You look like you feel **awful.**

У тебе такий вигляд, наче ти **погано** почуваєшься.

The translator conveys the connotation of the word "beautiful", even intensifying it in translation at the expense of the intensifier "дуже," by choosing one of the dictionary correspondences – "красива". But in some cases, none of the dictionary correlations fits in the context and the translator has to create an appropriate contextual correlation, which is shown in the example below.

Connotation of the word is conveyed by means of the contextual substitution, but the "evaluating register" is lowered by the translator.

In rare cases, the translator omits the connotatively charged word in translation either when it is redundant or he/ she takes this decision under the pressure of his / her own associations. The technique of omission is not the best choice but translators use it, thus demonstrating a degree of subjectivism in reaching a final decision.

I realized why so many **gifted and talented** high school kids in five boroughs had been knocking themselves senseless to get into this place.

Я зрозумів, чому так багато **талановитих** учнів із шкіл п'яти районів Нью-Йорка ладні були луснути від перенапруження, аби тільки сюди потрапити.

The English words **gifted and talented** are synonymous in English and the literal translation into Ukrainian would be unnatural and would not correspond to the stylistic norms of the TL. The translator makes the right translation decision by omitting one of these words, it being redundant.

The next illustration shows a certain degree of subjectivism on the part of the translator when he simply avoids rendering the connotatively charged adjective **friendly.**

I was being ushered into the back seat as the suitcase was hoisted into the trunk, and Goldie was slapping the roof, the **friendly** way he did.

Він уже запхав мене на заднє сидіння автомобіля, а валізу поклав до багажника, з виляском закривши кришку **за своїм звичаєм.**

There are even words of purely emotive character, such as interjections or forms of address (e.g на жаль! до! dear me! ouch!). The connotations of other words are not always easily recognizable. Sometimes dictionaries give hints as to their emotive values, labeling them as poetic, vulgar, colloquial, pedantic, slang, etc. We are given certain pointers as to the emotive meaning of a word, but the terms are very vague -compilers of dictionaries seem to have no objective, definable criteria for labeling. Indeed, almost the only way in which emotive meanings can be properly determined is through contexts, linguistic or extralinguistic.

So, we may conclude that in the process of re-creation of a literary work a certain sacrifice in the sphere of denotation, some loss or change of denotative meaning is permissible. It is very often compensated for by introducing an emotive word or finding an equivalent in a word with a vivid stylistic colouring. If an author uses a word both for its explicit meaning and for its additional overtones and associations, it is for the translator to decide what to sacrifice and what to preserve in translation, as long as his basic criterion is the author’s intention. In other words, where a certain loss is inevitable, the translator should strive to observe the principle of stylistic compensation in order to bring out the author’s intention and individuality more precisely.

14. NON – EQUIVALENT LEXIS. REALIA. WAYS OF THEIR TRANSFER

The history of every language gives evidence of constant changes of vocabulary according to rapid modifications of the life of society.

Distinctions between languages provided by cultural differences are noticeable in vocabulary because the nominative means of language are linked directly with extra linguistic reality. There are some words in any language which don't have equivalents in other languages. This is so-called **non-equivalent lexis**, particularly lexical units denoting specific notions of local culture. In the language vocabulary of any nation there are some words with specific national-cultural meaning which reflect referents peculiar to only one particular nation and missing in the compared language. For example, names of meals of national cuisine (борщ, квас); national clothes (вишиванка), They reflect typical reality of a certain country, certain nation and certain culture. Accordingly, their lexical notions have national-cultural specificity.

On this basis, words which have no notional correspondence in the other language can be accepted as **non-equivalent vocabulary.**

Realia are the words or word combinations, naming the objects peculiar to the life (culture, social and historic development, every day life) of one people and alien to the other. Realia belong to the vocabulary layer named **non-equivalent lexis.**

A translator is confronted with quite a number of problems in transfer of realia, as the Target language , in most cases, doesn't have objects to designate them. Besides, he should convey not only their semantics, but also their connotation, i. e. national and historic colouring.

Being the source of discrepancies between the two languages, realia attract attention of many linguists and are the object of their research (S. Vlahov & S. Florin, V. Vinogradov, A. Fedorov, I. Oleksieva, L. Barhudarov, etc.)

There are different classifications of realia, which are based on various principles.

Vinogradov V. suggests singling out all realia according to the thematic principle, which include the following types:

1) Every day realia;
2) Ethnographic and mythological realia (every day life, labour);
3) Natural world realia (plants, birds,etc.)
4) Political system and social life realia;
5) Onomastic realia – anthroponyms and toponyms;
6) Associative realia.

These groups are quite representative and fall into more detailed subgroups.

Olexieva’s classification is similar to S.Vlahov & S.Florin’s classification, which encompasses:

1) Geographic realia;
2) Ethnographic realia;
3) Socio-political realia.

Besides ascribing words or word combinations to a particular type of realia,

scholars also investigated and described their translation methodology.

The range of classifications as to the ways of transfer of realia in the TL is rather wide. They have a lot in common, but along with it, each classification has its own peculiarities. For instance, S. Vlahov & S. Florin propose the following translation ways:

1) Introduction of the neologism (calque, semi-calque, semantic neologism);
2) Approximate translation (hyper-hyponymous replacement, functional analogue, description);
3) Contextual translation/zero translation.

L. Latishev and V. Provotorov suggest using such a translation method as elimination of national-cultural specificity. It presupposes the loss of the realia coloring, which, in our opinion, is not an efficient device.

T. Kazakova's classification includes:

1) transcription / transliteration;

2) calquing;

3) semantic modification:

a) narrowing (widening) of the realia initial meaning;

b) functional replacement;

4) description/ commentary, translator's commentary;

5) combined translation.

Such a variety of translation methods gives an opportunity to the translator to choose among the many the one which is the most appropriate for this act of communication. Besides rendering the denotation of the realia, the translator has to convey their national and cultural "essence". The leading role of the translator in this process is indisputable.

The illustration of translation decisions concerning different types of realia and involving different ways of their transfer in the TL will be given below:

Transcription/transliteration usually has high frequency for transportation of onomastic realia.

Transcription of realia is an accurate transfer of sounds of the corresponding unit and transliteration is an exact transfer of the letters of the unit in the TL. The translator should strive for the maximum approximation to the original phonemic/ graphic forms. Transcription/transliteration is mainly used when the onomastic realia is known to everybody. When it's known only to a limited number of people (for ex., to people living in this area), this translation technique is not sufficient and the translator resorts, in addition, to some other way of translation, which results in combined translation.

Темза – **the Thames**;

Буг – **the Bug river**.

Посланці з **Корчина й Тустаня** говорили…

The messengers from **Korchin and Tustan** said…

Сумно і непривітно тепер у нашій **Тухольщині.**

Sad and unfriendly now is our **Tukhlia countryside.**

The translator uses the words **river, countryside** to specify these geographic names, to give a hint to the recepients what they mean. The translator may use descriptive translation, functional analogue and other means to convey onomastic realia. In the example below, the translator uses, besides transcription, also a functional analogue.

Підгірські ж **громади** стоять у зв'язках з дальшими, **покутськими** та **подільскими.**

The Pidhirya settlements are associated with further **settlements** in **the Pokuttya** and **Podillya.**

The word **settlement** is the functional analogue of the word **громада.** The English word **settlement** means a place where people live, whereas **громада** denotes people who live in a definite place.

Functional Analogue

A functional analogue is used to render a SL realia by means of a TL approximate correspondence. This correspondence has a similar meaning, but it is not identical to the SL unit. This translation technique is mainly used for the transfer of everyday realia:

Сіл і **присілків** більше, **хат** по селах більше, але зате по хатах убожества більше і нужди більше.

There were more villages and **hamlets**, more **cottages**, but at the same time there was greater poverty and misery among them.

The English realia **"хата"** is conveyed by means of the functional analogue **"cottage"**, which in English means a small village building. There is some similarity between them, but no identity. The same concerns **"присілки" and "hamlets".**

Ось мого батька **двір**, – сказав Максим, показуючи на один **двір**, нічим не відмінний від інших.

Here is my father's **homestead**, said Maxim, pointing toward **a dwelling** that in no way differed from the others.

Двір" is rendered by means of different functional analogues in English – **homestead, dwelling.** The first is used to designate a farm or just a place to live in. The second means a place where a man lives. They are close in meaning, but not identical.

Сіни – hallway, hall;

Світлиця – chamber.

The Ukrainian **”сіни”** is a small place, mainly without light, which leads to other rooms. The English **”hall”, “hallway”** is a spacious place in private buildings. **“Світлиця”** is a living room in a house. **“Chamber”** is a spacious room in a house used for official meetings and official ceremonies. Here again, the SL lexeme and TL have something in common, but there are some differences.

So, we may conclude that a functional analogue designates a similar notion with the SL realia, but not identical. A SL unit and a TL unit have their own peculiarities. A functional analogue is mainly used to render everyday realia, social life realia and historic realia.

Combined Translation

Combined translation is used to transfer a SL realia by means of a TL one by combining several translation techniques. This combination may include: transcription, a specifying word, translator’s commentary with footnotes and even literal translation.

Правда, і **Стрий, і Опір** однаково миють її ріністі, зелені узбережжя.

True, **the Striy** and **the Opir rivers** continue to wash its gravelly and verdant rivers.

Notes: **The Opir** and **the Striy** – tributaries of the Dniester river crossing Carpethian northern slopes.

This onomastic (geographic) realia is rendered by means of the combined translation. It includes transcription, specifying word and translator’s commentary with footnotes.

Що давно тихо тут було, не чути ніякого голосу, крім вівчарської **трембіти** десь на далекій полонині.

Where long ago silence reigned, no voice was heard, except perhaps the call of the shepherd’**trembita** on some far-off meadow.

Notes: **trembita** – mountain horn-a-folk wind instrument of Ukrainian mountaineers in the form of long wooden horn two or three metres long.

The Ukrainian everyday realia **‘‘трембіта”**, which designates Ukrainian folk musical instrument, is transferred by means of transcription. In its turn, transcription is accompanied by the translator’s commentary with notes.

So, a combined translation encompasses such ways of translation as: transcription and translator’s commentary; transcription, specifying word and translator’s commentary. All of them are used to render onomastic realia, everyday life realia and social life realia in the English translation.

Hypo-hyperonymic Translation

The realia of the Ukrainian reality can be also transported with the help of hypo-hyperonymic translation in the TL (English). For example:

Хата – house;

Світлиця – room.

The two given above everyday realia are rendered in the English translation by means of generic concepts **“house”, “room”.** In English these notions are wider (generic) in comparison with narrower (species) concepts than in the SL. Realia **”хата” & “світлиця”** can be translated with the help of a hypo-hyperonymic translation or a functional analogue. Many scholars refer these two ways of translation to certain types of an approximate translation.

Та й то знали його не лише як чудового лікаряб що лічить рани і всякі болісті, але й не менше як чудового **бесідника** та порадника.

And he was known not only as an excellent healer, who cured wounds and other ills, but as an excellent **orator** and adviser.

The realia **“бесідник”** is conveyed by means of the generic notion **“orator”**, which means “any speaking person”.

Низькі, підсадкуваті їх постави, повбирані в овечі **кожухи.**

Their short, thickest figures in sheepskin **coats.**

The Ukrainian realia **“кожух“** is transferred by means of the English **“coat”**, which ia a generic concept in relation to a species concept **“кожух“.** The English lexeme may designate any kind of outerwear, while the Ukrainian one means a type of warm winter clothing made from sheepskin wool.

The usage of hypo-hyperonymic translation is a possible means of a SL realia transfer, but its wide usage isn't desirable as there can be some loss of the SL realia "specificity", being rendered in translation by a word with a much wider meaning.

Descriptive Translation

A descriptive translation involves conveying a SL realia meaning by means of a word combination or even a sentence.

Волар – Ox driver;

Рубач – Wood cutter;

Топірник – Axeman;

Трач – Sawmill worker.

These examples illustrate usage of descriptive translation for designating the names of labour types characteristic of the past. These realia can be attributed to historical realia.

Тухольські **пасемці** й собі готовились, гострячи ножі та тесаки, обуваючи міцні жуброві **постоли** і складаючи в невеличкі дорожні **бисаги** печене м'ясо, **паляниці**, сир і все, що могло понадобитися в цілоденній трудній переправі (9).

The Tukhlia **lads** were also getting ready, sharpening their knives and axes, pulling on their strong, animals-hide **footwear** and filling their **knapsacks** with roasted meat, **flat bread**, cheese and all else that would come in handy during the difficult all-day journey .

In this translation everyday realia (**паляниці – flat bread; постоли – footwear**) are rendered by means of a descriptive translation and (**бисаги – knapsacks**) – with the help of a functional analogue.

Descriptive translation is mainly used for transfer of everyday realia that nominate types of labour and workers; types of clothing and food. It is also used to convey social life realia.

The analysis of different translations of Ukrainian fiction texts shows that the way of rendering SL realia in the TL is very much dependent on the translator's personality, his/ her vision of the whole text situation, his experience and even creativity.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Алексеева И. С. Веление в переводоведение: учебное пособие. М: Академия, 2004.352 с. Режим доступа: https://www.academia.edu

2. Алимов В. В. Теория перевода: пособие для лингвистов-переводчиков. М.: Ленанд, 2015. 240 с. Режим доступа: https://www.twirpx.com

3. Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод. М.: Международные отношения, 1975. 240 с. Режим доступа: https://superlinguist.ru

4. Гарбовский Н. К. Теория перевода. Учебник. М. Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 2004. 544 с. Режим доступа: https://studfile.net

5. Зорівчак Р. П. Реалія і переклад. Львів: Вид-во Львів, ун-ту, 1989. 215с. Режим доступу: https://r2u.org.ua

6. Карабан В. І., Мейс Дж. Переклад з української мови на англійську. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003. 608 с. Режим доступу: https://chtyvo.org.ua

7. Карабан В. І. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2004. 576 с. Режим доступу: https://www.twirpx.com

8. Комиссаров В. Н. Современное переводоведение. М.: ЭТС, 2002. 424с. Режим доступа: https://antigtu.ru

9. Корунець І. В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2003. 448 с. Режим доступу: https:// r2u.org.ua

10. Коптілов В. Теорія і практика перекладу: Навчальний посібник. К.: Юніверс, 2002. 280 с. Режим доступу: https://www.twirpx.com

11. Мірам Г.Є. Алгоритм перекладу (англійською мовою). Київ: Твим-інтер, 1998.

12. Пиввуева Ю. В., Двойнина Е. В. Пособие по теории перевода (на английском материале). М.: Филоматис, 2004. 304 с. Режим доступа: https://www.twirpx.com

13. Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. М.: Валент, 2009. 240 с. Режим доступа:

https://superlinguist.ru Bell R. Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice. London S/ New York: Longman, 1991. 298 p. Режим доступу: www. academia. edu.

14. Bullow-Moller A. The View from the Bridge. Text analysis for translators and other communicators. Samfundslitteratur, 1994.128 p.

15. Kelly N.& Zetzsche J. Found in Translation. New York: A Perigee Book, 2015. 272 p.

16. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. London: Longman, 2006. 292 p. Режим доступу: www.longman.com

17. Nolan J. Interpretation. Techniques and Exercises. Multilingual Matters LTD. Bristol. Buffalo. Toronto, 2005. 320 p.

Навчальне видання

ЯРОВЕНКО Людмила Степанівна

ТЕОРІЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Методичний посібник

Підп. до друку 22.07.2021. Формат 60х90/16. Папір офсетний.
Гарн. «Times» Друк цифровий. Ум. друк. арк. 5.1.
Наклад 100 пр.
Видавець Букаєв Вадим Вікторович
вул. Пантелеймонівська 34, м. Одеса, 65012.
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 2783 від 02.03.2007 р.
Тел. 0949464393, 0487431393, 0941259868, email – *7431393@gmail.com*