МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Наталія ЄМЕЦЬ

Переклад як особливий вид комунікації

посібник з перекладознавства
для студентів першого курсу
(бакалаврського рівня)
факультету германської філології і перекладу

Київ
Видавничий центр КНЛУ
2025

УДК 811.111’25(075.8)

Є 60

Друкується за рішенням вченої ради
Киїівського національного лінгвістчнго університету
(протокол №16 від 28 квітня 2025 рноку)

Укладач:

Ємець Н. О. канд. філол. наук, доцент кафедри фонетики і практики англійської мови.

Рецензенти:

Львова Н. Л. канд. філол. наук, доцент, доцент кафедри фонетики і практики англійської мови Київського національного лінгвістичного університету;

Цапро Г. Ю. канд. філол. наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри англійської мови та комунікації Київського столичного університету імені Бориса Грінченка;

Пожар А. Б. канд. філол. наук, доцент, доцент кафедри іноземних мов навчально-наукового інституту права Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка;

Марк Браун учитель англійської мови Fitzalan High School, Кардіфф, Уельс.

ISBN 978-966-638-418-1 (online)

Є 60 Ємець Н. О.

Translation as a unique kind of communication / Переклад як особливий вид комунікації. Навч. посібник. – К.: Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2025. – 70 с.

Посібник розроблено для студентів першого курсу до вибіркової дисципліни «Переклад як особливий вид комунікації». У посібнику висвітлюються основні питання перекладознавста у комунікативному ракурсі, Теоретичний матеріал подається відповідно до робочої програми курсу, підкріплюється питаннями для самоконтролю та оригінальними статтями.

ISBN 978-966-638-418-1 (online**)**

Contents

Topic 1. Translation studies as an interdisciplinary branch of science

Translation studies is an interdisciplinary field that examines the theory, practice, and implications of translating written texts from one language to another. Since translation is considered today as a complex phenomenon with linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and technological dimensions, which makes it a rich and dynamic field of research, modern translation studies draw on a variety of disciplines, at the intersection of literary theory, linguistics, cognitive studies, cultural studies, anthropology, pragmatic studies, semiotics, psychology, and technology.

1.1. Interface of translation studies and literary studies.

Literary theory provides valuable insights into the interpretation, analysis, and representation of texts, which are essential aspects of translation. The relationship between translation studies and literary theory is symbiotic, with each field informing and enriching the other. Shedding light on the creative and interpretative processes involved in translating, literary theory helps translators navigate the complexities of conveying meaning and style across languages, as well as the aesthetic qualities, narrative structures, and thematic concerns of literary texts. Translators may employ literary theories to address challenges such as wordplay, cultural references, idiomatic expressions, and poetic and stylistic devices, ensuring that the target text captures the essence of the original work. Literary theory offers various frameworks for interpreting texts, such as structuralism, post-structuralism, psychoanalysis, feminism, postcolonialism, and more. Translators often draw on these theories to analyze the source text (ST) and make informed decisions about how to convey its meaning, style, and cultural nuances in the target text (TT).

Conversely, translation studies contribute to literary theory by raising questions about the nature of texts, authorship, readership, and the dynamics of cultural exchange. Translation is not merely a mechanical process of transferring words from one language to another but a complex act of interpretation and recreation. By examining translated texts and the practices of translators, literary theorists gain insights into the multilayered nature of literary works and the ways in which they are mediated across languages and cultures.

Defining the essence of literary theory of translation, C.W. Orr compares translation to painting: "An artist does not reproduce every detail of the landscape – he emphasizes what seems best to him. Likewise, a translator seeks embodiment in their own version of the spirit, not just the letters of the original." Depending on whether the translator considers language form or artistic result of its usage as primary, they may take different approaches to determining which components of a literary text should be considered translationally relevant. The role of language in literary translation fully corresponds to its role in literary creation.

In simplified form, the main trends of literary translation include: (a) Shifting the focus from the original to the translated text (foreignization strategy); (в) Understanding the literary text as a complex structural unity of interacting elements subordinate to a concept-idea; (c) Transition from viewing the text as a

linguistic unit to considering the function of translation as part of linguistic culture; (d) Semantic consistency and proportionality at the level of structural analogy between the source and target texts, rather than equivalence at the lexical or syntactic level, if by the structure of the literary text we understand a special type of relationship between form and content. In this case, the structural levels themselves may undergo deformation as long as the principle of their relationship is maintained; (e) Taking into account extratextual series, including socio-cultural contexts, literary norms, traditions, and representations.

Juliane House proposes a nomenclature of elements subject to harmonization in literary translation, which includes: (a) Structural characteristics, expressive potential, and limitations imposed by two language systems on the translation process; (b) Characteristics of extralinguistic reality, differently formatted by the source and target languages; (c) Linguistic-stylistic and aesthetic characteristics of the source text in relation to norms relevant to the linguo-cultural community of the source language country; (d) Linguistic-stylistic and aesthetic norms characteristic of the receiving linguo-cultural community; (e) Intertextuality governing the integrity of the source text; (f) Traditions, principles, history, and ideology of translation characteristic of the receiving culture; (g) The translator's inherent sum of knowledge and skills, as well as their ethical position and personally developed "individual" theory of translation (House 2015, 2–3).

The primary quality of a literary translator should lie in their ability to recreate the form and effects as accurately as possible, to hear and convey the author's voice, all their intonations, as well as all their ambiguities. A literary text is a special texture, bound by a common coherence, reflecting, on one hand, the author's intent, and on the other hand, the conceptual world-picture of the target language in which the text is written, and which embodies a unique vision of the world, sealed in its grammar and lexicon of the text, particularly in concepts of time and space, life and death, etc. Illustrative in this regard is Pierre Klossowski's translation of the "Aeneid," in which he aimed to convey Virgil's Latin in French translation, creating an epic fresco through it. As a result, the more Virgil's Latin is conveyed in this translation of the "Aeneid," the less audible is the original voice of the poet, which is effectively annihilated in favor of the supremacy of the Latin language in a different cultural environment.

Speaking about the translation of literary works, Goethe in his "West–Eastern Divan" outlined three types of translation: the first, initially aimed at conveying the foreign in our own understanding, i.e., a translation close to adaptation; the next, more complex, attempts to assimilate the foreign spirit by transferring it to our own mind. Then the third type is to make the translation identical to the original.

1.2. Interface of Translation Studies and Cognitive Studies

The interface between translation studies and cognitive research has led to the emergence of cognitive translation studies – a field of research whose main goal is the "modeling of cognitive processes in translation", relying on concepts and theoretical foundations of cognitive science, psycholinguistics, and neurolinguistics. In Europe, the most well-known schools of cognitive translation

studies were "Translation Science," created by scholars from Leipzig University, and "Interpretive Theory of Translation," developed by scholars from today's University of Paris "New Sorbonne". Influenced by Chomsky's generative linguistics, Leipzig scholars were developing a grammar of translation, formalizing transfer rules for switching language codes (Muñoz & Martín, 2020). However, thanks to the works of Eugene Nida (1964) and Jäger (1975), it was demonstrated that the correspondence between text fragments does not necessarily have to be formal, and that the concept of equivalence is not sufficient or adequate for describing translation as a cognitive process. The focus shifts from texts to translators, with the development of a three-stage model of translation, including comprehension, reformulation, and production. The intermediate stage of reformulation is carried out, according to scholars' assumptions (Danica Seleskovitch), "in the black box," where the meaning is deverbialized.

From the beginning to the mid-1990s, several cognitive models of translation emerged, such as those by Neubert (1994), Wilss (1996), and Bell (1991), who, drawing on constructs and concepts from psycholinguistics and artificial intelligence, integrated notions from generative linguistics – such as sequential syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic processing – with psychological constructs related to the description of short-term and long-term memory (p. 44) to develop a model of the translation process consisting of two stages: analysis and synthesis. Today, a connection has been established between the translator's memory capacity and the quality of translation in terms of speed and accuracy. Gutt (1991) developed a translation model based on Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986). He suggested that context consists of a set of premises / presuppositions; that thoughts are mental representations in propositional form; and that this meaning can be quantified and computed in terms of the sum of implicatures and explicatures, among other factors.

Other focuses of cognitive translation studies include neurobiological aspects of interpretation, "process research" as opposed to "product research," adherence to empiricism, computer-assisted translation studies, attention and cognitive control, acquisition and development of translation skills, stress and emotion management, and multimodality. For oral translation, a cognitive effort model was proposed by Gile (1995). Drawing on the concept of cognitive psychology regarding limited information processing capacities, Gile developed a triple effort model (listening, reproduction, and short-term memory) for simultaneous translation, aiming to help translators understand "translation difficulties and select appropriate strategies and tactics."

1.3. Translation studies and semiotics

Translation studies and semiotics are interconnected fields that offer complementary perspectives on how signs function and are interpreted in various cultural contexts. In this context, translation is studied as the process of transferring signs from one linguistic and cultural system to another. Translators often use semiotic theories to analyze the meaning of texts and make informed decisions about how to convey this meaning in the target language.

One of the key concepts in semiotics relevant to translation studies is the idea of sign equivalence. Translators must consider not only the literal meaning of words but also the cultural and symbolic associations that may vary depending on the language. This implies understanding how signs operate in the corresponding cultural context and seeking appropriate equivalents that convey the same meaning and effect in the target language. Furthermore, semiotics helps translators cope with the complexities of translation by providing a basis for analyzing different types of signs, such as linguistic signs (words and phrases), visual signs (images and symbols), and cultural signs (customs and rituals). By understanding how signs interact and convey meaning, translators can better interpret and convey the intended message of the source text.

1.4. Interface of Translation Studies and Psychology

Psychology delves into the cognitive processes involved in translation, examining factors such as perception, memory, and decision-making, which influence translator behavior and performance. Yaeskelainen (2012) asserts that "most phenomena related to translation have a psychological aspect." The interface between psychology and translation studies has led to the emergence of a field known as translation psychology or psycho-translation. Translation psychology encompasses not only translational thinking but also emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and social factors that influence translators in the translation process, as well as the social interaction of translators and readers' reactions to translated products (specifically, studies of perception).

Four approaches to translation psychology are distinguished: cognitive, social, gestalt, and embodied (embodied cognition). Among the issues studied by translation psychology is the connection between the translation process and thinking aloud. By comparing experiment participants who translate silently and those who think aloud, researchers have concluded that thinking aloud significantly negatively impacts the duration of translation but does not affect the quality of translation of complex texts.

The interface between translation studies and psycholinguistics is evident in the study of "translator" bilingualism, focusing on the psycholinguistic resources of translators in language use – their attitudes, motivations, and strategies, which occupy a central place in the context of translation activities. The importance of psycholinguistic mechanisms in the language use of bilingual translators is explained by the fact that proficiency in multiple languages requires a fundamental reorganization not only of the entire linguistic system but also of the mechanisms controlling language use. From psycholinguistic perspectives, code-switching, prompted by psycholinguistic factors, is also examined. For example, code-switching may be initiated by trigger words – words at the intersection of two linguistic systems, which as a result, may cause the speaker to lose linguistic orientation / mix languages and continue the sentence in another language. Such words include proper names, international and pseudo-international words, among others.

Today, translation psychology is increasingly interested in studying psycho-affective factors such as stress and emotions, for which neurological and physiological methods are used to measure in oral and audiovisual translation (temperature fluctuations, heart rate frequency, heart rate variability, skin conductance, pupil dilation). Psychological and behavioral dimensions of the translation process under time constraints are also being studied, and strategies for managing time constraints are proposed: providing time instructions before task execution, increasing participants' internal motivation, and visualizing elapsed time.

1.5. Interface of Translation Studies and Sociology

The interface between sociology and translation studies represents a field of research that analyzes the social aspects of translation, as well as the interaction between translators, texts, and sociocultural contexts. This interface helps understand how sociological factors influence translation processes and how translation, in turn, shapes and modifies sociocultural realities. Research in this area may include analyzing the role of translation in shaping sociocultural perceptions and identities, studying the social and economic conditions that impact the translation of specific texts and the translation market, as well as analyzing the interaction between different social groups and language communities through translation. Additionally, this interface may investigate the social recognition of translation work, the status of translators in society, and other sociological aspects that influence the field of translation. To analyze the conceptualizations of translators, source text authors, and target text readers, translation studies apply the theory of social representations, offering a comprehensive model for studying the social construction of knowledge by integrating individuals, social groups, and social interactions (Sari Hokkanen). Social representations are formed and adapted through three interconnected processes: sociogenesis (at the level of social groups), ontogenesis (at the level of individuals), and microgenesis (through social interactions).

1.6. Interface of Translation Studies and Anthropology

Anthropology offers perspectives on the social and cultural dimensions of translation, considering how translations shape and are shaped by societies. The contemporary anthropological translation studies are characterized by interest in power issues that affect both translators and editors when choosing topics and editing texts, an increased interest in "otherness" and addressing marginal problems, as well as an interest in minority languages and cultures. One of the distinguishing features of ethnographic approaches to translation studies is the role of the researcher in this process. Ethnographic research methods include participant observation and field interviews, which encourage "a high degree of personal involvement of researchers" (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014). Thus, ethnographic research on translation processes raises some questions about the relationships between researchers and participants – for example, what is the participants' attitude toward researchers. In their article "Situated Knowledge and Ethnographic Research on Translation Processes," Elena Miloshevich and Hannah

Risku illustrate from the perspective of ethnographic translation studies that, although translator participants predominantly perceive researchers as "others," their specific relationship with them varies – for example, considering them as academic authorities, translation consultants, interested scholars, engaged participants, spies, or uninformed students.

1.7. Translation Studies, Pragmatics and Technology

Pragmatic research plays a crucial role in understanding how translation can be adapted to meet the needs of a specific audience. This includes analyzing the target audience, their cultural expectations, preferences, and the context in which the translation will be used. Pragmatic research also helps understand how socio-cultural and pragmatic aspects influence the choice of translation strategies, taking into account issues of communicative misunderstanding in a different cultural and social environment than that of the target text.

Technology, particularly in recent years, has become increasingly important, with the development of translation tools and machine translation systems impacting both the practice and study of translation. In translation studies, there is a growing interest in studying the use of digital tools that enhance productivity, ensure consistency, and handle mundane, repetitive text fragments. At the same time, there is an examination of achieving a certain compromise between using machine translation systems and traditional translation in terms of adequacy and creativity.

Linguistics plays a fundamental role in translation studies by analyzing the structures and systems of language, aiding in understanding the intricacies of source and target languages. **Cultural studies** contribute by exploring the cultural contexts in which texts are produced and received, highlighting the importance of cultural nuances in translation. The interaction of translation studies and linguistics in studied in Topic 6. Linguistic and extralinguistic factors of translation; interface of translation studies and cultural studies is discussed in Topic 3. Culturological and sociological aspects of translation studies.

1.8. Models of translation in view of interdisciplinary connections of translation studies.

The interdisciplinary relationship between translation studies and various fields of knowledge is reflected in existing translation models. For instance, the reliance on linguistics correlates with the text-centric model of translation. This model considers the linguistic features of the source text as the primary object of translation analysis and focuses on identifying all the formal and substantive characteristics of the source text that the translator must consider. In this context, translation analysis focuses on establishing the lexical-semantic and syntactic features of the source text, its conceptual architecture, stylistic and figurative devices, and compositional structure. Moreover, such a model also takes into account the specificity of the author and narrator of the text, its target audience, which relates to the interface between translation studies and literary studies, as well as with functional and communicative models of translation.

The functional model of translation is closely associated with the interface of translation studies and pragmatics. This model was proposed by the German researcher Christiane Nord (Nord, 1991). The main idea of the functional model of translation is the "compatibility between the intention of the source text" and the "function/intention of the target text" (Nord, 1991). Accordingly, if such compatibility cannot be achieved, then translation becomes impossible altogether. In this context, priority is given to the target-text purpose, or in the researcher's terminology, the skopos, over all other determinants of translation, because, according to the researcher, it is the skopos that determines the choice of translation strategies.

The communicative model of translation is based on the interdisciplinary connections of translation studies with fields such as cultural studies, literary theory, anthropology, and psychology. This model involves conducting a translational analysis of the text by drawing on a significant amount of extratextual information, including data about the place (country) of origin of the source text and the culture of this text in its broadest sense (as a collection of texts and other signifying cultural products, united by Yuri Lotman's term "semiotic universe"), about the author, their intentions and motivations, the historical period in which the text was created, the potential recipient with their corresponding expectations and level of perception, relevant socio-cultural realities reproduced by the source text.

Finally, the most contemporary model of textual translational analysis is the discursive model, which incorporates elements of all other models and relies on the interconnection of translation studies with semiotics, pragmatics, anthropology, linguacultural studies, and literary studies. This model focuses on the interrelation of such components as: the author/sender of the original text; its presumed or actual recipient; the translator as an intermediary, performing the transformation of the source text while simultaneously being the recipient of the original text and the sender of the translated text; socio-cultural realities relevant to translational reproduction; the place of the text within the semiospheres of other texts, in which the author, translator, and recipient are immersed (Selivanova, 2012).

1.9. The role of translation in world globalization processes

Translation plays a key role in the processes of globalization, facilitating communication, fostering cultural exchange, and ensuring the flow of information and ideas across linguistic and cultural boundaries. English language, which is now considered the lingua franca of the 21st century, plays a special role in promoting interconnectedness in the globalized world. Translation contributes to globalization in such key aspects:

Communication and Business: Translation enables individuals, businesses, governments, and organizations to communicate effectively in different languages. In the globalized world, where people with different language backgrounds interact regularly, translation eliminates barriers, ensuring smooth communication and understanding. In the global market, where businesses operate across borders, translation facilitates negotiations, contract signings, marketing materials, provides

product information and customer support in multiple languages, allowing companies to reach diverse markets and audiences.

Diplomacy and International Relations: Translation ensures accurate communication between governments, diplomats, and international organizations, promoting cooperation, negotiations, and conflict resolution on the global stage. It provides accessibility to legal documents and agreements for speakers of different languages, empowering individuals and communities to participate in social and political processes.

Cultural Exchange: Globalization entails the exchange of cultural products, ideas, and values across borders, helping to preserve and promote cultural diversity. Translation plays a crucial role in this exchange by making literature, films, music, and other cultural artifacts accessible to people who speak different languages.

Media: Translation provides access to information and news from around the world despite language barriers, promoting awareness and understanding of global issues.

The Role of Translation in the Internationalization of Scientific Knowledge:

Globalization of knowledge is unthinkable without translation. It is translation that enables the transmission of knowledge from the dominant culture to another national culture and vice versa. The importance of scientific translations into English sharply increased with the adoption of the Bologna Declaration, signed in 1999 by the Ministers of Education of 29 European countries. As a consequence of creating a pan-European education space, there was a requirement to publish articles in scientific international journals in English to make research results accessible to the global community. Editors of international publications note that in the field of exact sciences, their work mainly involves editing articles, while in the field of social sciences and humanities, it is often necessary to perform full translations of materials. Such texts are complex to translate because they are more closely linked to national culture and the concepts used often reflect local phenomena, for which it is not easy to find a translation equivalent in the English language. In addition, the original text is usually structured according to rhetorical norms that are foreign to the English language.

On the other hand, with the internationalization of knowledge, there arose the need to translate texts from English into other languages, which significantly influenced the incorporation of anglicisms and structural elements of the source language into local languages. This led to greater syntactic rigor and clarity of scientific language in the global academic space, as well as a pronounced conceptual apparatus and a certain hierarchy in text structuring, in accordance with the norms of the Anglo-Saxon academic system. The translation of scientific texts from English is aimed at the precise conveyance of information, prioritizing the referential function of language. Accordingly, the translation is carried out in accordance with the realistic theory of translation, where the external world should be analyzed and described in absolute terms, regardless of the subjective position or instruments of cognition employed. Translators of scientific texts from English

must adhere to the following rules: sentences should be syntactically simple and not overly long; vocabulary should be specific, with precise translations of definitions; nominalization and non-personal verb forms should be used to remove the subjective observer and to focus on the content.

Points for discussion

1. What is the symbiosis of relationships between translation studies and literary theory?
2. What are the four main focuses in literary translation?
3. What is the nomenclature of elements that need to be harmonized in literary translation?
4. What determines the translator's definition of which components of a literary text should be considered significant for translation?
5. What is the goal of cognitive translation studies?
6. Elaborate on the existing cognitive models of written and oral translation.
7. What is the translation process from a semiotics perspective?
8. Which key concepts of semiotics are relevant to translation studies?
9. What aspects does the psychology of translation include?
10. What are the four approaches to the psychology of translation?
11. How is the bilingualism of a translator studied in the course of psycholinguistics?
12. What are the current research focuses in the field of the psychology of translation?
13. What is the interface between sociology and translation?
14. What is the specificity of the anthropological approach to the study of translation?
15. What constitutes the pragmatics of translation?
16. How do the text-centric, functional, and communicative models of translation reveal the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies?
17. In what key aspects does translation contribute to globalization?
18. Read the extracts from Nida’s article (p. 53) and do the post-reading exercises.

References

Селіванова, О.О. (2012). Проблема моделювання перекладацького процесу. Світ свідомості в мові. Черкаси. 488 с.

Alves, F., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2017). Evolution, challenges, and perspectives for research on cognitive aspects of translation. In J. W. Schwieter & A. Ferreira (Eds.), The handbook of translation and cognition (pp. 537–554). Wiley-Blackwell.

Alves, F. & Jakobsen, A. L. (Eds.). (2020). The Routledge handbook of translation and cognition. Routledge. House J. Translation Quality Assessment. London; New York, 2015.

Bolaños-Medina, A. (2016). Translation psychology within the framework of translator studies: New research perspectives and pedagogical implications. In C.

Martín de León & V. González-Ruiz (Eds.), From the lab to the classroom and back again: Perspectives on translation and interpreting training (pp. 59–100).

Ferreira, A. & Schwieter, J. W. (Eds.). (2015). Psycholinguistic and cognitive inquiries into translation and interpreting. John Benjamins.

House, J. (2014). Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 290 p.

Laukkanen, J. (1996). Affective and Attitudinal Factors in Translation Processes. Target: International journal of translation studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Vol. 8, 257–274.

Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press, 200 p.

Nida, E. (2004). Principles of Correspondence. The Translation Studies Reader. NY: Taylor & Fran-cis Group, 153–167.

Nord, Ch. (1991). Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Method, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis. Translated from the German by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow. Amsterdam/Atlanta GA, Rodopi, 250 p.

Shreve, G. M. (2010). Neural and physiological correlates of translation and interpreting in the bilingual brain: Recent perspectives. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), Translation and cognition (pp. 289–322). John Benjamins.

Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (eds.). (1997). Dictionary of Translation Studies. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. (2006) The Turns of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Topic 2. Methods of Describing the Translation Process

Scientists unanimously define translation as the transfer of the meaning and stylistic features of a statement / text in one language into another, taking into account cultural and regional differences between the source and target languages. Translation is thus interpreted as a specific activity of a translator, a process that results in a text in another language.

In terms of strategies and tactics, translation as a process includes: 1) development of a translation strategy or a program of speech actions for the translator; 2) implementation of the intended program using specific techniques - translation transformations, adaptations, etc. When speaking about the stages of translation as a process, linguists identify three phases within it: a) the phase of comprehension, during which the translator analyzes the original text considering its content, including implicit and subtextual meanings, grammatical, lexical, syntactic, stylistic, connotative, symbolic, and other features; b) the phase of translation itself, which involves reproducing the content of the original text using the means of another language without distorting the meaning, while preserving the compositional structure and sentence order, and considering the context and the characteristics of the audience for which the translation is intended; c) checking the

translation for accuracy and maintaining style, correcting errors, clarifying details and final quality control.

In the first phase, components of pre-translation analysis are used: gathering external information about the text (author, recipient, time of creation and publication, intertextual relations, etc.), the composition of information and its density (compressiveness), thematic relevance of the text, communicative purpose of the source text and translation, target audience, text composition, its genre-stylistic characteristics.

For the translation of literary texts, the phases of the translation process may vary slightly.

Successful translation of a literary text includes three stages of the translator's work with it: a careful reading, the participation and engagement, and "stepping away" from the text. The first step of reading a text carefully involves studying its syntax, vocabulary, metaphors, ambiguities, delving into concepts and poetics, in order to understand what must be preserved and what allows deviations from the original text. Then comes active the participation, engagement with the text, its own interpretation by the translator. In this regard, J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet assert: "The one who translates does so not in order to understand, but in order for others to understand. However, he himself understands before translating".

The next step is to "step away" from the text, exploring the environment and conditions of the work's creation, the non-linguistic contextual factors that are "external" to the text but determine its internal features at different levels of organization. Such factors include cultural conditions, the artistic and stylistic paradigm dominant at the time of writing the source text, the temporal and spatial conditions of its creation, in particular, the temporal gap between the source and translated texts, and others. This "stepping away" stage is necessary to establish the "function of the text in culture," which forms the basis for identifying and isolating elements of the source text that need to be preserved or adapted in translation, and also to avoid imposing overly subjective interpretations of the text on the reader by the translator.

If the first phase of the translation process involves pre-translation analysis, then the second phase, the actual translation, involves choosing a translation variant, which is modeled by various models explaining the essence of the translation process. The task of a model is to describe the sequence of actions that can solve a specific translation task under certain conditions of the translation process and to reveal the linguistic mechanism of translation. Any translation model is hypothetical because there is no direct evidence that a translator uses it specifically; however, the coincidence of the translation result with what is predicted by a certain model indicates its certain efficacy.

The most common models of the translation process at present are: semantic, situational (denotative; formal), transformational, psycholinguistic, communicative, and informative. Each model assumes different types of translation operations carried out within its framework.

The denotative translation model involves referring to the denotative situation described in texts through various means inherent to a particular culture and language. According to this model, translation is defined as the process of describing the situation represented by the original language, using the language of translation, i.e., as the process of replacing the material signs of denotations from one language with signs from another language that correspond to the same denotations. The denotative translation model is used when the choice of translation variant is impossible without referring to the real situation to which the original text refers. In particular, this model is applied when translating non-equivalent lexicon, where the choice of translation variant is unambiguously determined by the situation described in the original, and when additional aspects of the described situation need to be clarified for a correct understanding and, consequently, translation of the original. The translator compensates for the absence of equivalents through comments, footnotes, annotations, or direct borrowings.

The semantic model addresses the substantive components of the source text, using a componential analysis of its units, highlighting denotative and connotative semes, including stylistic, pragmatic, and evaluative semes. Within this model, the meaning of any language unit is represented as a set of more elementary senses – semes, identified through componential analysis. Subsequently, equivalent or similar units in terms of content (componential composition) are selected in the language of translation for these semes. In this approach, the translation process operates not so much at the level of words and sentences but at the level of elementary semantic components. The higher the degree of coincidence of such elementary meanings in the original language and translation, the more adequate the translation. For example, the word "dog" contains the most generalizing sememe (archiseme) "animal," integrative semes that unite the denoted with such subclasses as mammals, domestic animals, carnivores, and a differential seme distinguishing a dog from other components of the subclasses. In addition, the meaning of the word includes connotative semes such as "human's friend," "protector," and others. Depending on the context and the translator's tasks, in the target text, words including more general semes (archisemes and integrative semes) can replace the word "dog," and then the translator applies a transformation of generalization of meanings or, conversely, generalized semes can be replaced with more specific ones, leading to a transformation of specification. Transformations of differentiation of meanings are the result of choosing a synonymous pair for the word in the source text, provided that both words have a common integrative seme. For example, the verbs “hurried”, “hurried” can be conveyed in the Ukrainian language by the lexemes “біжав”, “летіл”, “мчав” (з усіх ніг), etc. based on the presence in the words of the source and target text of the integrative seme “high-speed movement in space”.

Let's consider some examples:

This evil animal bites me all the time. – Мене весь час кусає цей злий собака. (Specification with replacement of archiseme by a differential seme);

This evil pet keeps biting me. – Ця клята собака продовжує мене кусати. (Specification with replacement of integrative seme by a differential seme);

This angry dog bites me all the time. – Ця клята домашня тварина мене весь час кусає. (Generalization with replacement of differential seme by an integrative one with additional ironic connotations);

the children felt as if they had left their insides behind them – ... дівчата відчули, що у шлунках замлоїло;

He was feeling very sick. – Його жахливо нудило (Lewis, The Chronicles of Narnia).

In the examples provided, integrative semes are replaced by differential ones, hypernyms (generic concepts) are replaced by hyponyms (specific concepts). The general concept "children" – діти – was specified because the translator identified and emphasized that among the children there were only girls. Poor health, denoted by the word "sick," is specified by the type of illness - "нудило" (a colloquial term for feeling nauseous). In addition to this, there is a specification of the seme indicating the intensification of the attribute – with the replacement of "very" by "жахливо" (awfully), resulting in the appearance of a connotative sememe in the target utterance.

He felt tired. – Він почувався смертельно зморений.

In this case, due to the transformation of adding the unit "смертельно" (deadly) in the translation, a contextual connotative seme appears, indicating the maximum intensification of the state with a negative connotation.

Example of generalization:

He is 6 feet 2 inches tall. – Він високого росту (Lexemes denoting specific height parameters are replaced by a generalizing word with the seme "високий" (tall).

The informative translation model, unlike the semantic model, does not consider the importance of elementary semantic components in translation. Instead, this model takes into account various types of information – denotative, connotative, sociocultural, genre-stylistic, pragmatic, and encyclopedic – conveyed by the original text and which the translator must decode for the optimal perception of information by the translation recipient.

The transformational translation model is based on interlingual transformations of minimal core deep structures – restructuring of syntactic sentence patterns, and their transformations considering constraints in languages. The transformational model breaks down the translation process into three stages:

1) Analysis of the original syntactic structures and meanings of lexical units within the source language.

2) Transfer, i.e., transition to core structures and semantic components of the target language.

3) Restructuring, or carrying out transformations on the target language from the core level to final, surface structures and units of the original.

In core structures, unlike surface ones (transforms), semantic relationships are always expressed clearly: the subject is always denoted by a noun, and the action –

by a verb; the subject is always the agent, and the object – the complement. For example, the sentence "John hit Bill" as a core structure can be transformed into transforms that share significant content plan similarity: "Bill was hit by John", "John's hitting Bill", "Bill's being hit by John", and so on. Any of these structures can be used by the translator in the target text considering the context and stylistic features of the text.

This model justifies the use of grammatical-syntactic translation transformations – transpositions, modulations, restructuring of sentences with translation of active voice into passive, impersonal sentences, and vice versa, among others.

The psycholinguistic model of translation utilizes principles from psycholinguistics about the structure of speech activity to model the translation process. According to the purpose of the speech act, an internal program of the future message is formed by the speaker, which is then unfolded into a speech utterance. This process consists of the following stages: (1) a motive arises, prompting action; (2) a goal appears, which the individual seeks to achieve to satisfy the motive through the speech production; (3) an internal program of the future utterance is created; (4) the utterance is formed in internal speech; (5) the verbalization of the utterance occurs in oral or written speech.

The process of translation goes through the same stages, but with one significant difference: the translator's internal program is not generated by them but constitutes a condensed content of the original. The translation process involves two stages – "translation" from the original language to internal code and "translation" from internal code to the target language. In the first stage, the translator transforms ("translates") the meaningful content of the original into their internal program (the intent of the utterance); in the second stage, the translator unfolds this program into the translation text in another language.

The intermediary language translation model is based on the concept of an intermediate space existing between two languages. The intermediary language contains a set of standard features that cannot be fully represented in either the source or target languages but are partially present in each of the two languages.

For example, in the equivalent sentences "I have arrived" and "Я прийшла," the set of features includes: 1) the speaker; 2) feminine gender; 3) arrival; 4) on foot; 5) preceding; 6) relevant now; 7) completed. The English construction uses features 1, 3, 5, and 6, while the Ukrainian one uses features 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7.

This translation model relies on the universalist theory of denotative commonality in the thinking of all peoples, the universal object-image code of humanity.

Various characteristics of translation as a process define the existing typologies of translations in translation studies. Jean Delisle identifies eight classes of translations based on four different characteristics:

(a) Based on the function of the source text: Pragmatic translation – predominantly informative text; Literary translation – translation of a text in which expressive and aesthetic functions prevail; (b) Depending on the degree of

specialization of the source text: General translation - does not require specialized knowledge; Specialized translation - requires such knowledge; (c) According to the overall purpose of the translation: Academic translation – aimed at acquiring the language of the translator; Professional translation; (d) Based on the translation approach used in creating the target text: Transcoding – leading to word equivalency; Transduction or proper translation, producing equivalency of the entire message/text (Delisle, 1980).

Newmark, in accordance with the function of the source text, distinguishes between the translation of expressive text, which focuses on the author and their style, the translation of informative text, which emphasizes the content, and the translation of vocative text, where the main attention is given to the reader (1981: 12-15; 1989: 39-42). Depending on the style of the source text, he distinguishes between the translation of narration, description, discussion, and dialogue (1989:13). Based on the content or theme of the source text, he differentiates between scientific-technical translation, institutional-cultural translation, and literary translation. According to the overall purpose of the translation, he separates translation for language teaching from translation for professional purposes. Finally, oriented towards the target text, he distinguishes semantic translation, which "attempts to convey, as far as the semantic and syntactic structures of the target language allow, the precise contextual meaning" and communicative translation, which "attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that achieved on the readers of the original" (1981: 39). Depending on the methods, Newmark distinguishes word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, free translation, and adaptation (1989: 45-53).

The classification by Barbara Snell and Patricia Crampton (1983) is based on seven characteristics. According to the content, style, and function of the original text, these researchers distinguish literary translation (which includes both artistic and scientific translation), translation of advertising and educational materials (including promotional and commercial literature, operating instructions, etc.), as well as translation of informational materials (such as legal and official documents and scientific articles). According to the degree of translation style, literary translation (where style is most important), translation of informational material (where style is less important), and translation of advertising-instructive material (where style may be important) are distinguished (1983: 109-117). According to the "completeness" of the translation, full-text translation is distinguished from brief translation for extracting specific information (1983: 117-118). Based on the direction of translation, translation into native and from native languages are distinguished. Depending on the method of translation, written translation and oral translation are distinguished, including dubbing, subtitles, and translation aloud for the customer.

Points for discussion

1. What are the stages of translation as a process?

2. What is the specificity of the first phase – comprehension – in the process of literary translation?
3. What is the task of the translation model, the choice of which is related to the second phase of the translation process?
4. What is the denotative model of translation?
5. What is the semantic model of translation and how is it related to the choice of lexico-semantic translation transformations?
6. What is the informative model of translation?
7. Into which three stages does the transformational model divide the translation process? How is it related to the choice of syntactic translation transformations?
8. What is the psycholinguistic model of translation?
9. What is the essence of the intermediary language translation model?
10. What are the existing typologies of translations in the context of characterizing translation as a process?
11. Read the extracts from M. Bogusławska-Tafelska's article and do the post-reading exercises (p.58).

References

Рябуха Т. В., Куликова Л. А., Тарасенко Т. В. (2019). Практика перекладу з англійської мови: навчальний посібник для студентів філологічних спеціальностей вищих навчальних закладів. Мелітополь: ТОВ «Колор Принт», 119 с.

Bogusławska-Tafelska, M. (2001). Psycholinguistic mechanisms of translation. Acta Neophilologica, III, 11-24.

Carell, P. (1982). Cohesion is Not Coherence. TESOL Quarterly, 16 (4), 479–488.

Charolles, M. (1989). Coherence as a Principle in the Regulation of Discursive Production. Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse. Berlin; New York, 3–15.

De Beaugrande, R.-A., Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman.

Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. Ibérica. Vol. 13. No. 1, 7–38.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English (1st ed.). Routledge.

Kaindl, K., Kolb, W., Schlager, D. (2021). Literary Translator Studies. John Benjamins, 313.

Locher, M.A., Dayter, D., Messerli, T.C. (2023). Pragmatics and Translation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 336 p.

Newmark, P. A. (1995). Textbook of Translation. New-York: Phoenix ELT, 292 p.

Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford, Pergamon, 200 p.

Nida, E. A. and Reyburn, W. D. (1981). Meaning Across Cultures. Maryknoll, New York, Orbis, 1981.

Rosman, A., Rubel, P.G. (2003). Translating Cultures. Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology. Routledge, 320 p.

Torop, P. (2008). Translation and semiotics. Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 36 (2), 253–258.

Snell, B. and Crampton, P. (1983). Types of Translations. The Translator's Handbook. In C. Picken (ed.). London, Aslib, 109–120.

Topic 3. Culturological and sociological aspects of translation studies

3.1. Culturological aspects of translation studies

Translational activity implies not only the interaction between two languages but also the contact between two cultures. According to modern research, translation is considered a cultural phenomenon that encompasses both cognitive-semantic and real-cultural dimensions. The specificity of culture manifests itself in texts subject to translation from two perspectives: as "culture in language," i.e., a particular linguistic worldview of a certain people representing reality in language through cognitive-semantic structures such as concepts and their integrating conceptual spheres; and as "culture described by language," where the specificity of culture, national realities, and other cultural attributes are presented in the content of the translated text.

When working with translation analysis of texts, it is important to consider such cultural aspects as:

Linguistic and cultural equivalence: Language features are directly or indirectly conditioned by the culture of language speakers and are evident at the lexical and semantic levels. At the lexical level, the vocabulary of the language is culturally determined. For example, the number of terms in a specific field of activity directly depends on the degree of social significance of that field for a particular ethnic group: different types of snow among the Eskimos (up to 10); numerous color names for horses among Argentinean herdsmen.

On the semantic level, it is important for a translator to consider how the meaning and usage of lexical units reflect the specific of conceptualizing the surrounding world by members of a particular culture. For example, Anglo-Saxon conceptualizations of the world typically involve perceiving eyes, teeth, and tongue as located in the head (eyes in the head, teeth in the head, tongue in the head). For representatives of English culture, it is characteristic to include the perceiving subject in sensory perceptions: "Suddenly we heard noise," whereas for Ukrainian linguistic culture, a more impersonal perception of the world is typical: "Раптом почувся шум (Suddenly noise was heard). Each language creates its own unique "linguistic worldview," which is one of the reasons for the difficulties encountered in translation. Special importance lies in conveying culturally specific elements in source texts that embody culturally marked concepts and stereotypes of

the national or ethnic mentality, which may be unique to a specific culture and lack a precise equivalent in another language. For example, one of the key concepts of the English people, undoubtedly influencing the set of culturally marked linguistic and speech means, is the concept of PRIVACY, embodying the individual's right to independence, personal autonomy. Every resident of England is "an island unto himself." The precise lexical equivalent of the word "privacy" is absent not only in Ukrainian but also in other European languages, as noted by the contemporary English writer-journalist J. Paxman. The concept of "privacy" extends to the entire structure of the state, from the basics of legislation to the homes in which the English live [Paxman].

Values and Behavioral Norms: To avoid violating the cultural expectations of the audience, a translator must take into account the cultural values and behavioral norms that vary across different linguistic cultures. The code of conduct associated with "privacy" dictates that English people refrain from asking personal questions upon first meeting – such as name, occupation, marital status, presence of children, place of residence, income, etc. The concept of privacy also explains the universality and frequency of the greeting question "How do you do," alongside the fixation on weather (to fill awkward pauses in conversation). British linguistic culture establishes norms of communicative behavior, including those reflected in syntactic structures, imposing restrictions on asymmetric/vertical communication. Emphasizing status both by the holder and their lower environment, i.e., both top-down and bottom-up, which is characteristic of Ukrainian culture, is considered impolite in English culture. The very word "deference" (respect), according to the English, is perceived as outdated.

Context and Cultural Realities: A translator must be familiar with the nuances of the cultural context crucial for understanding the original text and reproduce cultural realities associated with ethnographic knowledge – the result of the "historical development of a particular ethnic or national community." Such background information encompasses specific facts of history and government structure of the national community, features of its geographical environment, characteristic objects of material culture of the past and present, as well as ethnographic and folkloric concepts. For instance, in English homes, bedrooms are often located on the second floor, the translation of the phrase "It's late, I'll go up" should most likely use the construction "Вже пізно, час лягати спати".

Realities posing complexity for translation can be divided into four types:

(a) Unique cultural words: Christmas yule log (English) – велике поліно, що спалюється на святвечір; a potluck (American) – це банкет або фуршет, де кожен гість приносить страву, щоб поділитися; tailgating – спільна їжа і випивка з друзями або родиною переглядом спортивної гри (зазвичай американського футболу);

(b) Equivalents: drug-store (English) – аптека; hazing (American) – дідівщина;

(c) Similar words with different functions: cuckoo’s call (English) – the cry of a cuckoo: American girls count to determine when they will get married; Ukrainians count to find out how many years they have left to live;

(d) Gaps: clover-leaf (English) – дорожня розв'язка у формі листка конюшини; a fixer-upper – це будинок, який ви можете купити за відносно низькою ціною, оскільки він потребує багато ремонту.

When reproducing culturally marked lexemes, translators use transcription, transliteration, calques, which involve creating a new word, phrase, or compound word to denote a corresponding object based on morphological elements already existing in the target language. For example: people of good will (люди доброї волі), Cape of Good Hope (мис Доброї Надії). Another technique is semi-calques, which translate only part of a word or idiom: workaholic (тругологік).

However, if applying these methods for translating a reality is impossible or inappropriate, descriptive translation is used. For example, the English word lobby can be translated not only as "лобі" but also described as «тиск на членів англійського парламенту в кулуарах».

Idioms and Cultural Associations: The use of idioms, proverbs, jokes, allegories, symbols, and metaphors, rich in cultural associations, can be challenging to translate, as it requires the translator to find equivalents in the target language that convey the same meaning and emotional connotation. For example, in every culture, there are ways to prevent unwanted outcomes. In English, the idiom "to keep fingers crossed" means "to hope that nothing will happen to bring bad luck or to ruin one's plans." When translating the phrase "This appointment will make or break me, so keep your fingers crossed, please" into Ukrainian, translators replace the idiom with the verb "to scold," which in Ukrainian linguistic mentality is associated with preventing unwanted outcomes: Ця зустріч вирішить мою долю, так що свари мене, будь ласка.

3.1.1. Culturological aspects of translation and translation strategies of foreignization and domestication.

Depending on the type of text and the target audience, the translator chooses either a strategy of foreignization or domestication, or combines both approaches. In the fields of communication, business, diplomacy, and especially in the internationalization of scientific knowledge, the dominant strategy is foreignization. In this strategy, the translation assimilates the foreign text to the language of translation and its culture, ensuring the preservation of specific features of the foreign text, elements of foreign culture, and their integration into another culture through the use of carefully selected linguistic means. Similar (or identical) words inevitably simplify and deepen communication, contributing to the expansion of contacts at the global political, economic, and cultural levels.

The strategy of foreignization is implemented through methods (Newmark) such as word-for-word translation – translating each word separately, with the preservation of word order; literal translation, which involves slight changes in grammatical structures by using structures of the language of translation with a similar function; faithful translation, which is carried out with consideration of the

context, allowing for the violation of accepted lexical-grammatical standards in order to preserve the specificity of the original text; semantic translation – highlighting semantic elements (semes) in the original text and selecting units containing the same semantic elements in the original text.

The strategy of domestication aims to create a translated text that does not include "foreign" elements of the original text, does not reflect its stylistic and cultural features, and is oriented towards the style and norms of the target language, perceived by the reader as a text in their native language. The exchange of cultural products, ideas, and values through the translation of literature, films, and other cultural artifacts necessitates translators to combine both strategies, with a frequent dominance of the domestication strategy.

When applying the domestication strategy, it is advisable to use methods (Newmark) such as adaptation – conveying the text in a free form in another language, where the theme of the text is preserved but the text itself is rewritten anew; free translation, which conveys the factual content, disregarding the form; idiomatic translation, which conveys the meaning of the original using the language resources of the target language; communicative translation – conveying the original text using typical communicative constructions of the target language, without foreign elements of the source language.

Domestication is primarily applied in the translation of words with rich cultural connotations, which carry additional pragmatic information, indicating not only objects and phenomena but also the attitudes towards them by members of the respective linguistic community, whose consciousness implicitly contains information associated with these objects and phenomena.

3.1.2. Culturological Aspects of Translation and the Problem of Translator's Adaptation.

Umberto Eco said that to translate is to "say almost the same thing," however, he also noted that any translation is a negotiation, where the translator constantly agrees to lose, for instance, when it's impossible to convey the ambiguity of a word, alliteration in a sentence, or an idiomatic expression, provided that we can compensate for this loss elsewhere in the text and restore what was left out at that moment. The reproduction of cultural concepts, realities, and connotations is associated with the issue of translator's adaptation, which is one of the most debated topics in contemporary translation studies. Some scholars refer to adaptation as an "offensive form of translation" (Raw, 2012), claiming that it "distorts" the image of the source text (Gorp, 2004). On the other hand, another group of researchers overemphasizes the significance of adaptation, believing that demanding from a translator to "create an easily understandable text without using cultural, pragmatic, or other types of adaptation seems unrealistic" (Gambier, Gottlieb, 2001). From the perspective of V. Demetska, "translator's adaptation does not contradict translation-reproduction but rather represents a complementary type of translation. Adequate translation, in any case, involves adaptation". In this regard, the concept of adaptation directly correlates with the notions of formal and dynamic equivalence introduced by J. Nida (2003). Formal equivalence is guided

by translating based on the correspondence of the content and expression planes of units in the original and translated texts. Dynamic equivalence is based on principles of equivalent effect, focusing on the reaction of readers to both the original and translated texts, and thus involves adaptive strategies.

Usually, the question of adaptation is resolved "in favor of" the recipient of the target culture, often implemented through the adaptive strategy of domestication, which involves the translator's effort to adapt as closely as possible to the norms of the receiving culture. Contemporary translation studies have identified certain characteristics of the source text that may necessitate sociocultural adaptation (Chang, 2009; Birdwood-Hedger, 2006), including: differences in temporal and spatial perceptions of reality; variations in conceptualization of objects, phenomena, connections; discrepencies in syntactic and discursive organization between languages; presence of cultural gaps, nationally specific names, idioms, puns, lexemes denoting units of measurement, etc., in the source text.

Among the techniques or methods of adaptation, scholars distinguish: omission of information fragments, explanation of the original information (explication or, conversely, increasing the degree of implicitness of the target text fragment compared to the original text – Chesterman, Wagner, 2002); substitution with rough "exotic" equivalents; "abridgment" (the target text retains only the most important information from the source text), "updating" (replacement with modern equivalents) (Kosonen, 2011); interpersonal changes related to altering the level of formality, degree of involvement and participation; radical rewriting of the original text; explication of the author's presence in the text; "illocutionary changes."
Examples of adaptation:

He was not so slim as in his youth and I was not surprised that when the waiter offered us rolls, he asked for Rye-Vita. – Він вже не був таким худорлявим як у молодості, і я не здивувався, що, коли офіціант запропонував нам булочки, він замовив житні хлібці.

A Philadelphia highboy had been moved out into the hall. – Комод пересунули до передпокою.

I began to feel rather hungry…and stole some biscuits from the sideboard. I had six of them. Bath Olivers. – Я добряче зголодніла… і вкрала трохи галетного печива з буфету. Я взяла шість крекерів.

In this case the proper name Bath Oliver unknown for Ukrainians, is substituted with "крекери" which is quite well known in Ukrainian culture and is a synonym of the phrase галетне печиво) (the examples are taken from the article: Slavova, Borysenko, 2018).

3.2. Sociological Aspects of Translation.

Sociological aspects of translation studies examine the relationship between translation and society, the impact of sociocultural factors on the translation process and outcomes, and the influence of translation on the formation of sociocultural connections and social identities. This approach investigates how social and political conditions affect translators' choices, translation methods, the

adaptation of texts for target audiences, and the perception and interpretation of translations in various sociocultural contexts. The sociological aspects of translation studies include: examining the political and ideological function of translation in shaping public opinion and manipulating information; researching how social preferences, tastes, and needs influence the perception and evaluation of translations, as well as the translation services market.

The sociocultural aspect of translation considers the differences in genres and registers of texts (Halliday) – situations of communication and the roles of participants in the communication process. Commonly identified registers include formal, official, friendly, and intimate. When choosing a translation variant, the translator must consider the register of the communication. For example, the choice of translating the English "auntie" as "тітка," "тітонька," "тіточка," "тьотя" depends on the register. A central "sociological" problem in translation studies is examining the translation process in connection with the complexities arising from the heterogeneity within the cultural-linguistic community. Studying translation in this aspect includes the method of reproducing social and regional dialects.

The existence of a unified culture and a common language does not imply homogeneity within the cultural-linguistic community. Each society exhibits numerous territorial, social, professional, age-related, and other differences that need to be reproduced in translation. For example, there are British, American, and Australian variants of the English language. Words used to denote specific objects or phenomena may vary in different countries (for instance, "lift" in British English and "elevator" in American English). The same phrase will differ in British, American, and Australian variants of English: British English: "Would you like a biscuit with your tea?"; American English: "Would you like a cookie with your tea?"; Australian English: "Would you like a bikkie with your cuppa?".

Within one country, there may be some differences in the speech of inhabitants of particular territories – the so-called territorial dialects. Sometimes the differences are significant enough for the dialect to be considered a separate language. Other dialects have only minor phonetic, lexical, or grammatical differences. For example, English dialects of the northeastern states (e.g., New York, Massachusetts), southern states (e.g., Alabama, Louisiana), and Midwestern states (e.g., Illinois, Ohio) differ in pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar.

Differences in Pronunciation: In the northeastern states, simplifications in pronunciation are often observed, such as the omission of the "r" sound at the end of words (for example, "car" may be pronounced as "cah"). In the southern states, the pronunciation of the "a" sound may be more rounded, and there are unique pronunciations of certain words, such as "y'all" (short for "you all"). In the Midwestern states, there may be unique pronunciation features, such as "pin" and "pen" sounding differently, as well as variations in intonation.

Lexical Differences: Different regions may use different lexical units to denote the same object or phenomenon. For example, in the northeastern states, the

term "soda" is used to refer to a sweet non-alcoholic beverage, while in the southern states, it's "coke," and in the Midwestern states, it's "pop."

Grammatical Differences: Various regions may exhibit differences in grammatical constructions and tense usage. For instance, in the southern states, the construction "might could" is often used instead of "might be able to."

Points for discussion

1. What is "culture in language" and "culture described by language"?
2. What cultural aspects are important in the translation analysis of texts?
3. Into what types can the realities creating translation difficulties be divided?
4. What is the strategy of foreignization? What techniques are used to implement it?
5. What is the strategy of domestication aimed at? What techniques are used to implement it?
6. What is translation adaptation?
7. What characteristics of the source text may require sociocultural adaptation?
8. What adaptation techniques are used in translation?
9. What do the sociological aspects of translation studies include?
10. What does the study of translation include in terms of difficulties arising from heterogeneity within a cultural-linguistic community?
11. Read the extracts from the article **Culture and translation. The referential and expressive value of cultural references** (p. 62) and do the post-reading exercises.

References

Демецька, В.В. (2007). Адаптація як поняття перекладознавства й культурології. Вісник СумДУ. Серія Філологія, 1 (2), С. 96–102.

Славова Л. Л., Борисенко Н. Д. (2023). Стратегії форенізації та доместикації у відтворенні ономастичних реалій (на матеріалі українського перекладу роману М. Мітчелл «Звіяні вітром»). Фаховий та художній переклад: теорія, методологія, практика: збірник наукових праць, С. 136–139.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London & New York: Routledge.

Bastin, G.L. (2014). Adaptation, the Paramount Communication Strategy. Linguaculture, Vol. 1, pp. 73–87.

Bowker, L., Cronin, M., Kenny, D., Pearson, J. (2016). Unity in diversity. Current trends in translation studied. Routledge, 208 p.

Carbonell, O. (1996). The exotic space of cultural translation. In R. Alvarez & C. Vidal (eds.), Translation, power, subversion (pp. 79–98). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jänis, M., Kemppanen, H., Belikova, A. (eds.) (2012). Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies. Frank & Timme GmbH, 231 p.

Lefevere, A. (1992b) Translation – History, Culture: A Sourcebook. New York: Routledge.

Rabassa, G. (1996). Words cannot express… The translation of cultures. In M. G. Rose (ed.). Translation horizons beyond the boundaries of translation spectrum (pp. 183–194). Binghamton: State University of New York.

Raw, L. (2012). Adaptation, Translation and Transformation. New York: Continuum.

Venuti, L. (1994). Translation and the formation of cultural identities. Current Issues in Language and Society, 1(3), 201–219.

Venuti, L. (1996). Translation as social practice: Or, the violence of translation. In M. G. Rose (ed.), Translation horizons beyond the boundaries of translation spectrum (pp. 195–214). Binghamton: State University of New York.

Yeoman E. Untranslatability and an invitation to adventure. *Translation Studies*, 2024. Vol. 17 (1), pp. 181–184.

Topic 4. Social and territorial dialects as a translation problem

The difficulty in reproducing dialectal features in the target text lies in the fact that dialectal forms of the target language, even if they exist, identify a completely different group of people. Additionally, the translator cannot simultaneously be a dialectologist familiar with various dialects. An attempt to reproduce dialect forms in the original text using Ukrainian dialectisms can be represented by the translation below.

Elise Dolittle : Ow, eez ye-ooa son, is e? Wal, fewd dan y' de-ooty bawms a matther should, eed now bettern to to spawl a pore gel's flashrzn than ran awy athaht pyin. Will ye-oo py me f'thm? – Еліза Дулітл: О! Так це синок ваш! Нічо' не ска'еш, виховала мамуся! Це ж тре', виваляв мені всі хвіалки в грязюці і втік! Юкою так мо' ви заплатите? (B. Shaw – Pygmalion).

This translation attempts to convey in translation the stylistic connotations associated with the use of dialecticisms in the original text. The translator uses certain features of the Ukrainian South-Eastern dialect, in particular, which differs from the standard language in the abbreviation of verbs: зна – знаю, гука – гукаю, пита – питає. Here the forms треба (to тре') и можете (to мо'), are shortened, and the form нічого is also reduced to Нічо'.

However, selecting dialectal forms of the target language for translation is labor-intensive, time-consuming and does not justify itself in terms of the translation adequacy. Solving this problem is partly facilitated by the existence of another type of linguistic variation: so-called social dialects, which mark belonging to different social strata. In translation practice, it's crucial to consider the fact that there's often a close connection between social and territorial dialects: territorial differences typically persist in the speech of less educated individuals and become less pronounced as education is acquired.

He's no gentleman, he ain't to interfere with a poor girl! – Зачіпа бідну дівчину ... Жинтільмен називаєця!

He do look quiet, don't 'e? D'e know 'oo 'e is, Sir? – Вигляд у нього спокійний, правда? Анужбо, скажіть, хто він такий.

Here the translator tried to compensate for the combination of grammatical and phonetic features indicating that the speaker belongs to the common people with one colloquial word "Анужбо".

The translation of slang or jargon, which indexes youth or professional speech respectively, presents no less of a translation challenge than the reproduction of dialects or colloquialisms. The methods of translating these types of social dialectss include (examples here and further in the text are taken from the situational comedy "Friends").

(a) Equivalent Translation:

It is phat – Це так круто

You slowpoke! – Ти копуха!

Are you okay, kiddo? – Все гаразд, крихітко?

Come on, wussies! – Ну ж бо, слабаки!

Sorry. I'm such a doofus! – Пробач. Я такий дурень.

(b) Analogous Translation: Choosing a word from a range of synonyms in translation, determined by the context:

Would you stop being such a wuss! – Годі вже бути такою ганчіркою!

Joy, stop hitting on her! – Джої, годі клеятися до неї!

It is a real blast, good that we came here.– Це дійсно офігенна вечірка,добре, що ми прийшли сюди. Please, Monica, let`s loose on this blowout at least today.– Будь ласочка, Моніка, давай принаймні сьогодні відірвимося на цій тусі.

Maybe her friends are betting to see who gets the biggest geek. – Може вона посперечалася з друзями, хто зніме самого нудотного ботаніка.

(c) Descriptive Translation or Explication: A method of translation where a slang or jargon term in the source language, based on the realities of a particular country and lacking equivalents in the target language, is replaced by a phrase that describes/explains its meaning.: gringos – випускники коледжів, що працюють не по спеціальності; webliography – список літератури, що складається з інтернетпосилань; postdoc – людина, яка займається науковою роботою після захисту дисертації; win-win situation – ситуація, вигідна одразу в кількох аспектах; senioritis – «хвороба випускників», коли студенти останнього року навчання прогулюють пари і не виконують завдань; all but dissertation – студент, який повністю пройшов програму навчання, але ще не написав дисертацію.

Let us comment on examples of translation of slangisms:

But, hey, I can be a kook! – Ей, але я можу бути й крутою, й божевільною.

Since the word "a kook" loses its slang connotation when translated into Ukrainian (eccentric, strange, or crazy), the translator adds the slang lexeme "крутою" to the literal translation "божевільною".

Bummer – Невдача: In this case, the translator performs an equivalent translation but loses the stylistic marking. An analogous translation could be used by selecting one of the slang synonyms, including those of English origin, such as "треш".

What's wrong, buddy? – Що сталося, друже?

In this translation, to restore the slang connotations, it would be appropriate to reproduce the slang as "чувак" or "бро."

He is jock. – Він шотландець.

The word "jock" to denote a "Scot" carries negative connotations in youth slang. In translation, a neutral equivalent is used, causing the slang connotations to be lost. Therefore, a more adequate translation would involve adding some slang descriptor to the word "шотландець" (depending on the context).

Often, slang terms are polysemous or homonymous, which determines the important role of context in their translation. For example, "Mr. Charlie" (TV series "Friends") is translated in as "білий чоловік" with the loss of the negative connotations inherent in the original, and even with the addition of positive connotations characteristic of the use of this phrase in the Ukrainian language. At the same time, the African American community uses "Mr. Charlie" as a derogatory term for a powerful white person, or it can refer to a black man who is arrogant and perceived as one who "acts white." Simultaneously, the slang word "Mr. Chatly" is homonymous, used as slang jargon to denote Cocaine.

Depending on the context, the slang term "to hang out" from the American TV series "Friends" can be translated into Ukrainian in different ways.

You guys are always hanging out in my apartment.– Хлопці, ви весь час зависаєте в моїй квартирі.

But I`m just going to hang out there. – Але я просто хочу потусити там.

The territorial, social and national background of the speaker are often reflected in Graphones, which are particularly difficult to translate and in most cases are not reproduced, due to which slang or colloquial connotation is lost in the target text.

Graphones are classified into two major groups: interior (reflecting changes in vowels and in consonants) and contact (reflecting changes at the word junctions).

Interior graphones: hungry —> 'ungry, told -> tole, after —> arter, almost —> a 'most, extra —>hextra.

Contact graphones: what do you —> wuddaya; what you may call it —> wuhchamacallit; for instance —>frins; ‘ave (=have); ‘at (=hat); ‘is (=his); ‘ope (=hope) (examples of cockney).

Examples of translation of phrases containing graphons (examples are taken from the situational comedy "Friends"):

We gotta get rid of all this girlie stuff. – Ми повинні позбутися від всіх цих дівчачих штук.

In this translation, the colloquial graphon is rendered as part of the stylistically neutral verb phrase "повинні позбутися," resulting in the loss of the text's youth language marking. When translating slang, it is desirable, if an

equivalent or analogous translation is not possible, to apply a transformation by adding a slang unit or enhancing the slang connotation of one of the words in the original text to maintain the age-related speech marking. For example, it can be translated as: "Нам треба позбутися всієї цієї дівчачої фігні."

You gotta be careful. – Ти повинен бути обережним.

A slang touch is lost in translation. To translate "You gotta be careful" into Ukrainian while conveying the colloquial connotation expressed by "gotta," you could add a slang element to keep the informal tone of the original phrase: "Тобі треба бути обережніше, чувак".

Unfortunately, graphons are often reproduced in Ukrainian translations by restoring the reduced forms, which makes the translation literary and loses the slang connotations. For example, the texts of the famous American rapper Kendrick Lamar are translated into Ukrainian in this way:

I wanna see the family stronger, I wanna see the money longer. – Я хочу бачити сім'ю міцнішою, Я хочу бачити гроші довше.

Feel like I ain't feelin' you all. – Здається, я не відчуваю вас усіх

Ain't nobody prayin' for me – Ніхто не молиться за мене (In the translation, moreover, the intensifier of the feeling of sadness and disappointment is lost; it would be more correct to translate «Невже ніхто не молиться за мене» or «Чи вже ж ніхто не молиться за мене», which would add a more conversational tone to the phrase).

In rare cases, slangism is translated literally or is compensated by transformation by adding colloquial inclusions.

Yeah, 'cause if I want it all without you involved. – Тому що аби я виграв все це без твоєї участі (adding “аби” makes the syntactic structure more ungrammatical, adding the connotation of vernacular).

50K to cousins, post a caption. – П’ятдесят кусків кузенам, зроби пост.

The difficulties in translation arise due to the existence of professional jargon in the language. In most cases, the main professional groups can be found in different cultures, and when translating, forms of the corresponding professional dialect may be used. For translating jargon, the translator should consult terminological dictionaries of a specific professional field. A particular challenge is posed by the translation of metaphorical slang, the internal form of which often does not provide clues regarding the word's motivation. In such cases, the translator employs a descriptive translation that explicates the meanings of the slang, or uses an international term-hypernym.

Here are some examples of English and Ukrainian jargon that are translated using descriptive translation: «wildcat drilling» – свердловина у нерозвіданому нафтовому родовищі, цікава для подальшої розробки; «worm» – співробітник-новачок, який не має досвіду у роботі. An example of Ukrainian jargon used, for example, by ZSU, are: «Муха» – hand-held anti-tank grenade launcher; along with the term drone, the jargon «Оса, птіца, птічка» (copters, that is, unmanned vehicles that use both sides for reconnaissance) is used, which are not reproduced in translation, being replaced by the hypernym term «drone».

Points for discussion

1. What is the difficulty in reproducing dialect features in the target text?
2. How can the problem of translating dialectisms be solved?
3. What methods exist for translating such types of social dialects as slang or jargon?
4. What is the problem with translating interior and contact graphones that mark territorial and social belonging?
5. How can slang and colloquial connotations marked by graphones be compensated for in translation?
6. What are the difficulties of translating professional jargon and how can they be addressed in translation?

References

Балабін, В.В. (2002). Сучасний американський військовий сленг як проблема перекладу. Монографія. Київ: Логос. 315 с.

Могильницький, В. В. (2020). Врахування регіональних особливостей при перекладі британських діалектів та сленгу (на матеріалі кінодискурсу)." Магістерська робота, Хмельницький національний університет.

Петренко М.О., Якушко К.Г. (2023). Молодіжний сленг в аспекті українсько-англійського художнього перекладу. Young Scientist. No 6 (118), 65–69.

Coleman, J. Life of slang (1st publ. ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2020. 374 p

Fursa, O. Anglicisms of Ukrainian youth slang: dynamic factors and problems of classification. Language and history: Periodical collection of scientific papers. Kyiv, 2020. Vol. 61. P. 57–65.

Lance, D.M. Regional variation in subjective dialect divisions in the United States. In Dennis Preston (ed.), Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, vol. 1, 283–314. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999

Partridge, E. Slang To-Day and Yesterday. London and New York: Routledge Revivals, 2015. 470 p

Partridge, E. A dictionary of slang and unconventional English: colloquialisms and catch phrases, fossilised jokes and puns, general nicknames, vulgarisms and such. London: Routledge. 2021.

Stolt, R. (2010). The Translation of Slang: Within the Bounds of Possibility? Munich: Grin Verlag, 36 p.

Topic 5. Bilingualism and translation studies.

Bilingualism is the practice of alternating the use of two languages by an individual or group of individuals for communication purposes. A translator, by virtue of mastering at least two languages, is also a bilingual. Translators are often referred to as trained bilinguals. Some scholars have advocated for the integration of bilingualism with translation. Of particular interest are questions about how the presumed bilingual mental lexicon can be organized and accessed.

Cognitive advantages of bilinguals are studied, not just related to the fact of mastering two languages, but also to their use by translators and the efficiency of translation. Bell (1991) argues that "the translator, as a communicator (participant in communication), must possess the knowledge and skills necessary for all communicators, but in two languages." Harris sees the development of translation competence as a result of bilinguals performing "natural translation." Koller describes translation competence as the "ability to combine language competences in two languages."

There is a viewpoint that bilingualism itself provides the ability to translate, as the study of a foreign language spontaneously develops a range of skills and abilities that have much in common with translation. However, a more prevalent view in translation studies is that translation competence goes beyond language competence in a foreign language and is qualitatively different from it. In the natural translation performed by bilinguals, who are not translators, there is no activation of two language systems necessary for code-switching: a word in one language does not stimulate semantic connections in the system of another language. Transfer competence, i.e., the ability to convey texts, is not part of bilingual competence and requires special modes of socialization as well as knowledge of translation norms. Additionally, translation competence has a textual character, i.e., it ensures the transmission of complex texts in terms of content and style with the necessary degree of communicative equivalence.

The fundamental differences between ordinary bilingualism and translator bilingualism lie in the role these types of bilingualism play in cross-linguistic communication. Translator bilingualism forms the basis of professional activity. On one hand, bilingual competence is present in all models of translation competence and is regarded as one of the fundamental competencies on which specific translation skills and abilities are developed and operate. On the other hand, in translation activity, the use of language is not an end in itself. A translator does not use languages to express their own personal thoughts. Their main task is to convey the meaning and content of the original text, which they do using two languages.

A translator needs to master the interconnected use of languages, known as "ordered bilingualism." To carry out translation activities, the languages in a translator's mental lexicon must be relatively independent/autonomous. Dependence of one language on another will inevitably have a negative impact on the quality of translation, leading to interference, unjustified borrowings, and literalism. The comparison of languages, their "correlation," necessary for translation, implies their relative independence in a person's mind. Thus, we can

characterize the relationship between a translator's languages as "independent interconnection." This relationship should be reflected in the organization of the translator's mental lexicon.

Currently, the most common viewpoint is to consider the bilingual lexicon as a single integrated system for storing multiple languages, hierarchical in nature, and including two levels of representations – conceptual and lexical. The conceptual block is unified and common for both languages, whereas the lexical representation blocks exist separately for each language and contain sets of units corresponding to words in the language.

The relationship between the lexicons of two languages and the conceptual block is reflected in hierarchical three-component models of the bilingual lexicon: the word-association model, the conceptual mediation model, and the hierarchical model. The word-association model is applicable to bilinguals with a low proficiency in the second language. In this model, words in the second language (L2) are associated with their equivalents in the first language (L1) rather than directly with their meanings. The conceptual mediation model describes equal and proficient command of both languages. Words in both languages are directly linked to concepts, allowing for efficient retrieval of meanings without intermediary translations. The hierarchical model combines elements of both the word-association and conceptual mediation models; explains the progression of conceptual access as proficiency in the target language increases; addresses differences in the strength of connections between components of the lexicon as bilingual proficiency develops.

Activation of the lexical representation block in the context of the functioning of translator bilingualism can vary significantly depending on the type of translation, and in many cases, is characterized by considerable complexity. Researchers identify five main groups of conditions affecting activation: 1) the perception of the message text (auditory/visual; single/multiple instances); 2) memory load (significant/insignificant); 3) switching between languages over time (restricted/unrestricted); 4) the format of the translation (oral/written; single/multiple); 5) the timing of the main operations (simultaneous/consecutive).

Of particular interest for describing the mental lexicon of a translator, distinguishing it from that of an ordinary bilingual, is the distributive model of bilingual memory. This model allows for the description and explanation of cases of incomplete equivalence of word meanings in two languages. That is, when elements of meaning may exist only in the source language or only in the target language.

Implications of the distributive model of the translator's bilingual memory for translation are as follows:

(a) Highlights the complexity of translating nuanced meanings that do not have direct equivalents.

(b) Emphasizes the need for translators to understand cultural and linguistic contexts deeply to convey meanings accurately.

(c) Illustrates the necessity for translators to navigate and reconcile these discrepancies to avoid loss or distortion of meaning. One of the key and specific elements of bilingual speech is code-switching. Code-switching is defined as "the alternate use of elements from two or more languages within a single communicative act." In bilingual communication, code-switching can be influenced by various factors, the main ones being: 1) the participants in the communication; 2) the setting and conditions of the communication; 3) the topic and subject of the conversation. In bilingual speech, code-switching can serve various functions, including sociolinguistic and discursive ones.

Sociolinguistic functions include: expressing ethnic, social, class, group, and other affiliations; demonstrating solidarity or lack thereof among members of a linguistic or ethnic community (Gumperz, 1982); signaling changes in communication conditions or situations; structuring the conversation; expressing attitudes (toward the listener); showing social respect, and more. Discursive functions can be categorized as follows: the referential function; the function of filling lexical gaps; the context-creation function; the phatic function; and the expressive function to achieve a desired stylistic effect.

A comparison of the conditions of bilingual and translator communication allows us to conclude that code-switching in translation has significant differences from the alternate use of elements from two languages by an ordinary bilingual. These differences include:

(a) Code-switching occurs only between separate utterances: unlike in casual bilingual communication, where code-switching can occur within a single sentence or even a phrase, in translation, it is confined to distinct segments of speech.

(b) Driven exclusively by the needs of the translation process: The switching is dictated solely by the requirements of translating from one language to another.

(c) Lacks personal motives: Unlike ordinary bilingual communication, where personal preferences and situational factors can influence code-switching, in translation, the process is objective and impersonal.

(d) Does not serve social or discursive functions: In typical bilingual interactions, code-switching can serve sociolinguistic purposes such as expressing identity or solidarity, or discursive purposes like adding stylistic nuances. In translation, these functions are irrelevant.

(e) Directed by the translation context.

(f) Must be performed promptly: The translation process requires quick and efficient switching between languages.

(g) May vary depending on the type of translation: Different translation modes (e.g., simultaneous vs. consecutive) might demand specific code-switching strategies.

The process of code-switching is associated with the need to overcome cross-linguistic competition, which is typical for bilingual speech. Cross-linguistic competition arises because, during speech production and perception, both languages of a bilingual are active. The non-target language can influence the generation and perception of speech. According to the Inhibitory Control Model,

the problems of language competition are resolved through the suppression mechanism of the non-target language. At the same time, stronger activation of the target language can occur, which is called “goal-maintenance view.” The successful functioning of both mechanisms is impossible without a self-monitoring system.

Effective code-switching in translation communication must be based on the conveyance of meaning. The identification of the original meaning is facilitated by the process of deverbalization, which is "the release of meaning contained in the text from the linguistic means, forms, and structures of the source language." In consecutive interpreting, the process of deverbalization occurs "instantly and intuitively" and is a key mechanism in information compression. At the same time, one of the contradictions in the activity of an oral interpreter is that in some cases, bypassing semantic analysis (and deverbalization) increases the efficiency of code-switching.

In addition to code-switching, a translator needs cultural-linguistic switching, which is based on the mechanism of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison, taking into account the specifics of the target culture, i.e., within the framework of the translating cultural-linguistic code. To find adequate means of expressing meaning in the target language, a translator requires not only the ability to construct statements in accordance with the norms and usage of the target language but also the ability to "think" in another language according to its laws and logic, and to switch between different worldviews.

The inability to perform cultural-linguistic switching can lead to interference, calquing, distortion, or loss of elements of meaning.

Points for discussion

1. What is the difference between the process of natural translation performed by bilinguals who are not translators and professional translation?
2. What is the role of bilingual competence in translation competence?
3. What is meant by the terms "ordered bilingualism" and "independent interconnection"?
4. How is the bilingual lexicon organized? What is the difference between a conceptual block and lexical representation blocks?
5. What components make up the three-component models of the bilingual lexicon?
6. What factors affect the activation of the lexical representation block in the bilingual lexicon?
7. What is the essence of the distributive model of the translators' bilingual memory?
8. What is code-switching in translation and how does it differ from the alternating use of elements of two languages by an ordinary bilingual?

9. Through what mechanism are the problems of language competition resolved in translator bilingualism?
9. What is cultural-linguistic switching and what shortcomings in translation result from the inability to perform this switching?

10. Read the article (p. 64) and do the post-reading tasks.

References

Beardmore. (1982). Bilingualism. Basic principles. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kroll, J.F., Dussias, P.E., Bogulski, C.A., Valdes-Kroff, J. (2012). Juggling two languages in one mind: What bilinguals tell us about language processing and its consequences for cognition. In B. Ross (Ed.) The Psychology of Learning and Motivation. Vol. 56. San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 229–262.

Riehl, C.M. (2005). Code-switching in bilinguals: impacts of mental processes and language awareness. Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 1945–1959.

Romaine. (1995). Bilingualism. Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Shen, Y. (2018). Code-switching and Translation: Taking Literary Text as an Example. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR). Vol. 300, 279–282.

Topic 6. Linguistic and extralinguistic factors of translation

6.1. Linguistic factors of translation

A linguistically oriented approach to translation, as opposed to a literary one, considers the process of translation as a linguistic act, during which a text in one language is replaced by an equivalent text in another, making this replacement in accordance with the rules of both language systems. Catford defines translation as the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) with equivalent textual material in another language (TL), distinguishing between translational equivalence and formal correspondence – the relationship between linguistic units of one language and their corresponding linguistic units in another. In addition, a linguistic approach to translation distinguishes between the concepts of linguistic equivalence and dynamic equivalence, according to which the effect of the target text should be analogous to the effect of the source text.

The primary linguistic factor influencing the translation process is the differences between the linguistic systems of the target and source texts at systemic linguistic levels – phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical-semantic, including differences in the connotative meanings of lexemes. Translational equivalence is realized at the level of absolute equivalence, partial equivalence, and lack of equivalence. Complete equivalence is more of an idealized construct and is realistically achievable only when there is close similarity in the systemic-structural characteristics of languages, homogeneous in genealogical and

typological terms, when translating simple texts with a narrow range of functional characteristics and under relatively uncomplicated communicative conditions.

Partial / relative equivalence, which entails preserving relative equality in content, meaning, semantics, stylistics, and functional-communicative information, is much more common. The criterion for partial equivalence in a functional-communicative perspective is considered to be an equivalent response from recipients of the source and translated texts. In a semantic perspective, partial equivalence is realized as the equivalence of texts in different languages in terms of meaning, including implicit information. Such equivalence is established not so much at the level of individual linguistic signs and isolated sentences, achieved through translation transformations, but at the level of the text as a whole. The degree of semantic and communicative-functional equivalence can vary depending on the characteristics of the text (its genre and cultural specificity, content, and structural features), the degree of proximity or distance between the semantic-structural characteristics of the source and target languages, and the degree of difference between the cultures of the speakers of these languages.

In all types of oral translation, relative equivalence is reduced. In written translation, the degree of relative equivalence is higher, but it varies for texts of different genres. For official-business texts, the degree of equivalence is primarily determined by the proximity vs. difference in the clichés and rhetorical structures accepted in the official-business style of the two languages; in scientific texts – by the accepted terminological systems in the source and target languages, the level of formalization of scientific texts in the source and target languages, and may decrease due to differences in terms, the concepts denoted by them, and their interpretation. The degree of relative equivalence of translation for mass media texts is influenced by the difference in socially-political terms and concepts accepted in them, the difference in realities and the use of journalistic jargon, colloquialisms, occasional words, and idiomatic expressions.

In literary translation, the relative equivalence depends not only on the differences between the language systems and their socio-cultural environments but also on the individual characteristics of the translator and the translation school in a particular country. The relativity of the equivalence of translating literary texts is largely determined by the difference in symbols, allusions, metaphors, images, lexically ambiguous words (in cases of polysemy and homonymy), culturally specific lexemes without equivalents, vertical context, opposition of linguistic meaning to pragmatic meaning in cases of irony, sarcasm, puns, and other techniques that violate the maxim of relevance of information.

It is often challenging for a translator to achieve syntactic equivalence, for example, due to the fact that English and Ukrainian belong to different structural types of languages. English typically uses the Subject-Verb-Object word order, while Ukrainian may have a different order, such as Subject-Object-Verb; in English, auxiliary verbs are used to form tense forms, while in Ukrainian tense forms may be formed differently, without using auxiliary verbs; in Ukrainian, verbs may govern different cases and prepositions compared to English verbs;

English extensively uses articles, which are absent in Ukrainian. Ensuring syntactic equivalence is achieved through the use of syntactic transformations, as in:

The fog stopped all traffic – Через густий туман зупинився весь дорожній рух.

In this example, there is a semantic shift - "personification," where the noun "fog," which has the meaning of an inanimate object, takes on the role of an agent, which is usually associated with an animate object. To translate such statements into Ukrainian, a conversion transformation is applied, where "fog" becomes the circumstantial "через туман" (through the fog), and the subject becomes the noun "рух" (movement).

These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. – Здійснення цих прав і свобод ні в якому разі не повинно суперечити цілям і принципам Організації Об'єднаних Націй

In the Ukrainian translation a double negative appears, which is impossible in English.

At the morphological level, a linguistic factor affecting relative equivalence is the differences in word formation between synthetic Ukrainian and analytical English languages.

In English, auxiliary verbs can lexicalize and acquire lexical meaning: "The secret was to quit while you are a has-been fighter who couldn't quit the ring" (як колишній боєць). Unlike Ukrainian, a highly productive way of creating words in English is conversion: "footnote" - "to footnote," "monitor" - "to monitor," "head" - "to head," "fool" - "to fool," "sign" - "to sign," "monkey" - "to monkey," "water" - "to water," "place" - "to place," and so on. In English, unlike Ukrainian, prepositions actively participate in word formation: "to give up" (здатися), "to give in" (поступитися), "to give away" (віддавати). English and Ukrainian significantly differ in the paradigms of prefixes: for example, in English, there is a paradigm of negation prefixes un-, in- (and its allomorphs - il/ir/im), de-, dis-, non-, while in Ukrainian only prefixes не-, без- are productive.

In Ukrainian, unlike English, diminutive suffixes are very common: -ньк-, -чк-, -ець, -езн-, -ил- (зіронька, сонечко, вітерець, малесенький, малюсінький, дівчинонька), which correspond very insignificantly to low-frequency common diminutive suffixes in English: -ie/-y (daddy, granny), -et (islet – острівець), and -ling (duckling, darling). Productive back-formation is prevalent in English – the removal of an affix from a word: "babysitter" – "to babysit," "housekeeper" – "to housekeep," "caretaker" – "to caretake," which is absent in Ukrainian. In English, postpositives are often written together in nouns and separately in verbs: "blackout" – "to black out": a news blackout (блокування новин), to black out the news (заблокувати новини), etc.

A significant linguistic factor in translation is the conveyance of cohesion (formal text connectivity) and coherence (semantic text connectivity). As part of the textual function of language, cohesion encompasses "the relations of meaning that exist within the text" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 4). There are five types of

cohesion: (1) reference (pronouns such as "she," "our," demonstrative words such as "this," comparative words such as "the same"); (2) substitution and ellipsis; (3) conjunctions; (4) substitution (replacement of words, for example, using a more general concept instead of repetition); (6) lexical cohesion (repetition, lexical isotopy, synonymy, and the use of words related within a lexical field; collocations - the phenomenon of the joint appearance of two lexical units, which are the primary building blocks of lexical and syntactic structure ("hold one's breath," "wage war"); the use of connectors to establish logical and temporal relationships between statements.

Coherence, as the semantic integrity and meaningfulness of a text, relies on logical and semantic connections between text fragments. Connections between elements of the text do not necessarily have to be explicitly expressed for the text to be considered coherent. The degree of coherence depends not so much on whether the text is understandable, but on how much effort the interpreter must exert to understand it. A translator can enhance the coherence of a text by considering the competencies and knowledge of potential recipients.

When focusing on cohesive devices, a translator may use a "bottom-up" text analysis model: from formal elements to meaning. To convey coherence, the translator's analytical model operates "top-down" – from content to formal structure. Altering cohesion or coherence in the target text leads to functional shifts in the source text. Even if one lexical element is translated incorrectly, it can affect the "shift in coherence" (Blum-Kulka, 1986).

6.2. Extralinguistic factors of translation

Extralinguistic factors of translation, or the extralinguistic context, refer to information existing independently of the translated text but crucial for its understanding and correct rendering into the target language. Some researchers even insist on the predominance of extralinguistic knowledge over linguistic, arguing that without information about extralinguistic factors and equivalent lexicon, the author's intent cannot be fully revealed and conveyed in translated texts. Therefore, Dansette identifies three levels of translation: linguistic, textual, and semantic. A translator who remains at the linguistic and textual levels and cannot fully access the semantic level (lacking extralinguistic knowledge) tends to find a "literal" meaning and ultimately achieves a less successful translation.

Given the significance of extralinguistic factors in translation, Ukrainian researcher S. A. Shvachko notes that while there may be certain common features between many foreign cultures, complete identity between them is never possible because the conceptual worldview is dynamic and changes primarily under the influence of extralinguistic factors of social, historical, and cognitive nature.

Among the leading extralinguistic factors, scholars include the linguo-ethnocultural and communicative-pragmatic aspects of translation. The extralinguistic context encompasses differences between the author's, reader's, and translator's worldview; disparities in their foundational knowledge; ethnic communicative competencies; cultural and mental distinctions; value systems. In other words, the extralinguistic context comprises ideological, encyclopedic,

subject-specific, and bicultural knowledge. Additionally, such context incorporates features of the speech situation: formality or informality of communication; limited or unlimited translation time; gender characteristics of translators, their personal cultural identity, values, age, competence, psychological state, temperament, ability to concentrate and pay attention, volume of short-term and long-term memory, erudition, translation methodology and skills, affective factors. Among the extralinguistic situational factors are the translator's intentions to use propagandistic or enlightening aims and to modify the source text for various purposes (ideology, ethics, morality, etc.).

Extralinguistic factors can significantly vary depending on the specific text, its style and genre, target audience, and translation objectives. For instance, translators of scientific and technical texts need to possess specific knowledge in the field to which the translated text belongs; they must be familiar with academic standards and requirements of the specific scientific domain. Translators of socio-political texts should be knowledgeable about the political system, current political situation, and other factors characterizing the country where the translated text was created. The extralinguistic context for such texts also includes knowledge of means of manipulative influence and how the text aligns with the norms of mass communication accepted in another language community.

Translators of literary fiction should have an understanding of the author of the work being translated, their worldview and aesthetic views, literary tradition, the era described in the work, the setting and conditions of society, etc. The extralinguistic context of a literary text is often referred to as its vertical context, which is defined as historical-philological information, general cultural information objectively embedded in the literary work. Vertical context refers to the deeper, often implicit, layers of meaning embedded within a text, which go beyond the literal words and immediate context. These layers might include cultural references, historical background, intertextual connections, and the author’s underlying intentions or themes. The author of the work may assume that their reader possesses the information associated with vertical context. In this case, the author shapes the text in such a way that it contains hints about any linguistic, literary, social, or other fact, reference to secondary texts and situations. However, the vertical context may also contain hidden information that is inherent in the language itself and exists independently of the author's intentions.

Common categories of the vertical context include allusions, symbols, idiomatic expressions, quotations, biblical references, references to geographical and cultural realities, etc. Texts can be rich with cultural and historical allusions that are familiar to the source language audience but obscure to the target language audience. Translators need to convey these references in a way that is accessible and meaningful to the target audience. In terms of intertextuality, authors may draw on other texts, using quotes, paraphrases, or thematic echoes that enrich the meaning. Recognizing and appropriately rendering these connections in the translation requires the translator to have extensive knowledge of both the source and target cultures’ literatures and contexts.

Points for discussion

1. What linguistic factor is the key in influencing the translation process?
2. On what three levels is translational linguistic equivalence realized?
3. What are the two aspects of partial equivalence in translation?
4. How does the degree of partial/relative equivalence vary in translations of texts of different types (genres)?
5. What does the achievement of relative equivalence in literary translations depend on?
6. Why is it difficult for a translator to achieve syntactic equivalence in English-Ukrainian translations and how is this problem solved? Provide examples from texts to illustrate this.
7. Why is it difficult for a translator to achieve syntactic equivalence in English-Ukrainian translations at the morphological level? Provide examples from texts to illustrate this.
8. By what means is linguistic cohesion achieved and what model of translation analysis should a translator use to reproduce it in the target text?
9. What is coherence?
10. What do extralinguistic factors of translation include and at what level of translation (linguistic, textual, and semantic) should they be considered?
11. How do extralinguistic context and extralinguistic situational factors differ?
12. What knowledge of extralinguistic contexts is necessary in translations of texts of different types (genres)?
13. What is vertical context and by what means is it marked in a literary text?
14. Read the article (p. 67) and do post-reading tasks.

References

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (2000). 'Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation'. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), The Translation Studies Reader, 298–313. London & New York: Routledge.

Catford, John C. (1965) A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1992) 'Linguistic Constraints on Translation'. Studies in Translation / Estudos da Traducao, Ilha do Desterro. 28: 9-23**.**

Halliday, Michael and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976). Cohesion in English. London & New York: Longman.

Hatim, B. Translating text in context. In Munday J. (ed.). The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009, 36–53.

Jakobson, R. (1999) 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation'. In Venuti, L. (ed.) The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.

Kenny, D. (1998) "Equivalence." In: Baker, Mona (ed.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London: Routledge. pp. 77–80.

Koller, W. (1995). The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies. Target. Vol. 7, P. 191–222.

Nida, E. (2001). Contexts in translating. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Svider I. A. (2021). The role of extralinguistic context in translation. Collection of scientific papers “New Philology”. No 81. Vol. II, 111–116.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1992). The Interaction of World Knowledge and Linguistic Knowledge in the Process of Translation: A Think-aloud Protocol Study. Translation and meaning. Maastricht: Tykswgeschoot Maastricht, Part II. P. 433–440

Selected articles

Корунець Ілько Вакулович

КОРУ́НЕЦЬ Ілько Вакулович (16. 03. 1922, с. Семенівка, нині Лисян. р-ну Черкас. обл. – 18. 11. 2018, Київ) – перекладач, літературний критик. Кандидат філологічних наук (1966), професор (1990). Член НСПУ (1990). Літ. премія ім. М. Рильського

(2009). Учасник 2-ї світової війни. Закін. Київ. пед. інститут (1950). Викладав 1948–60 англ. мову й літературу в англ. спец. школі-інтернаті; від 1960 – у Київ. лінгвіст. університеті: від 1972 – завідувач кафедри граматики й історії англ. мови, 1993–95 – завідувач кафедри теорії і практики перекладу. Актив. учасник руху шістдесятників проти зросійщення української мови. У його перекл. з англ. мови видано зб. «Оповідання» М.-Р. Ананда (1956, співавт.), повість «Маленькі втікачі» Дж. Тріза (1968; обидві – Київ), роман «Слідопит, або Суходільне море» Дж.-Ф. Купера (К., 1972; Т., 2006), зб. казок «Хлопчик-зірка» (К., 1979; 1993; 2000) та «Велетень, який дбав тільки про себе» (2010) О. Вайлда, «Колиска на орбіті» А. Кларка (К., 1983), зб. казок та оповідань «Щасливий принц» (Л., 2008), «Великий дитячий словник» В. Діснея (1993), «Як читати й вимовляти назви речей і дій» (1994), «Педагогіка душі» П. Фрейре (2003); з італ. – повість «Історія осла святого Йосифа» Дж. Верґа, зб. новел «Пригоди Мазетто в жіночому монастирі» (обидві – 1957), «Діти Італії» (1958, співавт.), повість-казку «Подорож Голубої Стріли» (1959; 1997), зб. «Італійські народні казки» (1986; 2009), повість «Джельсоміно в країні брехунів» Дж. Родарі (у зб. «Країна новорічних ялинок», 1997; 2010; усі – Київ). Автор ст. «Відображення метафоричної образності в поетичних перекладах» // «Радянське літературознавство», 1975, № 12; «Переклад поетичної трагедії на рівні його аналізу» // «Теорія і практика перекладу», 1980, № 6; «Видатний майстер перекладу (про М. Лукаша)» // «Вітчизна», 1985, № 8; «Франкові поеми в англомовному світі» // «Слово і час», 1990, № 4; «Проти перекручення українських власних назв в англійських перекладах» // «Мовознавство», 1993, № 3; «Микола Лукаш. Людина і перекладач» // «Всесвіт», 1999, № 11–12; «Просодійні елементи як об’єкт відтворення в перекладі» // Там само, 2004, № 9–10; низки статей в ЕСУ; наук.-популяр. брошури «Джек Лондон» (К., 1976), підручників «Theory and Practice of Translation» (К., 1986; В., 2000; 2003), «Contrastive Typology of English and Ukrainian languages» (К., 1995; В., 2003), «Essay on the History of West European and Ukrainian Translation» (К., 2000), «Вступ до перекладознавства» (В., 2008).

https://esu.com.ua/article-5316 - Енциклопедія сучасної України

Біля витоків українського перекладознавства (скорочено)

Ілько Вакулович Корунець

Переклад в Україні має свою досить довгу і славну історію, що бере свій початок більш ніж тисячу років тому — ще в X сторіччі і пов’язується із запровадженням християнства. Починався наш переклад масштабно, з розмахом, на державному рівні, про що засвідчив наш літопис, ведений першим великим письменником, істориком Нестором, який записав під 1037 роком: «*Ярослав собра писци многи і перекладаше на словінськоє письмо»*. Тобто, князь Ярослав Мудрий зібрав у новозбудованому

Софійському соборі багато перекладачів (*писців),* які перекладали на старослов'янську мову. […]

Головним завданням київської школи перекладачів на самому початку було дати перекладені з грецької мови матеріали для богослужіння, яких у нас узагалі доти ніколи не було. Після забезпечення церков у Києві, Чернігові, Переяславі та інших містах потрібною в перші десятиріччя X—XI ст. богослужебною літературою, перед перекладачами були поставлені ще вищі, не менш відповідальні завдання — переклад Євангелій, інших духовних та світських творів, зокрема праць таких теологів, як Сірен, Монотроп та інших. Історія свідчить, що в Київській Русі впродовж XI — першої половини XIII ст. (до 1240 р.) перекладалися і наукові (збірка «Фізіолог»), історичні й літературні твори («Історія іудейської війни» Йосифа Флавія), а також праці Плутарха, Арістотеля, народні казки, наукові твори, що по кілька разів з'являлися в переписаних варіантах. Причому перекладалися не тільки прозові твори різних жанрів. Єдине, чого не робилося в той час у жодній країні Європи, — не вказувалося, окрім хіба Ієроніма, відомого перекладача Біблії розмовною латинською мовою (так звана *Вульгата*), яким способом (методом) здійснювалися ці переклади і за якими правилами перекладалися чи мали перекладатися ті чи інші мовні одиниці/ змістові єдності. Коротко кажучи, не узагальнювався, а отже, й не критикувався перекладач і його доробок. Перекладачі «просто перекладали», хоч і знали, що сакральні твори та праці стародавніх грецьких філософів «треба перекладати» дослівно, а твори світських письменників можна було перекладати «як хочеш», тобто довільно. І жодна із середньовічних шкіл — ні київська, ні іспанська, римська чи французька — не залишила своїх конкретних правил чи вказівок щодо вимог до тогочасного перекладу прозових або поетичних творів. Не зробив цього і Лівій Андронік 240 року до н. е., переклавши добірною латинською мовою Гомерову героїчну поему «Іліада» та деякі поетичні твори інших стародавніх грецьких велетів художньої літератури латинською мовою.

Проте і Лівій Андронік не залишив (принаймні про це мовчить історія) жодних згадок про його методи перекладу творів своєї літератури на мову латинську. Всі наступні перекладачі також перекладали, обов'язково рівняючись, можна гадати, в дечому на Лівія Андроніка, а взагалі — кожен по-своєму, передаючи найголовніше в кожному тексті — його загальний зміст чи зміст кожної статті (як у різних угодах). Часто цей зміст розріджувався майже до невпізнання, й оригінал просто-таки спотворювався, як це робили Горацій, Квінтиліан та Апулей у стародавню римську добу чи Скаррон уже в добу класицизму («Перелицьована Енеїда», 1642 р.).

Перші пропоновані методи перекладу, як правило, не завжди були витвором чи спостереженням кожного перекладача зокрема, а переважно запозичувалися одним перекладачем у іншого. Чи не найпершим (власне автором) пропонованих правил відтворення поетичних творів був *Еш'єн Доле*, в якого потім запозичив і вдвічі розширив (до десяти) правил

перекладу *Джон Драйден*, тимчасом як англієць *А. Тайтлер* (1791 р.) скоротив вимоги Доле й Драйдена до поетичного перекладу всього до таких трьох: 1) **бездоганно володіти мовою оригіналу та мовою перекладу;** 2) **передавати сповна стиль автора оригіналу і навіть легкість сприйняття перекладеного твору як і носіями оригіналу;** 3) **передавати сповна зміст оригіналу тощо.**

На превеликий жаль, українські перекладачі, навіть із Могилянської академії XVII—XVIII століть, а серед них і Сковорода, не лишили нам жодних зауважень, вимог чи вказівок щодо теоретичних питань перекладу творів будь-якого жанру. Навіть такі фахові перекладачі другої половини XIX ст., як П. Куліш, І. Франко й Леся Українка не узагальнили теоретично свій велетенський перекладацький досвід відтворення прозових і поетичних творів. Навіть І. Франко, зробивши сотні й сотні різноманітних правок у Кулішевих перекладах Шекспірових шедеврів українською мовою, давши аналіз на рівні вимог XXI ст. польського перекладу своїх «Каменярів» С. Твердохлібом,* усе ж не створив окремої перекладацької праці.

Не стали зрештою незаперечними теоретиками перекладу і перші «хоробрі» буремних 20-х в Україні — *І. Кулик* (перекладач і коментатор своїх перекладів Волта Вітмена й інших американських робітничих поетів), *М. Зеров* (перекладач і критик перекладів античних і сучасних йому поетів), *Г. Майфет*, який досліджував способи перекладу творів Т. Шевченка французькою й англійською мовами, а також літературний редактор і критик українських перекладів *В. Державин*, почасти *Ю. Савченко* й інші. Саме цим поетам, критикам і редакторам випало першим рецензувати переклади українською мовою в 20-ті роки минулого століття. Вони відверто висловлювали свої критичні зауваження та побажання щодо перекладів, критикували своїх колег за неточні й неправильні переклади і вказували шляхи подолання труднощів у відтворенні поетичних і прозових творів українською мовою різними перекладачами. А критикувати перших перекладачів, що відважилися взятися за художній переклад, звичайно ж, було за що. Так, наприклад, І. Кулик був упевнений, що перекладати ті самі твори для різних класових категорій дорослих читачів треба було по-різному. Зокрема про свої переклади творів американських демократичних поетів українською мовою він писав таке: «Ми маємо на увазі, що перекладаємо для українського читача, до того ж для *сучасного радянського читача* (курсив наш. — ***І. К.***) Це змушувало нас свідомо *вносити деякі зміни в переклади*, порівняно з оригіналом... Так само вірші американських поетів, *точно перекладені* (курсив наш. — ***І. К.***) мали б один сенс у Нью-Йорку й інший у Харкові»*.

Важко погодитися, звичайно, із твердженням І. Кулика, що перекладач має право щось самостійно *змінювати* в перекладі на догоду читачеві. Такої думки в той час не дотримувалися ні М. Зеров, ні В. Державин, які були проти будь-яких кардинальних втручань перекладача, особливо у світоглядну орієнтацію автора першотвору. Таким чином, у 20-х роках минулого століття

поряд із появою нових імен в українській літературі постали і нові підходи до освоєння багатств світового красного письменства за рахунок перекладів кращих його зразків українською мовою. Цілком закономірно, що слідом за перекладами з'являлася й їхня критика — народжувалося українське перекладознавство, біля витоків якого стояли вже згадані вище перекладачі й рецензенти нових перекладів. Вони робили більш чи менш кваліфіковані оцінки й теоретичні та практичні висновки щодо прозових і поетичних перекладів різних творів українською мовою. Тому з погляду сьогоднішнього дня можна стверджувати, що біля витоків українського теоретичного перекладознавства стояли найперше І. Кулик, М. Зеров з його реалістичними поглядами й вимогами до поетичного перекладу та Г. Майфет і, безперечно, найбільш фаховий та найактивніший критик прозових і поетичних перекладів того часу В. Державин.

Проте пальма першості в теоретичному перекладазнавстві України належить все ж не їм, а їхньому співучасникові процесу становлення українського перекладознавства, харківському русистові, критикові перекладу й перекладачеві шекспірівських сонетів О. М. Фінкелю. Саме він зробив першу спробу в українському перекладознавстві визначити загальну проблематику, що стала об'єктом подальшого тодішнього й пізнішого дослідження в усіх національних республіках СРСР. Ця проблематики ставилася, звичайно, перекладачами, але вона була вперше систематизована чи більш-менш чітко окреслена в праці О. Фінкеля «Теорія і практика перекладу» — праці, що побачила світ 1929 року. Причому на рік раніше, ніж відома праця А. В. Федорова, що потім стала хрестоматійною в колишньому СРСР. Видана праця О. Фінкеля була в тодішній столиці України українською мовою. Перевидана «Теорія і практика перекладу», на жаль, тільки 2007 року у Вінниці (видавництво «Нова книга»). Вона з'явилася як підсумок наукової конференції, присвяченої О. Фінкелю, в Харківському національному університеті ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Підготували ж добірку найвизначніших праць О. М. Фінкеля науковці Харківського та Київського національних університетів Л. М. Черноватий, В. І. Карабан, В. О. Подминогин, О. А. Кальниченко та В. Д. Радчук. До збірки вибраних праць О. М. Фінкеля внесені, крім згадуваної вже перекладознавчої праці, також статті на перекладознавчі теми. Зокрема: «Г. В. Квітка — перекладач власних творів», «О некоторых вопросах теории перевода», «І. Франко — перекладач Некрасова», «Об автопереводе», а також «Лермонтов и другие переводчики «Еврейской мелодии» Байрона», «Заповіт» Т. Г. Шевченка в російських перекладах» і переклади самого О. М. Фінкеля (вибрано дев'ять Шекспірових сонетів російською мовою) та скорочені коментарі до них Л. Фрідмана й А. Анікста. Разом із тим О. М. Фінкель перекладав із ідиш та писав рецензії на твори єврейських поетів (кінець 20-х — початок 30-х) — Д. Гофштейна, І. Фефера й інших.

Треба сказати, що О. Фінкель був різнобічним філологом. Його цікавила російська мова, зокрема граматика й стилістика. Якщо його

кандидатська дисертація була виконана на тему «Г. Ф. Квітка — перекладач власних творів», то докторська (1962 р.) була присвячена російській граматиці («Производные причинные предлоги в современном русском литературном языке»). Треба зазначити, що більшість праць О. Фінкеля все ж присвячена русистиці (зокрема методичні викладання російської мови в школі). Він сам написав кілька підручників та посібників із російської мови, а деякі у співавторстві з Н. М. Баженовим. Кілька праць О. Фінкель створив також на теми загального мовознавства й української літератури та мови. Зокрема: «Пам'яті Квітки-Основ'яненка» (Харків, 1928), «Переклад у середній школі» (УМШ, 1952, №5), «Способи вираження граматичних значень в українській мові» (УМШ, 1933, №2), «Прикметники з префіксом без-» (УМЛШ, 1967, №7), «Дієприслівникові звороти з причинним значенням» (Харків,1962), «Короткий вступ до теоретичної стилістики» (1927) тощо.

О. Фінкель, працюючи в різних галузях філологічної науки, вочевидь не надавав своїй теоретичній праці з перекладу того значення, якого вона насправді заслуговувала. Цілком очевидно, що поява аналогічної праці А. Федорова російською мовою була офіційно сприйнята як пріоритетніша, тим більше, що з 1927 року почала згортатися українізація, а отже, почався комуністичний шовіністичний наступ проти «буржуазного націоналізму» — жупелу, що став основним звинуваченням у роки українського розстріляного відродження. Автор «Теорії й практики перекладу», який об'єктивно згадував імена М. Зерова, Г. Майфета, І. Кулика, М. Драй-Хмари, П. Филиповича, Д. Загула й інших «ворогів народу», треба гадати, побоявся навіть заїкатися про подальші видання своєї майже «крамольної» вже у 30-ті роки праці. Тим часом ця праця мала посісти виняткове місце в історії українського перекладознавства. Саме після неї майже традиційно всі теоретичні й практичні посібники та підручники почали називати «Теорія та/й практика перекладу».

Але повернімося до Фінкелевої «Теорії та практики перекладу», що складалася з чотирьох частин. Першу частину, названу автором «Теоретичною», повністю відведено коротенькому і далекому від глибокого й системного огляду історії перекладу в Європі (починаючи від Септуагінти), але оминаючи переклад в інші періоди його розвитку, зокрема в Росії та в Україні. В цій частині автор висловлює ряд своїх тверджень про «прозаїчний переклад», якому нібито належить виключно ідейно-практичний вплив на «художній переклад» (власне поетичний переклад. — ***І. К.***), що має, на його думку, «виключно мовне та літературне значення», оскільки він збагачує «поетичні засоби певної мови, поширюючи її арсенал та надаючи їй більшу міць, гнучкість та різнобарвність» (с. 53). Автор переконливо доводить, посилаючись на самого Цицерона, а також на авторитет Квінтиліана, В. Гумбольдта і М. Старицького, що переклад сприяє поліпшенню стилю мови, на яку він робиться. Цікаво, що педагогічне значення перекладу О. Фінкель бачив у царині сприяння навчанню рідної мови.

Цікавим є також підхід О. Фінкеля до визначення способів перекладу, серед яких він виокремлює такі найголовніші:

1) Передача літерами мови перекладу слів/фраз в іншомовній вимові (якщо ці слова/фрази зрозумілі мовцям перекладу). З таким способом «перекладу» навряд чи хто сьогодні погодиться, звичайно, позаяк передача буквами змістових одиниць мови оригіналу взагалі не є перекладом.

2) Другим способом (чи методом) перекладу О. Фінкель називає всім відомий *дослівний переклад*;

3) Третім способом — *вільний переклад*, коли можливі свавільні зміни оригіналу в перекладі;

4) Четвертим способом — *адекватний переклад*. Отже, термін «адекватний переклад» увів зовсім не А. Смірнов, який 1931 року зробив спробу визначення його значення. Цим терміном користувалися й раніше. О. Фінкель навіть вважав, що «адекватним перекладом» здійснювали свої найкращі відтворення змісту й художніх особливостей оригіналу всі видатні перекладачі в Німеччині в другій половині XIX ст., і навіть Й. Гердер «*виконав адекватно*» свої «Голоси народів» (1769 р.) — усім відомі переклади народних пісень, із-поміж яких українським відведено винятково високе місце, бо він їх вважав найдовершенішими змістовно, художньо й мелодійно, найпоетичнішими за образністю в усій європейській пісенній творчості.

До «адекватних перекладів» О. Фінкель зарахував переклади братів Шлегелів, Тіка, Гумбольдта й інших послідовників Гердера в Німеччині. Разом з цим він фактично підтримав постулат І. Кулика про ідеологічне «підтягування» перекладу під відповідну читацьку (зокрема «соціалістичну» українську) аудиторію. Таке «підтягування» перекладів, їх штучна ідеологізація, звичайно, призводить до спотворення оригіналу та до цілковитої переорієнтації читачів, а тому не може бути за жодних обставин виправдана, як не могла бути виправдана й вимога В. Державина про стилізацію перекладів. Цю вимогу В. Державина засудив О. Фінкель. Тому варто погодитися і з висновком автора праці про те, що «Тільки показуючи й визначаючи, як і в якій мірі окремі елементи твору піддаються перекладу, можна наблизитися до уяснення того, яким повинен і бути художній переклад» (с. 79). Отже, за О. Фінкелем, деталі оригіналу — важливі елементи перекладу. Але чи всі і які саме деталі?

У другому розділі, що має назву «Переклад прозаїчний нехудожній», О. Фінкель, за Ш. Баллі, визначає найперше типи художніх текстів, а саме: 1) науковий тип тексту і його переклад та 2) «адміністративний» тип тексту і його переклад. Останній тип текстів ще зараховує: «урядові акти, міжнародні ноти і пакти, з одного боку, та місцеві розпорядження, урядницькі правила, оголошення — з другого, ділову мову... з її особливими виразами та фразеологією...» (с. 84). За окремий жанр визначено (задовго до визначення його в Москві І. Гальперіним. — ***І. К.***) і публіцистичний. Хоча й тут автор вирізняє окремо мову газети. При цьому, однак, О. Фінкель дотримується

думки, що «*пролетарський*» публіцист пише не тою мовою, що буржуазний» і посилається на свою статтю про публіцистику В. І. Леніна. Проте суть, звичайно, не в хибних заідеологізованих поглядах, яких О. Фінкель міг щиро й не дотримуватися (принаймні сьогодні це можна хоча б припускати), а суть у тому, що він досить чітко, з погляду мовознавців XXI сторіччя, визначав головні особливості різних підтипів/підстилів мовлення та підходи до їх перекладу. О. Фінкель охарактеризував науковий текст, указав на термінолексику, яка тоді розроблялася українськими фахівцями, визначив головні шляхи створення національних терміносистем.

Що ж до синтаксичних/структурних особливостей нехудожнього мовлення, то тут О. Фінкель робив цілком логічні (й сучасні) висновки, а саме, що «всі національні мовні ознаки (в перекладі. — ***І. К.***) мають зникнути, і надо всім мусить панувати лише система мови перекладу з усіма її засобами та формами, які виконують ті самі функції, що їх у мові оригіналу виконують інші засоби та форми» (с. 93). Добре розуміючи, проте, що мова перекладу не може не зберігати певних притаманних тільки їй ознак, О. Фінкель зауважує, що «перекладач мимоволі передасть дещо з національних ознак, як зберігає їх і авторська мова теж». При цьому О. Фінкель підкреслював, що для виконання зразкових перекладів, наприклад, економічних текстів «перекладачі мусять уважніше ставитися до аргументації та логічного апарату автора» (с. 96).

Аналогічні вимоги О. Фінкель ставив і до перекладу юридичних текстів, які, на жаль, у нього зводяться фактично до тодішніх газетних текстів і їх українських перекладів. Досить часто при цьому автор зараховував до юридичних текстів суто інформаційні тексти (с. 101). При цьому він піддавав критиці тільки стилістичні огріхи щодо слововживання, і мало чи зовсім не зверталося уваги на точне відтворення специфічних особливостей саме юридичних текстів (угод, контрактів тощо).

Нарешті, в розділі третьому («Переклад прозаїчний художній») О. Фінкель зосереджує свою увагу на доборі й перекладі контекстуальних синонімів — проблеми, що хвилювала й хвилює перекладачів і досі. Разом з цим зосереджується увага і на перекладі реалій суспільного життя різних націй, зокрема на «національних формах привітань й індивідуальних привітаннях, на назвах національних чинів і посад, мір, ваги, монет (власне грошових одиниць)» тощо. Автор виступає проти заміни їх національними відповідниками і разом із тим припускає в певних випадках заміну таких реалій рівнозначними відповідниками мови перекладу (с. 112—113). О. Фінкель запропонував методи відтворення цих мовних одиниць, які (методи відтворення) й закріпилися в перекладацькій практиці, а саме: транскрипцію, калькування, заміни (с. 119). Адже «не можна ані Ксенофонта, ані Тамерлана, ані Скопіна-Шуйського називати генералами» (с. 117). Іноді при цьому О. Фінкель пропонує «де треба, не відшуковувати свої замінники, а залишати оригінальні назви», що краще, «ніж фальсифікувати текст чи утворювати

хибні асоціації» (с. 119). І з цією порадою, зробленою ще майже 80 років тому, також не можна не погодитися й сьогодні.

Зачепив О. Фінкель і деякі інші вже традиційні і в наш час питання теорії та практики перекладу, зокрема такі, як переклад архаїзмів, неологізмів, професіоналізмів, деяких типів усталених сполучень слів. Він проілюстрував свої зауваги прикладами неправильного перекладу тих чи інших мовних одиниць у М. Садовського («Тарас Бульба» Гоголя), О. Варавви, А. Ніковського та інших перекладачів. Однак поряд із загалом слушною критикою недоглядів натрапляємо у праці й на хибні твердження автора на кшталт: «Як можна перекласти такі вирази, як Sacramento, Goddam тощо». І сам же відповідає: «Звичайно, що ніяк, і краще навіть не пробувати» (с. 127), хоча знайти близькі відповідники цим лайливим словам у багатьох мовах перекладу не складає великих труднощів. І це знає кожен навіть середньої руки перекладач. Та в неперекладність цих та подібних слів, мабуть, не зовсім вірив і сам О. Фінкель, оскільки дещо нижче в рецензованій праці він і сам зазнає, що солдатська мова австрійської армії є, звичайно, не та, що в російській, але перекладач «Приключений бравого солдата Швейка» поруч із перекладом відповідних висловів використовував, мабуть, і метод аналогії (с. 128). То чому ж тоді, всупереч твердженням О. Фінкеля, українським перекладачам не шукати й знаходити ті ж аналоги для Sacramento і Goddam?

Не мав О. Фінкель рації і тоді, коли стверджував, що нібито «більшість перекладачів вважає, що головне у перекладі — це передати змістову точність, ідентичність значення. За таким поглядом переклад художнього твору перетворюється на переказ, бо саме елемент *художності в перекладі* (курсив наш. — ***І. К.***) знехтувано» (с. 129).

Зрозуміло, що в 20-ті роки (та й не тільки в ті роки, але й набагато пізніше) такі переклади були, як були тоді й справді художні переклади високого фахового, а отже, й літературно-мистецького рівня. Назвати хоча б кращі прозові переклади В. Самійленка, М. Іванова, В. Підмогильного й того ж таки критикованого О. Фінкелем М. Садовського, який, за свідченням тогочасних театральних критиків, зробив прекрасний переклад Гоголевого «Ревізора» українською мовою. А якими достовірними, блискучими вже тоді були непоодинокі поетичні переклади В. Самійленка, М. Зерова, молодого М. Рильського. Та й «точна передача змісту» ніколи не шкодила жодному перекладові, скоріше навпаки. І хоча О. Фінкель не вказував, яким (прозовим чи поетичним) перекладам шкодить, на його думку, «точна передача змісту», та з наведеного нібито «точного» власного пародійного російського перекладу Тичининого «На майдані» видно, що йдеться про поетичний переклад, про який давно вже існує дві паралельні, хоч і не всіма визнані, думки:

1) переклад має передавати зміст віршового твору;

2) переклад має передавати художніми образами й евфонічними засобами дух і музикальність, внутрішній «вогонь» твору. Тимчасом

пропонований російськомовний пародійний переклад Тичининого твору мало що передає сповна, а тому навряд чи може хоч якоюсь мірою бути ілюстрацією висловленої О. Фінкелем тези про нижчевартість змісту в перекладах поетичних творів.

Належне місце О. Фінкель приділив у своїй праці й художнім тропам і запропонував цілком сучасні способи їх передачі в перекладі. Він усебічно проілюстрував окремі вдалі й невдалі способи їх відтворення різними перекладачами. Автор цілком слушно наголошує на труднощах перекладу тропів, пов'язаних зі «специфічними особливостями кожної мови, бувши побудовані або на певних культурно-історичних асоціаціях (оно- та антономасія), або на грі слів (каламбур), або на прислів'ях (фразеологія)» (с. 133). Можна стверджувати, отже, що тема тропів не була обійдена О. Фінкелем, який поклав добрий початок для її ширшого вивчення в майбутньому.

Сказане стосується і фразеології, для вивчення якої, як зазначав учений, «Сучасна перекладацька традиція має три шляхи щодо їх відтворювання: 1) коли передається тільки зміст фразеологічного вислову, незважаючи на його стилістичні відміни; другий шлях — це точний, майже дослівний переклад фразеологічного вислову. Неясності, що постають унаслідок цього, пояснюються в примітках; третій шлях є підстановка фразеологічного вислову, властивого мові перекладу, замість фразеологічного вислову оригінального з тим або дуже близьким значенням» (с. 133—134). Тобто, знову ж таки подано стартові кроки до вивчення проблеми, що потім всебічно освоювалася в національних мовознавствах впродовж наступних десятиріч.

О. Фінкель радив у художньому перекладі зберігати синтаксичні особливості оригіналу — полісинтетичні, асиндетичні, паралелізми, анафору, епіфору, позаяк «відтворення синтакси є не перенесення форм оригіналу до перекладу, а вживання тих самих естетичних типів» (с. 137—138). О. Фінкель справедливо засуджував підміну перекладу прозового художнього твору його переказом і переробкою з порушенням синтаксичної естетики оригіналу. «Доки перекладачі не зрозуміють, що їхня праця є праця митця, доки переклад для них не буде *мистецтво* (курсив наш. — ***І. К.***), дотоді переклади стоятимуть на непорушному рівні штампованого шаблону, даючи читачеві замість бажаного автора тільки сурогат або підробку» (с. 1480) — висновок, який зберігає свою актуальність і в епоху інформаційної революції.

Нарешті, в останньому розділі праці аналізовано особливості віршового перекладу, який «є занадто складніший», оскільки «в ньому треба погодити й передати більшу кількість різноманітних естетичних ознак» (с. 149), а найперше — евфонію, що, власне, окрім асонансів та алітерацій (та й то зрідка), відтворити неможливо. Інша річ — ритмомелодика. Тут О. Фінкель вимагав від перекладачів відтворення як еквілінеарності, так і всіх рим (чоловічої, жіночої, вокалічної, консонантної), як і характеру ритмічної організації оригіналу.

Разом із цим автор визнавав, що «той самий оригінал можна відтворити на декілька метрів, які треба визнати принципово-рівними» (с. 161), з чим навряд чи всі сучасні перекладознавці беззаперечно згодяться. Тим більше, що О. Фінкель наводить приклад кількох перекладів однієї оди Горація, хоча в римській латинській поезії взагалі не було рими, тому її в перекладах, мовляв, можна римувати чи не римувати. Однак висновок він робить усе ж правильний: «Вірний шлях є один — зберігати розмір першотвору» (с. 164). У цьому, проте, О. Фінкель, як видно, не був до кінця впевнений і вважав, що тут «треба мати спеціальні дослідження, які б висвітили ці питання не тільки історично, але й теоретично» (с. 165) — зауважує він цілком логічно. Треба сказати, що так само подано і загальний висновок про поетичний переклад: «Натрапляючи на будь-який художній елемент твору, перекладач мусить дбати про максимум його відтворення, розглядаючи його у зв'язку з загальною поетикою твору, його літературну валентність, погоджуючи його з іншими стилістичними й тематичними елементами і маючи на увазі *свою мову* та *свою культуру*» (с. 177). (Курсив наш. — ***І. К.***).

Сучасний перекладач поетичних творів і теоретик перекладу, безсумнівно, цілком погодяться з таким твердженням автора.

Із наведеного короткого екскурсу в історію українського перекладу й аналізу стану в перекладознавстві другої половини 20-х років минулого сторіччя читач, сподіваємось, отримав певне уявлення і про тогочасний стан критики літературного перекладу взагалі та перекладознавства зокрема, як і про роль у перекладознавчому процесі перших «хоробрих» І. Кулика, Д. Загула, М. Зерова, літературознавця Г. Майфета й критика та перекладача В. Державина. Головні тогочасні українські поети, літературознавці й перекладачі розглядали й частково вирішували поточні питання, що поставали в практиці прозового й поетичного перекладу в Україні періоду «розстріляного відродження» другої половини 20-х — першої половини 30-х років минулого сторіччя — періодів голодоморів і більшовицького терору в Україні. Проте перші теоретичні висновки й узагальнення, як і визначення завдань українського (та й загального) перекладознавства в роки новонародженого після короткого періоду незалежності України 1917—1922 років теоретичного перекладознавства були загалом правильно зроблені харківським філологом, викладачем і перекладачем О. М. Фінкелем.

Саме О. Фінкель уперше в тодішньому СРСР опублікував 1929 року свою працю «Теорія й практика перекладу» (Харків: Державне видавництво України). У цій праці автор зробив спробу визначити погляди на роль перекладу найвизначніших європейських філологів та перекладачів минулого й тогочасного періодів розвитку художньої літератури. Проте йому вдалось принаймні найважливіше — коротко оглянути тогочасний перекладознавчий процес в Україні. Він визначив найважливіші питання перекладознавства, що ставилися й вирішувалися або й зовсім не вирішувалися за браком належних теоретичних напрацювань у тодішньому українському (та й російському

дореволюційному і радянському) перекладознавстві. Причому не тільки в художньому перекладі, а й у перекладах інших текстових підстилів — діловому, правознавчому, науковому, публіцистичному.

На превеликий жаль (і про це треба щиро сказати), О. Фінкель із незрозумілих причин, сміливо й успішно почавши освоювати нове й зовсім не «зоране ніким» до нього поле діяльності, що обіцяло закріпити його пріоритет у цій науково-дослідній галузі, самочинно залишив цю науково перспективну для нього галузь. Це тим більше здається дивним, адже він окреслив коло питань, що були важливими для теорії та практики тогочасного і майбутнього розвитку ще зовсім молодого перекладознавства як науки. Особливо це стосувалося поетичного перекладу, яким він фактично все своє життя активно займався, перекладаючи сонети Шекспіра російською мовою, які були в свій час (1969, 1976 і 1986 рр.) прихильно сприйняті в роки їх опублікування (1969, 1976 і 1986) критиками Л. Фрізманом та О. Аніктом.

Повний текст: https://www.vsesvit-journal.com/old/content/view/396/41/

Post-reading:

1. Draft a short article review.
2. Outline the main challenges in translation studies in historical perspective.
3. Find additional information about Ilko Vakulovych Korunets' (articles, interviews, book reviews).

Eugene Nida

Eugene Albert Nida (November 11, 1914 – August 25, 2011) was an American linguist who developed the dynamic equivalence theory of Bible translation and is considered one of the founders of modern translation studies.

Nida graduated *summa cum laude* from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1936. After graduating he attended Camp Wycliffe, where Bible translation theory was taught. In this period, Nida became a founding charter member of Wycliffe Bible Translators, a related organization to the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

In 1937, Nida undertook studies at the University of Southern California, where he obtained a master's degree in New Testament Greek in 1939. In that same year he became interim pastor of Calvary Church of Santa Ana, California following the resignation of its founding pastor.

In 1943, Nida received his doctorate in linguistics from the University of Michigan.

Nida retired in the early 1980s, although he continued to give lectures in universities all around the world, and lived in Alpine, Arizona, USA; Madrid, Spain and Brussels, Belgium. He died in Madrid on August 25, 2011, aged 96.

In 1943, Nida began his career as a linguist with the American Bible Society (ABS). He was quickly promoted to Associate Secretary for Versions, then worked as Executive Secretary for Translations until his retirement.

Nida was instrumental in engineering the joint effort between the Vatican and the United Bible Societies (UBS) to produce cross-denominational Bibles in translations across the globe. This work began in 1968 and was carried on in accordance with Nida's translation principle of Functional Equivalence.

Nida received an Honorary Doctorate from Heriot-Watt University in 1974.

Nida has been a pioneer in the fields of translation theory and linguistics.

His doctoral dissertation, *A Synopsis of English Syntax*, was the first full-scale analysis of a major language according to the "immediate-constituent" theory. His textbook *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words* was one of the major works of American Structuralism. It remained the only thorough introduction to the field for decades and is still valuable for its many examples and exercises.

His most notable contribution to translation theory is Dynamic Equivalence, also known as Functional Equivalence. For more information, see "Dynamic and formal equivalence." Nida also developed the componential analysis technique, which split words into their components to help determine equivalence in translation (e.g. "bachelor" = male + unmarried). This is, perhaps, not the best example of the technique, though it is the most well-known.

Nida's dynamic-equivalence theory is often held in opposition to the views of philologists who maintain that an understanding of the source text (ST) can be achieved by assessing the inter-animation of words on the page, and that meaning is self-contained within the text (i.e. much more focused on achieving semantic equivalence).

This theory, along with other theories of correspondence in translating, are elaborated in his essay *Principles of Correspondence*, where Nida begins by asserting that given that "no two languages are identical, either in the meanings given to corresponding symbols or in the ways in which symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences, it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence, there can be no fully exact translations." While the impact of a translation may be close to the original, there can be no identity in detail.

Principles of Correspondence (extracts)

Full text: Nida, E. (2004). Principles of Correspondence. The Translation Studies Reader. NY: Taylor & Fran-cis Group, 153–167)

SINCE NO TWO languages are identical, either in the meanings given to corresponding symbols or in the ways in which such symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences, it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence there can be no fully exact translations. The total impact of a translation may be reasonably close to the original, but there can be no identity in detail. Constance B.West (1932:344) clearly states the problem: "Whoever takes upon himself to translate contracts a debt; to discharge it, he must pay not with the same money, but the same sum." One must not imagine that the process of translation can avoid a certain degree of interpretation by the translator. In fact, as D.G.Rossetti stated in 1874 (Fang 1953), "A translation remains perhaps the most direct form of commentary."

Different types of translations No statement of the principles of correspondence in translating can be complete without recognizing the many different types of translations (Herbert P.Phillips 1959). Traditionally, we have tended to think in terms of free or paraphrastic translations as contrasted with close or literal ones. Actually, there are many more grades of translating than these extremes imply. There are, for example, such ultraliteral translations as interlinears; while others involve highly concordant relationships, e.g. the same source-language word is always translated by one— and only one—receptor-language word. Still others may be quite devoid of artificial restrictions in form, but nevertheless may be over traditional and even archaizing.

Some translations aim at very close formal and semantic correspondence, but are generously supplied with notes and commentary. Many are not so much concerned with giving information as with creating in the reader something of the same mood as was conveyed by the original. Differences in translations can generally be accounted for by three basic factors in translating: (1) the nature of the message, (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and (3) the type of audience. Messages differ primarily in the degree to which content or form is the dominant consideration. Of course, the content of a message can never be completely abstracted from the form, and form is nothing apart from content; but in some messages the content is of primary consideration, and in others the form must be given a higher priority. For example, in the Sermon on the Mount, despite certain important stylistic qualities, the importance of the message far exceeds considerations of form. On the other hand, some of the acrostic poems of the Old Testament are obviously designed to fit a very strict formal "strait jacket." But even the contents of a message may differ widely in applicability to the receptorlanguage audience. For example, the folk tale of the Bauré Indians of Bolivia, about a giant who led the animals in a symbolic dance, is interesting to an Englishspeaking audience, but to them it has not the same relevance as the Sermon on the Mount. And even the Bauré Indians themselves recognize the Sermon on the

Mount as more significant than their favorite "how-it-happened" story. At the same time, of course, the Sermon on the Mount has greater relevance to these Indians than have some passages in Leviticus.

In poetry there is obviously a greater focus of attention upon formal elements than one normally finds in prose. Not that content is necessarily sacrificed in translation of a poem, but the content is necessarily constricted into certain formal molds. Only rarely can one reproduce both content and form in a translation, and hence in general the form is usually sacrificed for the sake of the content. On the other hand, a lyric poem translated as prose is not an adequate equivalent of the original. Though it may reproduce the conceptual content, it falls far short of reproducing the emotional intensity and flavor. However, the translating of some types of poetry by prose may be dictated by important cultural considerations. For example, Homer's epic poetry reproduced in English poetic form usually seems to us antique and queer—with nothing of the liveliness and spontaneity characteristic of Homer's style. One reason is that we are not accustomed to having stories told to us in poetic form. In our Western European tradition such epics are related in prose. For this reason E.V.Rieu chose prose rather than poetry as the more appropriate medium by which to render The Iliad and The Odyssey.

The particular purposes of the translator are also important factors in dictating the type of translation. Of course, it is assumed that the translator has purposes generally similar to, or at least compatible with, those of the original author, but this is not necessarily so. For example, a San Blas story-teller is interested only in amusing his audience, but an ethnographer who sets about translating such stories may be much more concerned in giving his audience an insight into San Blas personality structure. Since, however, the purposes of the translator are the primary ones to be considered in studying the types of translation which result, the principa purposes that underlie the choice of one or another way to render a particular message are important.

The primary purpose of the translator may be information as to both content and form. One intended type of response to such an informative type of translation is largely cognitive, e.g. an ethnographer's translation of texts from informants, or a philosopher's translation of Heidegger. A largely informative translation may, on the other hand, be designed to elicit an emotional response of pleasure from the reader or listener.

A translator's purposes may involve much more than information. He may, for example, want to suggest a particular type of behaviour by means of a translation. Under such circumstances he is likely to aim at full intelligibility, and to make certain minor adjustments in detail so that the reader may understand the full implications of the message for his own circumstances. In such a situation a translator is not content to have receptors say, "This is intelligible to us." Rather, he is looking for some such response as, "This is meaningful for us." In terms of Bible translating, the people might understand a phrase such as "to change one's mind about sin" as meaning "repentance." But if the indigenous way of talking

about repentance is “spit on the ground in front of,” as in Shilluk,1 spoken in the Sudan, the translator will obviously aim at the more meaningful idiom. On a similar basis, “white as snow” may be rendered as “white as egret feathers,” if the people of the receptor language are not acquainted with snow but speak of anything very white by this phrase.

A still greater degree of adaptation is likely to occur in a translation which has an imperative purpose. Here the translator feels constrained not merely to suggest a possible line of behavior, but to make such an action explicit and compelling. He is not content to translate in such a way that the people are likely to understand; rather, he insists that the translation must be so clear that no one can possibly misunderstand. In addition to the different types of messages and the diverse purposes of translators, one must also consider the extent to which prospective audiences differ both in decoding ability and in potential interest. Decoding ability in any language involves at least four principal levels: (1) the capacity of children, whose vocabulary and cultural experience are limited; (2) the double-standard capacity of new literates, who can decode oral messages with facility but whose ability to decode written messages is limited; (3) the capacity of the average literate adult, who can handle both oral and written messages with relative ease; and (4) the unusually high capacity of specialists (doctors, theologians, philosophers, scientists, etc.), when they are decoding messages within their own area of specialization. Obviously a translation designed for children cannot be the same as one prepared for specialists, nor can a translation for children be the same as one for a newly literate adult.

Prospective audiences differ not only in decoding ability, but perhaps even more in their interests. For example, a translation designed to stimulate reading for pleasure will be quite different from one intended for a person anxious to learn how to assemble a complicated machine. Moreover, a translator of African myths for persons who simply want to satisfy their curiosity about strange peoples and places will produce a different piece of work from one who renders these same myths in a form acceptable to linguists, who are more interested in the linguistic structure underlying the translation than in cultural novelty.

Two basic orientations in translating

Since “there are, properly speaking, no such things as identical equivalents” (Belloc 1931 and 1931a:37), one must in translating seek to find the closest possible equivalent. However, there are fundamentally two different types of equivalence: one which may be called formal and another which is primarily dynamic.

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This

means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness.

The type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a "gloss translation," in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original. Such a translation might be a rendering of some Medieval French text into English, intended for students of certain aspects of early French literature not requiring a knowledge of the original language of the text. Their needs call for a relatively close approximation to the structure of the early French text, both as to form (e.g. syntax and idioms) and content (e.g. themes and concepts). Such a translation would require numerous footnotes in order to make the text fully comprehensible.

A gloss translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. For example, a phrase such as "holy kiss" (Romans 16:16) in a gloss translation would be rendered literally, and would probably be supplemented with a footnote explaining that this was a customary method of greeting in New Testament times.

In contrast, a translation which attempts to produce a dynamic rather than a formal equivalence is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (Rieu and Phillips 1954). In such a translation one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship, that the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message.

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message. Of course, there are varying degrees of such dynamic-equivalence translations. One of the modern English translations which, perhaps more than any other, seeks for equivalent effect is J.B.Phillips' rendering of the New Testament. In Romans 16:16 he quite naturally translates "greet one another with a holy kiss" as "give one another a hearty handshake all around."

Between the two poles of translating (i.e. between strict formal equivalence and complete dynamic equivalence) there are a number of intervening grades, representing various acceptable standards of literary translating. During the past fifty years, however, there has been a marked shift of emphasis from the formal to the dynamic dimension. A recent summary of opinion on translating by literary artists, publishers, educators, and professional translators indicates clearly that the present direction is toward increasing emphasis on dynamic equivalences (Cary 1959).

Linguistic and cultural distance

In any discussion of equivalences, whether structural or dynamic, one must always bear in mind three different types of relatedness, as determined by the linguistic and cultural distance between the codes used to convey the messages. In some instances, for example, a translation may involve comparatively closely related languages and cultures, e.g. translations from Frisian into English, or from Hebrew into Arabic. On the other hand, the languages may not be related, even though the cultures are closely parallel, e.g. as in translations from German into Hungarian, or from Swedish into Finnish (German and Swedish are IndoEuropean languages, while Hungarian and Finnish belong to the Finno-Ugrian family). In still other instances a translation may involve not only differences of linguistic affiliation but also highly diverse cultures, e.g. English into Zulu, or Greek into Javanese.

Where the linguistic and cultural distances between source and receptor codes are least, one should expect to encounter the least number of serious problems, but as a matter of fact if languages are too closely related one is likely to be badly deceived by the superficial similarities, with the result that translations done under these circumstances are often quite poor. One of the serious dangers consists of so-called "false friends," i.e. borrowed or cognate words which seem to be equivalent but are not always so, e.g. English demand and French demander, English ignore and Spanish ignorar, English virtue and Latin virtus, and English deacon and Greek diakonos.

When the cultures are related but the languages are quite different, the translator is called upon to make a good many formal shifts in the translation. However, the cultural similarities in such instances usually provide a series of parallelisms of content that make the translation proportionately much less difficult than when both languages and cultures are disparate. In fact, differences between cultures cause many more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure.

Post-reading:

1. Summarize the main points presented in the article.
2. What are two main orientations in translation (according to the article)?
3. How does the author define linguistic and cultural distance?
4. Find additional information about the author (articles, books, lectures, translations, etc..)

Psycholinguistic mechanisms in translation (extracts)

Marta Bogusławska-Tafelska

Full article - https://bibliotekanauki.pl/articles/444204.pdf

In the 60's and 70's, translation studies, embedded in linguistics, were preoccupied with the analyses of the source and target language texts (SL and TL texts). What was attracting the scholarly attention was the concept of translation equivalence1. All the research was orchestrated around the performance model that would ultimately direct the translator towards obtaining formal equivalence. What is vital to notice, that product-oriented approach rejected the human aspect, that is, the author, the translator and the receiver of the original and the translated texts. Any subjectivity was excluded.

First references to psycholinguistic aspects in translation were found in the book of the influential German theorist Wolfram Wilss (The Science of Translation 1982). In his book, Wilss devoted his attention to such issues as psycholinguistics, creativity and intuition in translation. It was only at that time that the first references to a translator as the subjective quality transmitter were made in translation studies. However, at that time, the psycholinguistic considerations about the process of translation were in their infancy. The synchronisation of the psycholinguistic concepts and the translation theory took place in the 80's when the Think-Aloud method of data elicitation was borrowed from the cognitive science (Think-Aloud protocols - TAPs). The new approach to translation (represented by such scholars as Hans Krings, Wolfgang Lörscher, Paul Kussmaul, Riitta Jääskeläinen or Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit) resulted in a considerable shift from the productoriented to the process-oriented (dynamic) perspective […].

1. Psycholinguistics as an independent field of study

Today, some psychologists investigating linguistic behaviours, do not accept the fact that psycholinguistics, having reached a proper maturity, gained a scientific autonomy. Voices like that of the Polish psychologist Ida Kurcz claiming that ”psycholinguistics is a branch of psychology” (translation mine), still can be heard (Kurcz 1992: 5). Although, the inspiration to create a new branch of study came from psychology (cf. Puppel 1998: 183), for the time being, psycholinguistics has been functioning as an independent field of research. The fact that psycholinguistic considerations bring about the new perspective in a number of autonomous linguistic areas, translation theory being one of them, constitutes the evidence for it. Besides, more and more scientifically valid theories, models and assumptions are crystallising within this area, which provide the material for further, long-term

research. While confronting such problems as linguistic processing, the mapping of the mind or the ways in which the information stored in the cognitive system is utilised in the production and understanding of expressions, psycholinguistics proves to be an interdisciplinary field of research; it is a hybrid of such sciences as psychology, linguistics, sociology, neuropsychology, anthropology and artificial intelligence (cf. Puppel 1996: 138).

2. A translator's expert role

Recently, the psycholinguistic research has comprised the area of Artificial Intelligence. Scientists are curious whether a computer is able to pattern the human problem-solving process. In addition, they want to find the limits of AI. Among the issues which are of particular interest for linguists, are expert systems that is, ''specialised software packages which are intended to allow users to benefit from the knowledge of an expert human consultant [...]. Expert systems are used to give advice to users, to communicate knowledge contained in the database to them and to organise that knowledge in novel ways" (cit. Bell 1993: 39). So far, expert systems have not been applied to translation. However, their application is but a matter of the nearest future. I have outlined the issue of the expert systems to show the origin of another concept which will be presented here, namely, the expert role introduced by Paul Kussmaul in his monograph on translation training. Kussmaul focuses his attention not on software products as such but on that human expert consultant standing behind. According to the scholar, a professional translator is characterised not only by his or her translation skills, but also by the self-awareness and self-confidence he or she shows with regard to his or her professional activities. Professionalism equates superior content knowledge but also the sense of the relevance of information, the ability to assess the translation situation and one's strengths and weaknesses, last of all, good monitoring skills. To control the process of translation, a translator must act as an expert. What is significant, expert behaviour is not a personality characteristic. Rather, it is a role acquired as a consequence of one's ability to give profound and well-grounded explanations to one's translation decisions. In short, a broadly understood translation competence including the psycholinguistic and general world-knowledge plus proper training, decide whether a trainee translator will eventually adopt the expert professional role (cf. Kussmaul 1995: 32; LeMaistre 1988). The methodological implications for training of translators will be demonstrated in the concluding section of this paper […].

3. Mediating across languages

There is no total symmetry between language systems, as far as such formal aspects as lexicon, syntax or semantics are concerned. Numerous contrastive analyses have provided the documentation for it. Also, languages being embedded in some culture-specific environment, can differ radically in terms of pragmatic and functionalist parameters. At this point, a fundamen tal question arises, namely: why is translating across languages possible at all? While trying to find the answer

to it, one should focus one's attention on the mechanisms that lay at the bottom of all language performance (the translation act being one of its variations) and may be attributed universally to all human language systems, regardless the culture or geographical position. In the below presented model of the translation process one will easily notice this twofold character of the linguistic processing (that is, universal occurrence and environment-specific modelling).

[…]

5. The translation process

As concerns the model of the creative translation process, it has the following structure: - preparation, - incubation, - illumination, - evaluation (cf. Kussmaul 1995: 40). The model being the theoretical construct, encapsulates the distinct, mental in nature phases of the process. In practise, however, the dividing lines between these phases are not clear-cut. As Kussmaul notices (1995:49), there are moves forward and backward in the process and the phases tend to overlap. Below, the next phases in the process will be briefly discussed. I also intend to present the report on a study conducted for the purpose of my M.A. thesis. The Think-aloud experiment was orchestrated to confirm the hypotheses put forth by psycholinguistically-minded scholars within the translation studies. Much attention was devoted to the psychological profiles of the subjects as translators. My intention was to check whether those translators-to-be assumed the expert roles and how their attitudes affected the translation performance […].

6. Guidelines for future translators

The practical aspect, which refers to the vital methodological implications, constitutes a great advantage of the mentalistic considerations within translatology. As, today, the standards imposed on translators are enormous, the need arises to formulate concrete methodological guidelines for translators-to-be. Psycholinguistic considerations may help those inexperienced, first, to preserve good solutions to translation problems that are lost somewhere along the translation process; second, to monitor and steer the mental processing, so that potential errors or mistranslations are ultimately avoided. Putting it in more general terms, the psycholinguistic orientation in translation studies helps the translator to shape his or her expert behaviour. As Paul Kussmaul states in his monograph, even those with weak personality features may eventually become competent, self-assured translators (cf. Kussmaul 1995: 32). In the below sections of this paper, I will present some practical tips and suggestions which, if followed, may facilitate considerably translation procedure. This pedagogical help has been collected from the research papers and monographs of the psycholinguistically minded scholars - Kussmaul, Lörscher, Jääskeläinen, Tirkkonen-Condit and Krings. Also, my own preliminary study confirmed the importance of these 'tricks of the trade' in the translator training. Below, the following notions will be briefly discussed: the balance between top-down and bottom-up processing, self-monitoring skills, the sufficient degree of precision, last of all, emotions in cognition.

6.1. The balance between the bottom-up and top-down processes

A university training is usually focused on teaching English as a foreign language, as a result, the emphasis in the curriculum is put on extending students' lexical repertoire, while the fact that texts are always embedded into some extralinguistic context, seems to be neglected. Today, commonly it so happens that a teacher provides his or her students with a pile of lists containing vocabulary to memorise. The results are pitiful: first, the students 'translate' these items into their native language, usually taking into account one or two 'meanings' given in the dictionary; second, this searching for formal equivalence often becomes their linguistic habit; in the psycholinguistic terms, the bottom-up approach is favoured in the training, which, later on, dominates in a translator's procedure and contributes to the translation failure. From the functionalist perspective, foreign language learners should be exposed to contextualised English. Paul Kussmaul suggests that students of translation should be taught to keep the balance between their focusing on the textual data of the original and their referring to the world or extralinguistic knowledge. Here, again, problem arises, as Polish educational system promotes the autocratic teacher as the leader in the classroom instruction. He or she has no intention to activate a student's world knowledge (which means creativity). Consequently, as early as at school bottom-up processes are dominant. Coming back to translatology, the imbalance between these two types of processing brings translation inadequacies, if not errors such as false friends, faulty one-to-one corespondents, based on one's interlanguage, or the misuse of dictionaries.

6.2. The maxim of the sufficient degree of precision

As a result of the long-lasting discussion within the field of translation, a formal equivalence has been established to be a utopian concept. The oneto-one correspondence between the elements of the two different languages seems not possible (except standardised technical terminology). What may be found, however, is the partial overlapping of meaning of the two items. This is a relevant linguistic information which should be taken into account by the translator (cf. Kussmaul 1995: 93). Paul Kussmaul advocates replacing the traditional maxim saying that there should be a complete reproduction of all the componential features of a word, by the maxim of the sufficient degree of precision, which says that one should aim to preserve in the translation (of a given text) only those semantic features of TL lexical elements which are relevant in a given context. Sometimes, it is recommended to foreground those most prominent and suppress those irrelevant ones […].

7. Conclusion

To conclude, there seems to be agreement on the assumption that verbal reports are suitable to gather hypotheses about the translation process. The results obtained through Think-Aloud protocols need further verification. The theory, at

this stage, cannot be taken for granted and applied universally. However, the above presented considerations sound seriously enough to continue this research, which is the more vital as today the expectations translators must face are tremendous. As Mary Snell-Hornby observed, the translator of the future is ”a talented multicultural expert who is not only a language specialist (...) but needs to be an expert in other fields, too” (Snell-Hornby 1992: 11). One may risk a statement that, at this stage, there is no return to the traditional purely linguistic approach to translation.

Post –reading:

1. Draft a short article outline.
2. What is the link between psycholinguistics and translation?
3. What is translation process?
4. What are the main guidelines for translators?
5. Who is the “translator of the future”?

Culture and translation. The referential and expressive value of cultural references (extracts)

Laura Santamaria

When discussing the advantages and disadvantages of foreignizing and domesticating our translations, we should not forget the external factors that shape translators' decisions as far as cultural references are concerned. I am not talking about the preferences outlined by the company paying for the translation or norms in the sense described by Toury:1 rather, I would like to underline the importance of awareness of how users of the translated text process the information deriving from the references to the original culture. […]

A key concept in explaining the value ascribed to cultural objects which may belong to various groups in societies is ideology. Ideology allows each group to harbor a construct of symbolic forms, which at the same time serving to provide group cohesion. Despite the existence of numerous groups with different ideologies, and therefore different sets of values, humans are nevertheless organized in societies. Different groups share affiliation to the same society because there is a solid and homogenizing structure built around the dominant group in that society. The central social structures are the ones that bear the dominant ideology, while the peripheral groups can be termed dominated ideologies. […]

Thus, if we want to base our translation strategies on the principle of helping our target audience to socially locate any fictional situation or character, it is important that translators be aware of the cognitive processes that take place whenever we encounter something new. Various authors (Farr and Moscovici, 1984; Breakwell and Canter, 1993; and Lambert and Schanks, 1997) have indicated how new information is integrated into the individual's system of social

representations: 1. In a first stage, in a process called anchoring, and with the help of memory, we try to integrate everything into our system of mental representations, even if it is strange and different from what is already stored there. 2. In a second stage, termed objectification, the knowledge we have just acquired is integrated into the previous system. Often this process leads to a subsequent reorganization of our previous classification of social representations. […]

Domestication, of course, has its own limitations. Rabassa (1996) reminds us of this when he says that gauchos and cowboys cannot be used interchangibly as a translation. In fact, the wish to learn more about gauchos and cowboys, and their culture, can be a reason to go to watch a film or read a book. However, reference to the foreign culture has to be carried out in such a way that it builds up new knowledge on the basis of the 7 previous information the audience of the target text may have on the foreign culture. Sometimes the reference demands that the viewers have some previous knowledge of events taking place elsewhere. In Casablanca by Michael Curtis, the French officer tells the character played by Humphrey Bogart, Rick, that his past reveals his political attitude. For instance, he says that Rick was in Spain in 1936 and Ethiopia in 1935. The only way these two references can make any sense is in association with the struggle for freedom taking place in those countries at those times. It is also helpful to turn to cognitive studies to learn how the referential, and expressive value, of Spain and Ethiopia can be recovered. I do not know whether the reference was censored during the dictatorship in Spain. Translators then must be aware of the fact that viewers of subtitled films will interpret the cultural elements, that is, they will assign them expressive value from the referential value, according to the previous knowledge they have of any given cultural reference. This is the reason why different translation techniques may be used in the same translation, producing the effect that translators have not followed a coherent strategy throughout the translation. For instance, in the translation into Spanish of the film The devil's shadow, we find that the word marine is borrowed from English (basically because this branch of the American army is well known is Spain), while RUC officers become policias del Ulster, and the word residencia is used to translate green card. As a general conclusion, I would like to underline that when translating cultural references, the priority must be to reflect a particular social reality in such a way that viewers can understand it through the usual cognitive processes.

Post –reading:

1. Draft a short article outline.
2. How does cultural reference relate to translation strategies?
3. What are the basic principles the tralstator should follow in choosing the translation strategy?

Juggling Two Languages in One Mind: What Bilinguals Tell Us About Language Processing and its Consequences for Cognition (extraxts)

Judith F. Kroll, Paola E. Dussias, Cari A. Bogulski, Jorge R. Valdes Kroff

Full text:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/B9780123943934000078

Abstract

Psycholinguistics has traditionally focused on language processing in monolingual speakers. In the past two decades, there has been a dramatic increase of research on bilingual speakers, recognizing that bilingualism is not an unusual or problematic circumstance but one that characterizes more language speakers in the world than monolingualism. Most critically, cognitive scientists and neuroscientists have come to see that understanding the way that bilinguals negotiate the presence of two languages in the mind and brain may reveal processes that are otherwise obscured in monolingual speakers. In this chapter, we review the new research on language processing in bilinguals. Our starting point is the observation that both languages are active when bilinguals intend to use one language alone. The parallel activation of the two languages creates competition across the two languages, which renders the bilingual a mental juggler. Surprisingly, the resolution of cross-language competition imposes relatively few processing costs to bilinguals because they appear to develop a high level of cognitive control that permits them to switch between the two languages and, at the same time, effectively select the intended language with few errors. The expertise that bilinguals develop in juggling the two languages has consequences for language processing, because both the native and second languages change as bilingual skill is acquired, and also for domain general cognitive processes, with the result that executive function is enhanced in bilinguals relative to monolinguals. We suggest that recent research on language and cognitive processing in bilinguals requires important revisions to models of language processing based on monolingual speakers alone. In this way, bilingualism is not only an interesting phenomenon in its own right, but an important tool for cognitive and language scientists.

Introduction

In traditional accounts of psycholinguistics, bilinguals were considered a special group, to be discussed at the end of introductory textbooks in a last chapter on special groups, such as aphasics or dyslexics, or fit within a discussion of the effects of language on thought and the debate over the Whorfian hypothesis (e.g., Glucksberg & Danks, 1974) or not discussed at all (e.g., Fodor, Bever, & Garrett, 1974). In retrospect, it is remarkable given the prevalence of bilingualism in many places in the world that bilinguals would be considered a special group, as if the active use of two languages were a disorder (e.g., Grosjean, 1989). Why have

bilinguals been considered special? On grounds of parsimony, one might argue that humans evolved to speak a single language and that adding a second language (L2) complicates the situation in a way that makes bilinguals special and different from ideal speakers. But why assume that evolution selected monolingualism as the norm? There are far too many bilingual and multilingual speakers in the world to believe that multiple language use is an aberration. A more compelling argument is that the acquisition of a second language as an adult has been documented to be a difficult task, often marked by incomplete knowledge of the L2 grammar and phonology (e.g., Johnson and Newport, 1989, Piske et al., 2001). On this account, evidence on bilingualism, particularly for late acquirers of an L2 has been taken to suggest that the L2 is fundamentally different and separate from the native language, with properties that are enabled by domain-general cognitive processes but constrained by the inability to access all of the linguistic representations typically associated with the native language (e.g., Clahsen & Felser, 2006).

In the past two decades, there has been a shift to recognize the implications of the prevalence of bilingual speakers for models of language and cognition (e.g., Kroll & De Groot, 2005). An important insight is that the presence of two languages provides a lens into the way that cognitive systems interact that cannot otherwise be seen if research is restricted to speakers of a single language, particularly when that single language is highly skilled. During this period, there been an upsurge of research on L2 learning and bilingualism that has also benefited from the introduction of new tools for analyzing neurocognitive processes. Much of this new evidence has called into question assumptions about fixed constraints on language learning, revealing far greater plasticity than earlier studies suggested and a more important role for proficiency than for age of acquisition (e.g., Abutalebi et al., 2005, Steinhauer et al., 2009).

At the same time, the emerging findings suggest a language system that is far more dynamic than previously understood (e.g., Hernandez, Li, & MacWhinney, 2005). A great deal of research on L2 learning demonstrates that there is transfer from the native or dominant first language (L1) to the weaker L2 (e.g., Kroll and Stewart, 1994, MacWhinney, 2005). But if all that develops during L2 acquisition is the L2 itself, then the L1 should remain relatively constant, imposing constraints that may shape L2 learning depending on the structural relations between the two languages (e.g., Pienemann, Di Base, Kawaguchi, & Håkansson, 2005), but otherwise enabling the L2 learner to enjoy all of the native language privileges normally associated with monolingual use of the L1. What we now know is that the bilingual is not two monolinguals in one (e.g., Grosjean, 1989, Malt and Sloman, 2003), with consequences not only for the L2 but also for the native language. These changes reflect L2 learning, increasing L2 proficiency, and the context of language use. Using an L2 within the L1 environment, as is typically the case for classroom learners, differs from being immersed directly in the L2 environment, for example during study-abroad experiences (e.g., Freed, 1995, Linck et al., 2009) or following immigration to another country. Even short-term immersion in the L2 has consequences for the L1, with evidence suggesting

that the activation of the L1 may be attenuated in the L2 context. Extended immersion in the L2 environment can also produce L1 attrition when the native language is no longer used actively (e.g., Schmid, 2010), with the L2 becoming the more dominant of the bilingual's two languages. The documented changes in the two languages in different contexts suggest a dynamic interplay between the two languages even when those interactions may have the consequence of modifying the native language.

The dynamic nature of bilingual language processing is supported by what we take to be the central observation in the recent research: bilinguals cannot switch off one of the two languages at will. When they listen to speech, read, or prepare to speak in only one of their two languages, information about the language not in use is also active and influences performance (e.g., Dijkstra, 2005, Kroll et al., 2006, Marian and Spivey, 2003). Most critically, these cross-language interactions can be observed at virtually every level of language processing, including those grammatical structures that are shared across languages (e.g., Hartsuiker, Pickering, & Veltkamp, 2004). Moreover, they are not restricted to individuals at low levels of proficiency but can be seen for even highly skilled bilinguals. Cross-language activity is likewise not the consequence of speaking two languages that are similar to one another and therefore likely to produce confusion over which language is in use. Similar interactions can be observed for bilinguals whose two languages differ in script, such as Japanese and English (e.g., Hoshino & Kroll, 2008) and for bimodal bilinguals who use one written or spoken language and another signed language (e.g., Emmorey et al., 2008a, Morford et al., 2011). The parallel activation of the bilingual's two languages also has the consequence of creating cross-language interactions that are bidirectional, with the L2 influencing the L1 in a similar manner to the way that the L1 influences the L2 (e.g., Dussias, 2003a, Jared and Kroll, 2001).

If both of the bilingual's languages are active when only one language is required, one might expect to observe a heavy cost associated with bilingualism, with frequent errors of language, erratic switching, and slowed processing. Although there is some evidence for slower lexical retrieval for bilinguals relative to monolinguals (e.g., Gollan et al., 2005, Gollan et al., 2008), what is striking is that proficient bilinguals do not make inadvertent and random errors of language. At the same time, some bilinguals code switch from one language to the other when they are speaking with others who are bilingual in the same languages, switching from one language to the other in midstream within the same sentence (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 2002). Critically, code switching is orderly, with syntactic constraints providing critical information about what is or is not an acceptable switch of language. The observation that both languages are active but that bilinguals are able to select the intended language with relative accuracy suggests that they develop cognitive control that enables them to negotiate the potential cross-language competition. The presence of increased control in bilinguals has been documented in recent neuroimaging studies that show that there is differential engagement of brain areas responsible for executive function during L2 use (e.g.,

Abutalebi et al., 2008, Abutalebi and Green, 2007, Hasegawa et al., 2002). As a consequence of having to resolve cross-language competition, bilinguals appear to gain a high level of skill associated with those executive functions that are recruited during language selection. The control that bilinguals are able to exercise in using the two languages has been hypothesized to create expertise that goes beyond language use to affect cognition more generally. Bilinguals have been shown to be advantaged relative to monolinguals in ignoring irrelevant information, switching between tasks, and resolving conflict (e.g., Bialystok, Craik, Green, & Gollan, 2009).

The cognitive consequences of bilingualism hold important implications for thinking about the relation between language and cognition. If we only studied monolingual speakers of a single language, we would not know that language experience has the potential to influence executive function in the ways that have been observed. The interchange between the bilingual's two languages and between language-specific and domain-general functions provide critical information about the scope of cognitive plasticity and the way in which common or specific cognitive control mechanisms are engaged to enable fluent language processing.

Post-reading:

1. Draft a short summary of the article.
2. How have recent studies shifted the understanding of bilingualism in relation to language and cognition?
3. Why were bilinguals traditionally considered a "special group" in psycholinguistic studies?
4. What is meant by the “dynamic nature of bilingual language processing”?
5. How does the presence of two active languages influence bilinguals' executive functions and cognitive control?

The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies (extracts)

Werner Koller

Full text - https://www.sci-hub.se/10.1075/target.7.2.02kol

The activity of translating and the products of this activity, translations, are studied from various perspectives, in accordance with various theoretical interests and aims, and with recourse to various methods: literary, text-theoretical, philological, linguistic (including contrastive and psycholinguistic), comparative and cultural-historical etc. This multiplicity of approaches is reflected in a

multiplicity of definitions which conceive of the process and products of translation from the most diverse standpoints. […]

For the subject of translation research the question of how the object is to be determined is put most succinctly by asking what preconditions must be satisfied for a text to be classified as a translation and to qualify as the object of translation studies? Considering the multiplicity of theoretical approaches and objectives, a single clear answer can hardly be expected, and the legitimate field of concern will be marked out in different ways depending on which factors and conditions — as these are specified in the next section — are taken as the basis of abstraction. […]

From a linguistic and text-theoretical perspective, translation can be understood as the result of a text-processing activity, by means of which a source language text is transposed into a target-language text. Between the resultant text in L2 (the target-language text) and the source text in L1 (the source language text) there exists a relationship, which can be designated as a translational, or equivalence relation. Equivalence is a relative concept in several respects: it is determined on the one hand by the historical-cultural conditions under which texts (original as much as secondary ones) are produced and received in the target culture, and on the other by a range of sometimes contradictory and scarcely reconcilable linguistic-textual and extra-linguistic factors and conditions:

- the source and the target languages with their structural properties, possibilities and constraints,
- the "world", as it is variously classified in the individual languages,
- different realities as these are represented in ways peculiar to their respective languages,
- the source text with its linguistic, stylistic and aesthetic properties in the context of the linguistic, stylistic and aesthetic norms of the source language,
- linguistic, stylistic and aesthetic norms of the target language and of the translator,
- structural features and qualities of a text,
- preconditions for comprehension on the part of the target-language reader,
- the translator's creative inclinations and understanding of the work,
- the translator's explicit and/or implicit theory of translation,
- translation tradition,
- translation principles and the interpretation of the original text by its own author,
- the client's guidelines and the declared purpose of the translation,
- the practical conditions under which the translator chooses or is obliged to work.

Fundamental to any linguistic-textual approach in descriptive translation studies is the assumption that translations are characterised by a double linkage: firstly by its link to the source text and secondly by its link to the communicative conditions on the receiver's side. This double linkage is central in defining (and this means in particular: in differentiating) the equivalence relation. The process of

differentiating this double linkage, and of thereby rendering it operational, is achieved by distinguishing between various frameworks of equivalence; at this stage, (translational) equivalence merely means that a special relationship — which can be designated as the translation relationship — is apparent between two texts, a source (primary) one and a resultant one.

The specification of the equivalence relation follows from the definition of relational frameworks; its application presupposes that the relational frameworks be specified.12 Linguistic/textual units which differ in nature and range are regarded as target-language equivalents if they correspond to sourcelanguage elements according to the equivalence relations specified in a set of relational frameworks. Target-language equivalents answer to translational units in the source text; both the similarities and the differences between the units of the source-language and their target-language equivalents result from the degree to which the values assigned to the relational frameworks are preserved.

Post-reading:

1. Summarize the article.
2. How do historical-cultural conditions affect the equivalence between the source and target texts?
3. How do historical-cultural conditions affect the equivalence between the source and target texts?
4. What factors influence the relationship between the source text and the target text in translation?
5. How do structural properties of the source and target languages affect the translation process?

Підписано до друку 01.05.2025 р. Формат 60×84 1/16
Обл.-вид. арк. 6,33
Умовн. друк. арк. 6,44. Умовн. фарбо-відб. 6,44
Зам. № 25-005

Видавничий центр КНЛУ
Свідоцтво: серія ДК 1596 від 08.12.2003 р.