

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Кам'янець-Подільський національний університет
імені Івана Огієнка

INTRODUCTION TO TRANSLATION STUDIES

курс лекцій

Кам'янець-Подільський
2022

Укладач: О. В. Галайбіда, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської мови

Рецензенти:

А. А. Марчишина – доктор філологічних наук, завідувач кафедри англійської мови Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка

О. О. Барбанюк – кандидат філологічних наук, завідувач кафедри германських мов і зарубіжної літератури Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка

Друкується за рішенням ученої ради факультету іноземної філології Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка (протокол № 6 від 25 квітня 2022 р.).

Introduction to Translation Studies: курс лекцій (англійською мовою) / Уклад. Галайбіда О. В., Кам'янець-Подільський: ВПП «'Апостроф», 2022. 96 с.

Посібник містить тексти лекцій, укладені відповідно до робочої програми навчальної дисципліни «Вступ до перекладознавства».

Основною метою посібника є ознайомити студентів із теоретичними засадами сучасного перекладознавства як міждисциплінарної галузі та як окремої лінгвістичної дисципліни, з методологією перекладу, основними віхами історії західноєвропейського та українського перекладу, лексичними, граматичними і стилістичними аспектами перекладу та способами досягнення адекватної передачі змісту вихідного тексту. Лекції укладено з урахуванням сучасних досягнень перекладознавчої науки, праць провідних українських та закордонних лінгвістів та перекладознавців.

Посібник рекомендовано для студентів спеціальності 035 Філологія, здобувачів освіти інших спеціальностей, які вивчають навчальну дисципліну «Теорія і практика перекладу», а також усім, хто цікавиться проблемами перекладу.

Topic 1. Lecture 1. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION. A SHORT HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF EUROPEAN AND UKRAINIAN TRANSLATION

Key terms: *source language SL (мова оригіналу/джерела), target language TL (цільова мова), accurate translation (точний переклад), faithful translation (faithfulness/fidelity of translation) (вірний переклад), equivalent translation (еквівалентний переклад), adequate translation, free interpretation, free adaptation, free/loose translation, off-hand translation/interpretation, versification, sight translation/ interpretation, simultaneous translation/ interpretation, consecutive translation/ interpretation.*

The tasks: to study the definition of translation as an object of linguistic study in terms of process and outcome; the definitions of languages translated from and into; the basics of the theory of translation, functions of translation, methods, types and kinds of translation; get acquainted with a short historical outline of European and Ukrainian translation

Plan

1. Translation as a notion and subject. Connection with other disciplines.
2. Theory of Translation.
3. Functions of translation.
4. Methods, types, kinds of translation.
5. A short historical outline of European and Ukrainian translation.

References

1. Корунець І. В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2003. с.10-90.
2. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. с.6-50
3. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. 240с.
4. Основи перекладу: лексичні та граматичні аспекти: навч. посіб / За ред. В.К.Шпака. К.: Знання, 2007. 310 с.

5. Munday J. *Introducing Transaltion Studies*. Routledge, 2016. p. 6-50.
6. Newmark P. *Approaches to Translation*. New York a.o.: Prentice Hall, 1988.
7. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York and London: Prentice Hall, 1988. 215p.
8. Nida E.A., Taber C. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden : E. J. Brill, 1969. 218 p.

TRANSLATION AS A NOTION AND SUBJECT

Translation (according to I.Korunets)as a term or notion is of polysemantic nature. Its common and most general meaning is associated with the action or process of rendering/ expressing the meaning/ content of a source language word, word-group, sentence or passage (larger text) in the target language.

Translation today has several meanings:

- (1) the general subject field or phenomenon (I studied translation at university)
- (2) the product - that is, the text that has been translated (they published the Arabic translation of the report)
- (3) the process of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating (translation service).

The **process of translation** between two different written languages involvesthe changing of an original written text (the **source text** or **ST**) in the originalverbal language (the **source language** or **SL**) into a written text (the **target text**or **TT**) in a different verbal language (the **target language** or **TL**):

Source text (ST)	—————→	Target text (TT)
in source language (SL)		in target language (TL)

Interpretation which is synonymous to “translation” is used to denote the way or manner of presenting the idea of the work in translation *orally* (as well as its aesthetic, religious, political, pragmatic background and other qualitative characteristics of the work under translation). Translation, by its very nature, is an interpretation.

Interpretation unlike translation admits more freedom of the translator. Hence, the existence of *free versifications* and free adaptation which are rightly treated as

new creations (when they are of high artistic value) e.g. Aeneid («Енеїда») by I.Kotliarevskyi.

A translator is to convey not only the ideas and themes of the source text (meaning, sense); s/he should also pay attention to the adequate form to express these ideas. S/he should not become carried away with a free (loose) form of translation, nor force the target language by following the source text word for word.

Translation is not only a linguistic act; it's also a cultural one, an act of communication across cultures.

People belonging to the same linguistic community are members of a certain type of culture. They share many traditions, habits, ways of doing and saying things. They have much common knowledge about their country, its geography, history, climate, its political, economic, social and cultural institutions, accepted morals, taboos and many other things. All this information is the basis of the communicants' presuppositions, which enable them to produce and to understand messages in their linguistic form.

Effective communication with people of different cultures is especially challenging. Cultures provide people with ways of thinking, ways of seeing, hearing, and interpreting the world. Thus, the same words can mean different things to people from different cultures, even when they talk the "same" language. When the languages are different, and translation has to be used to communicate, the potential for misunderstandings increases.

In other words, *the translated message is transferred not only to another language but also to another culture.* This fact cannot but influence the translating process. In addition to overcome the linguistic barrier the translator has to surmount the cultural barrier, to make sure that the receptors of the target text are provided with the presuppositions required for their access to the message contents.

Language system is the part of semiotics dealing with sign systems. Therefore, semiotic theories may be applied to language functioning. According to the semiotic approach, *translation is language code switching.* When translating, we switch from one language to another one.

American linguist Roman Jakobson in his article “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” spoke of three possibilities of code switching:

1– **Intralinguistic translation**, or *rewording*, i.e. interpreting verbal signs through other signs of the same language. This can be done on diachronic level: Chaucer’s text is translated into modern English. When done on synchronic level, this kind of code switching is called a *paraphrase*.

2– **Interlanguage translation**, i.e. substituting verbal signs of one language by verbal signs of another language, or switching from one language code to another one. This type of code switching is translation proper, the object of Translation Studies.

3 – **Intersemiotic translation**, i.e. substituting signs of one semiotic system by signs of a different semiotic system. In its broad meaning, the term implies **transmutation** and can be illustrated by decoding some ideas and themes expressed, for example, in a poem through the “language” of music or dance.

English scholars Peter Newmark (1916-2011), Susan Bassnett (born 1945), Mona Baker (born 1953), John Catford (1917-2009), American scholar Eugene Nida (1914-2009), Ukrainian V. Koptilov (1930-2009), Ilko Korunets (1922-2018) greatly contributed to the development of Translation Theory.

Connection with other disciplines.

Translation is an interdisciplinary study. It has contacts with other disciplines:

Translation+philosophy – application of such philosophical theories as hermeneutics, deconstruction, poststructuralism.

Translation+linguistics – semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, contrastive linguistics, corpus linguistics, cognitive linguistics.

Translation +literary studies – poetics, rhetoric, literary criticism, comparative literature, narratology.

Translation +cultural studies – film studies, language and power, ideologies, gender studies, history, postcolonialism.

Translation + language engineering – lexicology, machine translation, terminology, multi-media.

THEORY OF TRANSLATION

Translation studies is the new academic discipline related to the study of the theory and phenomenon of translation.

The study of (usually literary) translation began through comparative literature, translation 'workshops' and contrastive analysis.

The second half of the 20th century has seen the in-depth study of translation, which is sometimes called Theory of Translation, Science of Translation, Translation Linguistics, or even Translatology.

It has been claimed that translation studies began with J. Holmes's paper presented at the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics, held in Copenhagen, 21-26 August 1972, "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies".

The aim of translation theory is to determine appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts and to give insight into the translation process, into the relations between thought and language, culture and speech.

There are several aspects of this branch of linguistics:

- *General theory of translation*, whose object is general notions typical of translation from any language.
- *Specific* theory of translation that deals with the regularities of translation characteristic of particular languages – for example, translation from English into Russian and vice versa.
- *Special* theory of translation that pays attention to texts of various registers and genres.

British linguist Susan Bassnett. Translation Studies (2002):

Although Translation Studies covers such a wide field, it can be roughly divided into *four general areas of interest*, each with a degree of overlap. Two are product-oriented, in that the emphasis is on the functional aspects of the TL text in relation to the SL text, and two of them are process-oriented, in that the emphasis is on analysing what actually takes place during translation.

- *The first category* involves *the History of Translation* and is a component part of literary history. The type of work involved in this area includes investigation of the theories of translation at different times, the critical response to

translations, the practical processes of commissioning and publishing translations, the role and function of translations in a given period, the methodological development of translation and, by far the most common type of study, analysis of the work of individual translators.

- *The second category, Translation in the TL culture*, extends the work on single texts or authors and includes work on the influence of a text, author or genre, on the absorption of the norms of the translated text into the TL system and on the principles of selection operating within that system.

- *The third category Translation and Linguistics* includes studies which place their emphasis on the comparative arrangement of linguistic elements between the SL and the TL text with regard to phonemic, morphemic, lexical, syntagmatic and syntactic levels.

Into this category come studies of the problems of linguistic equivalence, of language-bound meaning, of linguistic untranslatability, of machine translation, etc. and also studies of the translation problems of non-literary texts.

- *The fourth category, loosely called Translation and Poetics*, includes the whole area of literary translation, in theory and practice.

- *The fifth category, the question of evaluation*. Critics frequently evaluate a translation from one or other of two limited standpoints: from the narrow view of *the closeness of the translation to the SL text* (an evaluation that can only be made if the critic has access to both languages) or from the treatment of the TL text as a work in their own language.

FUNCTIONS OF TRANSLATION

- **Informative** (carrying some information);
- **Vocative** (appealing to target audience);
- **Aesthetic** (translation is a piece of aesthetic work, piece of culture);
- **Authoritative** (having some purpose of indicating, explaining and teaching);
- As a **means of developing the language** (sonnet was introduced to China; Hexameter to Germany);

- **Mediator** function (medium through which one literature influences the other);
- **Nation shaping function** – the component of translation which, according to H.Kochur, may “arise from the context, far from being intended by the translator”, that is the protective function as it fosters the Ukrainian language and culture.

METHODS OF TRANSLATION(according to I. Korunets)

1. **Literal translation**, which is to be employed when dealing with *separate words* whose surface form and structure, as well as their lexical meaning in the source language and in the target language, fully coincide. These are predominantly international morphemes, lexemes/words, rarer word-groups having in English and Ukrainian a literally identical or very similar presentation and identical lexical meaning: *administrator, director, region, hotel, motel, hydrometer, Tom*.

But there is a danger of

1)so called “translator’s false friends”, that is words similar in sounds but different in meaning: *conductor* – not кондуктор, but диригент; *herb* – not герб, атрава;

2)copying the structure of the source language thus breaking combination rules of his/her own language.As an example, *We often heard his name mentioned* – *Мичасточулийогоім’язгаданім*.

3) giving the primary meaning of the word or its part, whereas a semantic transformation is required:*There, there, don’t cry.* – *Там, там, неплач*

Note! Literal translation is used when rendering proper and geographical names!

2. **Verbal translating** is also employed at lexeme/ word level (used in dictionaries). But unlike literal translating it never conveys the orthographic or the sounding form of the source language units, but their denotative meaning only: fearful *страшний*, fearless *безстрашний*, helpless *безпорадний*, incorrect *неправильний*, mistrust *недовір’я*, superprofit *надприбуток*, non-interference *невтручання*, weightlessness *невагомість*. The overwhelming majority of other words, when translated verbally do not preserve their structure in the target language.

Verbal translating permits a choice among the variants. A graphic example of verbal translation is presented in the dictionaries.

3. **Word-for-word translation** is another method of rendering sense. It presents a consecutive verbal translation though at the level of word-groups and sentences. E.g. love at 1st sight – кохання з першого погляду.

But very often you need grammatical transformations to translate correctly: e.g. You are right to begin with – Почнемо з того/ припустимо, що ви маєте рацію/ що ви праві instead of Ви маєте рацію, щоб почати з...

4. **The interlinear way/ method of translating** is a conventional term for a strictly faithful rendering of sense expressed by word-groups and sentences at the level of some text. For example: Who took my book? admits only one word-for-word variant, namely: *Хто взяв мою книжку?*; In interlinear translation there are more variants: *У кого моя книжка?*; *Хто брав/ узяв мою книжку?*

5. **Literary translating** represents the highest level of a translator's activity. Any type of matter skilfully turned into the target language, especially by a regular master of the pen may acquire the faithfulness and the literary (or artistic) standard equal to that of the source language. Depending on the type of the matter under translation, this method of performance may be either *literary proper* or *literary artistic*. Literary artistic translation presents a faithful conveying of content and of the artistic merits only of a fiction/ belles-lettres passage or work. The latter may be either of a prose or a poetic genre (verse). Literary proper translation is performed on any other than fiction/ belles-lettres passages/works. These may include scientific or technical matter, didactic matter (different text-books), business correspondence, the language of documents, epistolary texts. In short, any printed or recorded method devoid of artistic devices (epithets, metaphors). But whether literary proper or literary artistic, this translation provides an equivalent rendering not only of complete content but also of the stylistic peculiarities of the passage/ work and its artistic beauty, as in belles-lettres style texts. Literary proper or literary artistic translation of a larger passage/work often requires linguistic, historical and other inquiries in order to clarify the obscure places (historic events, notions of specific national lexicon, neologisms, archaisms, etc.)

Peter Newmark in “A textbook of translation” (1988) defines 8 types of translation:

word-for-word translation The SL word-order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context.

Literal translation (*syn. direct translation*) (SL constructions are converted to the nearest TL equivalents but lexical units are translated out of context, it preserves the structure and meaning of the original but not the style and poetry)

faithful translation (*dogmatic*, preserves some degree of grammatical and lexical structure of the SL)

semantic translation (like faithful but more *flexible*, preserves aesthetic value of the SL Text)

communicative (attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original, so that language and content are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the reader)

idiomatic (reproduces the message of the original, but tends to distract nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms. The original meaning is communicated naturally as well as accurately, e.g. siblings – брати і сестри)

free (preserves the meaning but uses natural forms of the TL. Reproduces the matter without the manner. The content without the form of the original)

adaptive (the freest form of the translation, mainly used for plays and poetry: themes, characters, plots preserved, SL culture converted to the TL culture)

A strategy is an overall orientation of the translator (e.g. towards ‘free’ or ‘literal’ translation, towards the TT or ST, towards *domestication* or *foreignization*) whereas a procedure is a specific technique or method used by the translator at a certain point in a text (e.g. the borrowing of a word from the SL the addition of an explanation or a footnote in the TT).

KINDS OF TRANSLATION

Difference in written translation and interpreting has been fixed by two international professional associations: F.I.T. (Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs) or the *International Federation of Translators*, the association of written translators; and A.I.I.C. (Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence), or

the *International Association of Conference Interpreters*, dealing with oral translation.

As is seen from the name of the professional association, interpreters are often called conference interpreters, though their functions can be much broader.

Conference interpreting is known to have started after World War I, at the Conference on the Preliminaries of Peace in 1919. Until then all international meetings had been held in French, the language of 19th century diplomacy.

The first conference interpreters did **consecutive interpreting**, i.e. they delivered their translation after listening to the speaker so that there was some time between the source language text and the translation. The interpreters worked in teams of two, each into his mother tongue. At the League of Nations, interpreters went to the rostrum to deliver their translation as soon as the speaker had finished.

Occasionally speeches lasted well over an hour, so the interpreters, considering it bad taste to interrupt a speaker, developed a technique of consecutive interpreting with note-taking.

Simultaneous interpreting, i.e. interpreting almost immediately as the speaker produces the text (the interpreter can lag behind the speaker not more than 2 or 3 seconds), came into life much later, at the Nuremberg trials (1945-1946) and Tokyo trials (1946-1948) of war criminals, though some attempts had been made in the late 1920s and the early 1930s.

There is also **whispered interpreting** where the interpreter sits between the participants and whispers his/her translation to them. This type of translation is often used in a business meeting.

Kinds of translating

1. **The written from a written matter translating**, which represents a literary/ literary artistic or any other faithful sense-to-sense translating from or into a foreign language. It may also be a free interpreting performed in writing.

2. **The oral from an oral matter interpreting**, which is a regular oral sense-to-sense rendering of a speech/radio or TV interview, or recording which can proceed either in succession (after the whole matter or part of it is heard) or simultaneously with its sounding. It is an consecutive interpreting.

3. **The oral from a written matter interpreting** is nothing else than interpreting at sight. It can also proceed either simultaneously with the process of getting acquainted with the content of the written matter, or in succession (after each part of it is first read through and comprehended).

4. **The written translating from an orally presented matter** is, as L.S. Barkhudarov points out, a rare occurrence.

TRANSLATION UNITS

Translation unit is a segment of a text which the translator treats as a single cognitive unit for the purposes of establishing equivalence.

A translation unit is the smallest unit in the source language with an equivalent in the target one, and when its parts are taken individually, they become untranslatable (Leonid Barkhudarov, 1975).

Translation units can be as small as phonemes or morphemes, or as large as entire texts:

- The phoneme level. This level of translation is mainly relevant to the translation of proper names, geographical names, internationalisms, units of specific national lexicon and neologisms: *Bush – Буш, Geography – географія*
- The morpheme level: *cloudless – безхмарний, expresident – экс-президент, superman – супермен*
- The word level: *blackboard – дошка* (at a word level) *чорна дошка* – at a morpheme level)
- The word-combination level: *first night – прем'єра, job hunting – пошуки роботи*
- The sentence level (translation equivalence of some language units (some sentences, proverbs and clichés, road signs, politeness formula can be achieved only at the sentence level): *It has been raining for two hours. Упродовж двох годин йде дощ; Every dark cloud has a silver lining. Немає лиха без добра. Take your time. Не поспішайте. Help yourself – Пригощайтеся, будь ласка.*
- The text level: translation of poetry

A SHORT HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF EUROPEAN AND UKRAINIAN TRANSLATION

World translation in general and European translation in particular has a long and praiseworthy tradition. The earliest mention of translation used in *viva voce* goes back to approximately the year **3000 BC** in ancient Egypt.

The history of European translation, however, is known to have started as far back as **280 BC** with the translation of some excerpts of The Holy Scriptures. The local leaders of the Jewish community in Alexandria decided to translate the Old Testament from Hebrew, which had once been their native tongue, but which was no longer understood, into ancient Greek, which became their spoken language (word-for-word translation).

Much was translated in ancient times also from Greek into Egyptian and vice versa, and partly from Hebrew into Greek.

A significant contribution to Roman literature in general and to the theory of translation in particular was made by the outstanding statesman, orator and philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC) (became famous for the principles of so called “sense-to-sense” translation, which he grounded for translation of secular works). He brought into Latin the speeches of the most eloquent Greek orators Demosthenes and Aeschines.

The way of free interpretation was accepted and further developed by the Roman poet Horace (65-8 BC).

But there were scholars who required word-for-word translation of Greek works into Latin.

Thus the Romans established the distinction between sense-for-sense and word-for-word translation.

TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

The Middle Ages (500 AD – 1450 AD) are characterized by a general lack of progress and a constant stagnation in many spheres of mental activity including translation and interpretation, which continued to be practiced, however, in the domains of ecclesiastic science and the church.

The greatest event in the early Middle Ages was the Bible as translated by St. Jerome (342-419/20). His Bible, known as the Vulgate, or standard Latin Bible, had great influence on succeeding generations of translators.

No less intensively practiced alongside of the free sense-to-sense rendering in Europe during the Middle Ages was the strict word-for-word translation. Its domain of employment was naturally restricted to ecclesiastic and philosophic works. By this method the first translation of the Bible from Latin into English was accomplished in 1377-1380 by the noted religious scientist and reformer John Wycliffe/ Wycklif.

TRANSLATION DURING THE RENAISSANCE

Certainly the greatest achievement of the Renaissance period in the realistic approach to conveying the source language works was the translation of the Bible into several West European national languages. The first to appear was the German Bible in Martin Luther`s translation (1522-1534). This translation of the Book of Books was performed by Martin Luther contrary to the general tradition of the Middle Ages, i.e. not strictly word-for-word, but faithfully sense-to-sense.

William Tyndale`s version of the Bible (1534) was the first scientifically grounded and faithful English translation of the Holy Book.

No less important for developing the national language was the English translation of the Bible known as the *King James Bible: The Authorized Version*. It was published in 1611.

TRANSLATION DURING THE PERIOD OF CLASSICISM AND ENLIGHTENMENT(17-18th c.)

This period is characterized by 3 trends which appeared long before:

1. The ancient “*strict and truthful*” word-for-word translation of ecclesiastic (the Septuagint) and philosophic works. The basic principles of the trend were considerably undermined by Luther`s and Tyndale`s translations of the Bible;
2. The unrestricted free translation introduced by Horace and Apuleius, which had established an especially strong position in France and gained many supporters there;

3. The old trend adhering to the Cicero`s principle of regular sense-to-sense translation without the unrestricted reductions or additions to the texts/works in their final translated versions.

The 18th century gave the British nation A Dictionary of the English Language, a prescriptive work by Samuel Johnson.

THE EPOCH OF ROMANTICISM AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES OF FAITHFUL TRANSLATION IN EUROPE

In the second half of the eighteenth century, especially during the last decades, the controversy between the opponents of the strict word-for-word translation and sense-to-sense translation continued unabated.

A.F. Tytler(Scotland) defined 3 principles of translation:

1) “the translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work;

2) the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original;

3) the translation should have the ease of an original composition.
(*The principles of translation, 1792*)

J. G. Herder (German) a successful versifier of songs, understood the inner power of literary works and consequently demanded that all translators of prose and poetic works render strictly, fully and faithfully not only the richness of content, but also the stylistic peculiarities, the artistic beauty and the spirit of the source language works. His resolute criticism of the unrestricted freedom of translation and verbalism found support among the most outstanding German poets such as Goethe and Schiller, among other prominent authors.

The general trend of western translation theory from Cicero in Classical antiquity to the twentieth century centred on the recurring debate as to whether translations should be *literal (word-for-word) or free (sense-for-sense)*, a diad that is famously discussed by St Jerome in his translation of the Bible into Latin.

Controversy over the translation of the Bible was central to translation theory in the west for well over a thousand years. Early western theorists tended to be translators who presented a justification for their approach in a preface to

the translation. They are often portrayed as paying little attention (or not having access) to what others before them had written. However, they reflected a faithfulness to the religious text, often manifested in Early Modern literalism, or a Classical view of language based on principles of clarity, logic and elegance that came to the fore with the advent of European Humanism.

In Ukraine, free sense-to-sense translation in the second half of the 18th century was occasionally employed by H. Skovoroda.

Ukrainian history of translation is today more than one thousand years old. It began after adoption of Christianity (988).

The Bible was translated from Greek into Old Slavonic (Yaroslav the Wise) and began to appear in different cities of Kyiv Rus.

A considerable intensification was witnessed in Ukrainian translation during the seventeenth century, which could have been influenced by the initial activities in the Kyiv Mohyla Academy (founded in 1632).

Great translators soon appeared in Ukrainian literature – poets, authors and public figures P. Kulish, I. Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, O. Makovai and some others. P. Kulish, a close friend of T. Shevchenko, was also the first professional translator in the 19th century in Ukraine. He was also the first to translate *The Psalter* (1879) and *The Bible* (together with *Puliuy and Nechui-Levytskyi*) into contemporary Ukrainian. In addition, P. Kulish is the author of the contemporary Ukrainian alphabet.

An influential role in this process played the *Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society founded in 1873 (Lviv)* and its Literary Journal where the best translations were published. In large measure, those translations appeared due to the titanic achievements in the domain of literary artistic translation of *I. Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, O. Makovei*.

Due to the support it managed to publish only in the first decade of the 20th century the works of the following authors: Conan Doyle, T.S. Eliot, Mark Twain; O. Wilde, K. Ritter, E.A. Poe, J. Milton; English and American authors: R. Kipling, C. Roberts, Ch. Dickens, H. Longfellow, J. London. West European and Russian authors were translated by P. Hrabovskyi.

The revival of literary translation in Eastern and Western parts of Ukraine in early 1870's and especially in the 1880's was greatly enhanced by the creative work of one of the most prolific Ukrainian poets, playwrights, philosophers, scientists and public figures I. Franko (1856-1916).

Among the most active Ukrainian translators after P. Kulish and I. Franko was our greatest poetess Lesia Ukrainka (1871-1913). From French poets she chose the works of V. Hugo, from English G.G. Byron`s works and excerpts from Shakespeare`s Macbeth.

Of considerable note is P. Hrabovskyi, who made both faithful translation and free versifications of many works by several prominent poets of different national literatures. During the same period P. Hrabovskyi worked with another prolific author and translator M. Starytskyi (1840-1906), who acquainted Ukrainian readers with a number of faithfully versified Serbian folk ballads (dumas) and poems of Yu. Slowacki (Poland). Besides he composed a very faithful versification of Hamlet`s monologue (Shakespeare).

An outstanding poet and a brilliant master of poetic versification was M. Voronyi (he translated Shakespeare).

But undoubtedly the most active translators in the first decades of the 20th century were the members of the Hrinchenkos family. B. Hrinchenko`s wife Mariia Zahirna, their daughter Nastia Hrinchenko.

This veritable constellation of patriotic men of letters and translators would be incomplete without the well-known poet and translator V. Samiilenko.

Undoubtedly the most outstanding translator of poetic works during the 1920`s-early 1930`s was Mykola Zerov. A professor and scholar in ancient literatures and in the field of translation, he improved and applied new, effective methods of faithful versification, which established his leading position among the Neoclassicists and Ukrainian translators. M. Zerov managed to faithfully convey not only the main content, but also the artistic merits and the spirit of the originals.

Unquestionably, the most outstanding place among the surviving Neoclassicists, and one who made a significant contribution to Ukrainian literature and culture by his poetic translation, belongs to Maxym Rylskyi.

Persecutions, trials, murders and deportations to the Far North or to Siberia of many prominent Ukrainian translators such as M. Zerov, M. Johansen, D. Zahul, V. Mysyk, M. Drai-Khmara, V. Pidmohulnyi, B. Ten, S. Fylypovych, H. Kochur and several others prevented them from further enriching the Ukrainian literary tradition with masterpieces of world literature.

Translation of post-war Ukraine

1960's – revival of Ukrainian translation. The journal **Vsesvit** during its almost 60 years of active and faithful participation in the literary process of Ukraine has succeeded in publishing thousands of belles-lettres works: novels, narratives, short stories and poetic works of classics and promising foreign authors, poets and playwrights from **110** foreign languages). Famous Ukrainian translators of those times were Mykola Lukash, H. Kochur, I. Switlychnyi.

Prominent in the galaxy of the older generation translators was Borys Ten, the pen name of Vasyl` Khomychevs`kyi, who translated the works of Shakespeare (King Richard III).

The translations of Mykola Lukash are distinguished by a rich and versatile Ukrainian lexicon, accurate idiomatic equivalents, high expressiveness and ease corresponding to those of the originals.

Dmytro Palamarchuk successfully versified all Shakespearian sonnets and published a collection of Byron's and Shelley's poems as well as many poems of well-known French, German, Polish, Italian, Byelorussian poets.

Among the very prolific translators of the 60's were also Volodymyr Mytrofanov (translated works by Mark Twain, E. Hemingway, R.D. Bradbury) and A. Sodomora (translated Horace, Ovid, Seneca).

It is necessary to note in conclusion, that despite the constant restrictions, persecution, unceasing terror and even executions of translators in Soviet times, the process of artistic translation in Ukraine was never interrupted for long. Only because of the persistent and devoted work of our most prominent translators from the older and succeeding generations Ukrainian belles-lettres have been tremendously enriched with many masterpieces of world literature. Ukrainians now have a true opportunity to become acquainted with a large number of faithful Ukrainian versions of the best

prose and poetic works of all major European, American and the main Asian literatures both of present times as well as of previous periods.

As a result of long practice and rich experience some Basic principles of artistic translation have been worked out.

Basic principles of artistic translation

1. To maintain in the target language version all the structural peculiarities of the matter/work under translation.

2. To hold strictly to the author`s conception and render faithfully the content of the source language matter/work under translation.

3. To maintain in the version of the target language the fidelity in the means and ways of the author`s depicting the artistic images and expressiveness pertained to the source language matter/work.

4. To maintain in the version of the target language the main peculiarities/features of the syntactic organization and stylistic means of expression of the source language matter/work.

5. To avoid deliberate omissions and any other forms of free interpretation/rendering unless required of the source language matter/work.

6. To restrain in the process of translation of the text/work from any deliberate shortening or enlargement of it, as well as of any embellishment of its stylistic or artistic qualities in the target language/work.

7. To render/maintain as fully as possible in the target language variant the ease of expression pertaining to the source language/work.

8. To render/maintain in the target language version the pragmatic intention/orientation of the author and his force of influence on the reader.

Questions and Topics for discussion

- What is translation and interpretation? Speak about translation in the aspect of linguistics and culture studies?
- Name Ukrainian and foreign scholars who contributed to the development of Translation Theory.
- When did Translation Studies originate and what are its main functions?

- What are the four general areas of interest of Translation Studies (according to the British linguist Susan Bassnett)?
- What Functions of translation do you know?
- What methods of translation do you know (according to I.Korunets)?
- What kinds and types of translation do you know?
- Speak about main landmarks of European translation
- Speak about main landmarks of Ukrainian translation

Topic 2. Lecture 2-3. THE PROCESS OF TRANSLATION AND COMMUNICATION.

ADEQUATE AND EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION

Key terms: *a concept, a denotatum, a linguistic sign, a connotation, monolingual communication, bilingual communication, verification of the model, context (semantic, grammatical, stylistic), situation, and background information, adequate and equivalent translation, compatibility rules, ambiguity of translation equivalents, extralinguistic information, communicative purpose, communicative function, translation unit*

The tasks: to study the notions of a linguistic sign, a concept and a denotatum; the mental concept of a linguistic sign; the relations of polysemy and synonymy; causes of ambiguity of translation equivalents, compatibility rules, stages of the translation process; the role of verification process, the notion of equivalence applied to translation at syntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels, translation equivalence and units of translation, adequacy of translation

Plan

1. Language and extralinguistic world
2. Translation and communication
3. The process of translation
4. Dialectics of translation
5. Adequate and equivalent translation
6. Types of translation equivalents.
7. Translation units

References

1. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (Лингвистические конспекты): Учеб. для ин-тов и факульт. иностр. яз. М.: Высшая шк., 1990. 253 с.
2. Корунець І.Б. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2000. с. 391-398.
3. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. с.7-14.

4. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. с.255-257, 282-287.
5. Baker M. In other words: A Coursebook on Translation. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. V. XII. 304 p.
6. Bassnet S. Translation Studies. New Accents. London and New York: Methuen, 1980. V. XII. 159 p.
7. Catford J. A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965. viii, 103 p.
8. Munday J. Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. p. 86-103.
9. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. New York; London: Prentice Hall, 1988. XII. 292 p.
10. Nida E. A., Ch. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003. 218 p.
11. Snell-Hornby M. Translation Studies: An integrated Approach. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, 1988. VIII. 163 p.

LANGUAGE AND EXTRALINGUISTIC WORLD

The notions of a linguistic sign, a concept and a denotatum (*part of the extralinguistic world*)

It is worthwhile to begin lectures on translation with a short introduction to *the phenomenon of language*, since not knowing the relationship between language and extralinguistic world one can hardly properly understand translation.

The relation of language to the extralinguistic world involves three basic sets of elements: *language signs, mental concepts and parts of the extralinguistic world* (not necessarily material or physically really existing, which are usually called *denotata* (Singular: denotatum).

The language sign is a sequence of sounds (in spoken language) or symbols (in written language) which is associated with a single concept in the minds of speakers of that or another language.

It should be noted that sequences smaller than a word (i.e. morphemes) and those bigger than a word (i.e. word combinations) are also language signs rather than

only words. Word combinations are regarded as individual language signs if they are related to a single mental concept which is different from the concepts of its individual components (e. g. best man).

The signs of language are associated with particular *mental concepts* only in the minds of the speakers of this language. Thus, *Frau* and *kobieta* are the language signs related to the concept of *a woman* in German and Polish, respectively. It is important to note that one can relate these signs to the concept of a *woman* if and only if he or she is a speaker of the relevant language or knows these words otherwise, say, from a dictionary.

The **mental concept** is an array of mental images and associations related to a particular part of the extralinguistic world (both really existing and imaginary), on the one hand, and connected with a particular language sign, on the other.

The relationship between similar concepts and their relevant language signs may be different also in different languages. For example, among the words of different languages corresponding to the concept of *a woman* mentioned above: *Frau* and *kobieta*, the first will include in the concept of *a woman* that of *a wife* whereas the last will not.

The differences in the relationship between language signs and concepts (i.e. similar concepts appearing different to the speakers of different languages and even to different speakers of the same language) may explain many of the translation difficulties.

The language reflects the world through concepts:

parts of the extralinguistic world → *mental concepts* → *language signs*

The **mental concept of a word** (and word combination) usually consists of **lexical meanings, connotations, associations** and **grammatical meanings**. The lexical meanings, connotations, and associations relate a word to the extralinguistic world, whereas the grammatical meanings relate it to the system of the language.

Thus, *a lexical meaning is the general mental concept corresponding to a word or a combination of words.* To get a better idea of lexical meanings let's take a look at some definitions in a dictionary.

noodle - 1. type of paste of flour and water or flour and eggs prepared in long,

narrow strips and used in soups, with a sauce, etc.; 2. fool.

A **connotation** is an additional, contrastive value of the basic usually designative function of the lexical meaning. As an example, let us compare the words *to die* and *to peg out*. It is easy to note that the former has no connotation, whereas the latter has a definite connotation of vulgarity.

An **association** is a more or less regular connection established between the given and other mental concepts in the minds of the language speakers. As an evident example, one may choose *red* which is usually associated with *revolution, communism* and the like. A rather regular association is established between *green* and *fresh (young)* and (mostly in the last decade) between *green* and *environment protection*. Or *a black cat* is a symbol of *misfortune* in Ukrainian culture and of *Good Luck* in English.

The concepts being strongly subjective and largely different in different languages for similar denotata give rise to one of the most difficult problems of translation, the problem of **ambiguity of translation equivalents**.

Another source of translation ambiguity is the **polysemantic nature of the language signs**: the relationship between the signs and concepts is very seldom one-to-one, most frequently it is one-to-many or many-to-one, i.e. one word has several meanings or several words have similar meanings.

These relations are called polysemy (homonymy) and synonymy, accordingly. For example, one and the same language sign *bay* corresponds to the concepts of *a tree or shrub, a part of the sea, a compartment in a building, room, etc., deep barking of dogs, and reddish-brown color of a horse*.

The peculiarities of conceptual fragmentation of the world by the language speakers are manifested by the **range of application of the lexical meanings** (reflected in limitations in the combination of words and stylistic peculiarities).

This is yet another problem having direct relation to translation – *a translator is to observe the compatibility rules of the language signs* (e. g. *make mistakes*, but *do business*, *високатрава* – *long grass (довга)*, *міцнийчай* – *strong tea (сильний)*, *сильний дощ* – *heavy rain (важкий)*). Every word possesses its lexical-phraseological compatibility and combinability (valency) which is different in different languages (it

is national, not universal).

TRANSLATION AND COMMUNICATION

A language may be regarded as a specific code intended for information exchange between its users (language speakers). Any language resembles a code being a system of interrelated material signs (sounds or letters), various combinations of which stand for various messages.

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

The communication variety with one common language is called the **monolingual communication**.

If, however, the communication process involves two languages (codes) this variety is called the **bilingual communication**.

Translation unifies two different language speech acts in one communicative situation: The translation situation doubles the elements of communication. The receptor of the original text in turn becomes a translator who makes a translated text, or **target text** intended for the receptor speaking another language.

SL Message Sender → Translator → TL Recipient

The translator acts as a special communication intermediary

THE PROCESS OF TRANSLATION

A language is a code used by language speakers for communication. However, a language is a specific code unlike any other and its peculiarity as a code lies in its ambiguity – as opposed to a code proper a language produces originally ambiguous messages which are specified against

- **Context** (e.g. a book – to book)
- **Situation** (e.g. at the railway station / at the library)
- **Background information** (e.g. *electoral college*)

Let us take an example. Let the original message in English be an instruction or order: BOOK! It is evidently ambiguous having at least two grammatical meanings (*a*

noun and a verb) and many lexical ones (*e.g., the Bible, a code, a book, etc. as a noun*) but one will easily and without any doubt understand this message:

1. *Book tickets ! in a situation* involving reservation of tickets or
2. *Give that book !in a situation* involving sudden and urgent necessity to be given the book in question.

So, **one of the means** clarifying the meaning of ambiguous messages is the fragment of the real world that surrounds the speaker which is usually called **extralinguistic situation**.

Another possibility to clarify the meaning of the word BOOK is provided by the **context** which may be as short as one more word a (a book) or several words (*e.g. The book I gave you*).

The ambiguity of a language makes it necessary to use situation and context to properly generate and understand a message (i. e. encode and decode it). Since translation according to communicational approach is decoding and encoding in two languages, the significance of situation and context for translation cannot be overestimated.

There is another factor also to be taken into account in communication and, naturally, in translation. This factor is **background information**, i.e. general awareness of the subject of communication.

To take an example the word combination *electoral college (538people)* will mean nothing unless one is aware of the presidential election system in the USA.

Another example:

Profile of a Prime Timer

We were here before computers. A mouse pad was where mice hung out. To log-on was to add wood to fire. A chip was a piece of wood. Hardware meant hardware, and software wasn't even a word. A hard drive was a long, grueling journey. A CD was something you invested in. Windows were for looking out of. A virus was a flu bug that people caught. Backing up was what you hoped never happened to your toilet, especially when you had company.

So, speaking very generally, when we translate, the first thing we do is analyze the source text trying to extract from it all available information necessary for

generating the target text , then verify this information against situation and background knowledge and generate the target text.

The formation of the source and target texts is governed by the rules characteristic of the *source* and *target languages*. Hence the systems of the two languages are also included in our sphere of interest. These systems consist of grammar units and rules, morphological and word-building elements and rules, stylistical variations, and lexical distribution patterns (lexico- semantic paradigms).

Having considered all this, we shall come to understand that as an object of linguistic study **translation is a complex entity** consisting of the following interrelated components:

- a) elements and structures of the source text;
- b) elements and structures of the target language;
- c) transformation rules to transform the elements and structures of the source text into those of the target text;
- d) systems of the languages involved in translation;
- e) conceptual content and organization of the source text;
- f) conceptual content and organization of the target text;
- g) interrelation of the conceptual contents of the source and target texts.

Thus, **the process of translation** may be represented as consisting of three stages:

1. analysis of the source text, situation and background information,
2. synthesis of the translation model
3. verification of the model against the source and target context (semantic, grammatical, stylistic), situation, and background information resulting in the generation of the final target text.

Translation, then, consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context.

Translation can be defined as a special type of communication intended to convey information between the participants speaking two different languages. As E. Nida and C. Taber put it, “translating consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language meaning and style.”

DIALECTICS OF TRANSLATION

1. Inseparability of form and meaning.

A translator is to convey not only the ideas and themes of the source text (meaning, sense); s/he should also pay attention to the adequate form to express these ideas. S/he should not become carried away with a free (loose) form of translation, nor force the target language by following the source text word for word. A translator always bears in mind a standard language of the target text,

2. Social functions.

Translation does not exist outside of society. It appeared in society when communities began to trade and exchange ideas.

3. Translation and culture are inseparable.

Translation could not have developed without culture. Literature, science, and philosophy influence translators’ conceptualizations. On the other hand, culture could not have developed without translation, since translations enrich nations with the cultural values of other nations.

4. Reflection and creativity in translation.

Translation reflects the source text but it does not copy it. To translate adequately, a translator must do his or her best to find a proper means of expression. A translator bears in mind that the receptor has a cultural background other than that of a receptor of the original text; therefore, s/he has to be very resourceful in producing the same impact upon the receptor as that of the source text. Special problems arise in translating dialects, foreign speech, puns, poetry, etc. And a translator is in constant search for new tools to solve translation problems.

The ideal translation should be

- Accurate: reproducing as exactly as possible the meaning of the source text.
- Natural: using natural forms of the receptor language in a way that is appropriate to the kind of text being translated.

- Communicative: expressing all aspects of the meaning in a way that is readily understandable to the intended audience.

ADEQUATE AND EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION

The **equivalence** paradigm was conceptualized by the following scholars in the field, namely, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Jakobson (1959), Nida and Taber (1969), Catford (1965), House (1997), Koller(1979), Newmark (1981), Baker (1992),The term was introduced by American scholar R. Jakobson in 1959 in his seminal paper “On linguistic aspects of translation”.

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

To evaluate the quality of any translation is difficult, since it is not entirely clear what the focus of the evaluation should be. Surely, a good translation has to capture the meaning of the foreign original. At the same time, it is desirable to have fluent output that can be read easily.

These two goals, *adequacy and equivalence (fluency)*, are the main criteria in translation evaluation.

Equivalence refers to the degree to which the output is well-formed according to the target language’s grammar, lexis, syntax etc.

Adequacy refers to the degree to which the output communicates the information present in the reference translation.

The measure of adequacy in translation is the degree of equivalence between the meaning of the original message and the meaning of the translated one. Thus, we presume that adequacy is the goal and result of a good translation, while equivalence is the means to achieve this goal.

For example, if we compare the original text *Everyone thinks he'll be Director of the firm one day. He's the blue-eyed boy* and its translation *Всі вважають, що одного дня він стане директором фірми. У нього сині очі*, it is obvious that although the target text is equivalent to the original on grammatical, syntactic and lexical level, it does not convey the original implication (*Він є улюбленцем керівництва*).

The same may be said about the following example: *I think people who help the old, sick and homeless are the salt of the earth*. It is possible to make the target text equivalent to the original on all the levels, including idiomatic (*Я вважаю, що ті, хто допомагають старим, хворим та бездомним, – це сіль землі*), but if the readers do not recognize the Biblical allusion or this idiom gets another shade of meaning in the target culture, the idea is lost. It would be better to render it by means of a neutral correspondence (*Я схиляюсь перед людьми, які допомагають старим, хворим та бездомним*).

Translation theorists have long disputed the interrelation of the terms ADEQUATE AND EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION. V. Komissarov considers them to denote non-identical but closely related notions. He claims that adequate translation is broader in meaning than equivalent translation.

Adequate translation is the translation corresponding to the communicative situation.

Equivalent translation is the translation providing the semantic similarity of the target and source texts.

Two texts may be equivalent in meaning but not adequate, for example:

«Я тобі дам джосу» – “I'll put the fear of God into you!”

The Ukrainian sentence is low colloquial, whereas the English one, though it describes a similar situation, has another stylistic overtone, a rather pious one.

Thus, adequate translation is the translation corresponding to the communicative situation. For example *Help yourself* (when you are eating) is not *Допоможіть собі* but *Пригощайтесь!*

Close to this understanding of translation adequacy is E. Nida's concept of **dynamic equivalence**, “aimed at complete naturalness of expression” and trying “to

relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture.”

Y. Retsker states that the notion of adequate translation comprises that of equivalent. According to him, an **adequate target text** describes the same reality as does the source text and at the same time it produces the same pragmatic effect upon the receptor. Translation adequacy is achieved by three types of regular correlations:

1) equivalents, that is regular translation forms not depending upon the context (they include geographical names, proper names, terms): *the Pacific Ocean – Тихий океан, Chiang Kai-shek – Чан Кайши, hydrogen – водень.*

2) analogs, or variable, contextual correspondence, when the target language possesses several words to express the same meaning of the source language word: *soldier – солдат, рядовий, військовий.*

3) transformations, or adequate substitutions: *She cooks a hot meal in the evening. – На вечерю вона завжди готує щось гаряче.*

Adequate translation may be defined therefore as that which is determined by semantic and pragmatic equivalence between the original and target-language text.

Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), a German philologist and translator, stressed that “no word in one language is completely equivalent to a word in another language”, and that “each language expresses a concept in a slightly different manner, and each language places it on a rung that is higher or lower on the ladder of feeling.”

For the translation to be adequate and effective, the target text should be equivalent to the source text. Indeed, when reading tragedies by Shakespeare in Ukrainian, the receptor is but seldom aware that the words s/he sees in the text were not written by Shakespeare but by some other person, a translator. The form of the target text is new but the purport and the content are very close to the original. Paradoxically, the better a translator's work, the less his/her work is observed.

TYPES OF TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS

Translation equivalence is the key idea of translation. According to A.S. Hornby *equivalent* means equal in value, amount, volume, etc. (Hornby A.S. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford, 1982).

What does it mean if applied to translation?

As applied to translation, **equivalence** means that if a word or word combination of one language (A) corresponds to certain concept (C) and a word or word combination of another language (B) corresponds to the same concept (C), these words or word combinations are considered **equivalent**

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

Translation equivalence never means the sameness of the meaning for the signs of different languages. V. Komissarov defines translation equivalence as a measure of semantic similarity between source text and target texts.

Translation equivalents in a dictionary are just the prompts for the translator. One may find a proper equivalent only in speech due to **the context, situation and background knowledge**.

e.g *minute*

As a noun: Give me *a minute*.

As an adjective: *minute error* - *незначна помилка*

Minute anatomy - *гістологія, мікроскопічна анатомія*

Modern translation theory suggests such **types of translation equivalents**.

1. Regular and occasional

Regular equivalents may be *permanent* (one-to-one correspondence: London - Лондон) and *variable* (one-to-many correspondence: ambitious – амбітний і грандіозний).

Depending on the type of the language units involved regular equivalents can be classified as lexical (terms, geographical names), phraseological (sink or swim – пан або пропав), phraseological or grammatical.

The fact that a SL unit has **a number of regular equivalents** doesn't necessarily mean that one of them will be used in each particular case. Sometimes the context doesn't allow the translator to employ any of the regular equivalents to the given SL unit. In such a case the translator has to look for a different way of translation which will render the meaning of the unit. Such an exceptional translation

of a SL unit which suits a particular context is called an **occasional equivalent or a contextual substitute**. The particular contextual situation may force the translator to give up even a permanent equivalent.

e.g. “New Haven” is invariably rendered as “Нью Хейвен”. But the sentence “I graduated from New Haven in 1989” is translated as “Я закінчив Йельський університет в 1989” as our reader may not know that New Haven is famous for its Yale University.

The regular equivalents are not mechanical substitutes and their use or replacement by occasional equivalents calls for a high level of the translator’s skill and knowledge.

Occasional – depending on the contextual situation

Occasional equivalents can be created in one of the following ways:

1. Using loan-words imitating in TL the form of the SL word or word combination, e.g. impeachment — імпічмент, brain-drain — відтік мізків (кваліфікованих працівників).

2. Using approximate substitutes (if necessary, with the help of foot-notes), e.g. drugstore — аптека, The Ukrainian «аптека» is not exactly a drugstore where they also sell such items as magazines, soft drinks, ice-cream, etc.,

3. Using all kinds of lexical (semantic) transformations modifying the meaning of the SL word, e.g. “He died of exposure” may be rendered into Ukrainian as «Він помер від простуди / сонячного удару»

4. Using a description to convey the meaning of the SL unit, e.g. landslide – перемога на виборах із значною більшістю голосів

2. Dynamic equivalence and formal equivalence

E. Nida (1914 – 2011), an American linguist who developed the dynamic-equivalence Bible-translation theory, argued that there are two different types of equivalence: *formal equivalence* and *dynamic equivalence*. Formal correspondence focuses attention on the message itself in both form and content; dynamic equivalence is based upon the principle of equivalent effect.

Dynamic equivalence and formal equivalence are two dissimilar techniques used to achieve differing levels of literalness between the original and target languages of a text.

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

The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the TT since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience.

Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact the original wording did upon the ST audience.

Both of these techniques are used in biblical translation. The two terms have often been understood fundamentally as sense-for-sense translation(translating the meanings of phrases or whole sentences) and word-for-word translation(translating the meanings of words and phrases in a more literal method).

3. Full and Partial Translation Equivalents

Full Translation Equivalents

One can hardly find truly full and universal equivalents for a word. The source and the target texts should be **identical pragmatically, semantically and structurally**.

For practical purpose full equivalence is presumed when there is complete coincidence of pragmatic meanings of the source and target language units .

Translation equivalents of all words and word combinations one finds in a good dictionary are full. Stylistically neutral words with reference meanings (terms, geographical and proper names, words denoting physical objects and processes) are more likely to have full translation equivalents because semantic and pragmatic parts of their meaning are less ambiguous.

Partial Translation Equivalents

Partial equivalence is, as a matter of fact, the absence of one or more of equivalence aspects, i.e. of syntactic, semantic or pragmatic aspect.

The Ukrainian word *протестувати*, for example, is a *partial equivalent* of the English word *protesting* (say, in the sentence *Protesting is a risk - Протестувати ризиковано*) because of different grammatical meanings (a Gerund and a Verb), the semantic and pragmatic aspects being similar.

To take another example of partial equivalence consider the English saying *Carry coal to Newcastle*. If one translates it as *Возити вугілля до Ньюкасла* it would lack the pragmatic aspect of equivalence (The intent of this message *Bring something that is readily available locally* would be lost, because the Ukrainian audience could be unaware of the fact that Newcastle is the center of a coal-mining area). If, however, one translates it “*їхати до Тули з власним самоваром, носити воду у криницю*” it would lose the semantic similarity, but preserve the pragmatic intent of the message, which, in our opinion, is the first priority of translation. Anyway, both suggested translation equivalents of this saying are considered *partial*.

Semantic similarity between the source and target texts *is desirable*, but again it is not an ultimate goal of a translator. More often slight differences in meaning help to adapt the idea of the original message to the target audience.

What is really important for translation adequacy is the pragmatic equivalence.

It means that both texts should have one and the same *communicative function*. The target text should have the same impact upon the receptor as the source text has. When the original message is lost for the target audience it is a failure of the translation and translator and no semantic or syntactic similarity will redress the damage.

Let us take several examples of semantic and/or pragmatic equivalents to illustrate the idea:

зелений - green; (недосвідчений) verdant; зелений горошок - green peas; зелений театр – open-air stage; зелений хлопчисько – greenhorn; давати зелену вулицю – to give open passage, to give the go-ahead; туга зелена – utter boredom; зелене будівництво – laying out of parks, etc.; зелений борщ – sorrel soup; потопати в зелені – to be buried in verdure

Translation equivalence does not mean that source and target texts are identical. It is a degree of similarity between source and target texts, measured on a certain level.

Viewed from the semiotic angle, the source and target texts should be identical **pragmatically, semantically and structurally.**

Conclusion

Many translation theories are based on two opposing ways of translating. For example, Nida distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence, Newmark between semantic and communicative translation, Catford between formal correspondence and textual equivalence, House between overt and covert translation and Pym between natural and directional equivalence. These bipolar views of equivalence soon faded away and more attractive translation paradigms came to the forefront. Contrary to linguistic-oriented approaches to translation which assume that the source text occupies a supreme position and that it is considered to be of crucial importance in determining not only the translation process but also the extent to which it has been successful, target-oriented approaches view the source text as the point of departure for the translation process and mostly focus on the cultural, historical, and socio-political factors surrounding translation, thus looking at it as a culture-bound phenomenon. Despite of its shortcomings, it should be stressed that equivalence is still one of the pivotal definitory axes of translation since it functions as a reminder of the central problems a translator encounters during the translation process.

Questions and Topics for discussion

- What are the basic elements of the relationship between a language and extralinguistic world?
- What is a language sign, a concept and a denotatum? Give definitions. Show the relation between them?
- What is a lexical meaning, a connotation and an association? Give definitions and examples.
- What is the range of application of a word? Give examples.
- What are the main sources of translation ambiguity?
- What is the translating process? What mental processes make up the translating process?
- What is translation equivalence and adequacy?

- What helps to find proper translation equivalents?
- What is a unit of translation? What are the optimal units for practical translation?
- What is the translation equivalent? What is aregular equivalents?
- What is an occasional equivalent? What are equivalent-lacking words?
- What is full and partial translation equivalence? Give definitions.
- What are syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation equivalence?
Which of them is the most important for adequate translation?

Topic 3. Lecture 4-5. LEXICAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION.

LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS

Key terms: *transcoding, transcribing, transliteration, mixed transcoding, adaptive transcoding, abbreviations, attributive clusters, transformations, contextual substitution, synonymous substitution, calque translation, loan translation, descriptive translation, antonymous translation, compression, decompression, permutation, transposition, concretization, generalization, sense development, attributive groups (clusters), semantic correspondences, non-equivalent units, international words*

The tasks: to study the rules of rendering proper names, abbreviations, attributive clusters, equivalent units, international words in translation; basic translators' devices at lexical level applied as tools to ensure adequate translation

Plan

1. Translation of proper names. Rules of transliteration.
2. Conveying the names of companies, corporations, firms
3. Translation of Abbreviations
4. Lexical transformations
5. Translation of Attributive clusters.
6. Types of semantic correspondences. Translating lexical units which have no equivalence in the TL
7. Translation of International words

References

1. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. М.: Международные отношения, 1980. С. 18-93.
2. Зорівчак Р.П. Реалія і переклад. Львів, 1989. 215с.
3. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2003. с.91-196.
4. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. с.94-96.
5. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. с.91-197.

6. Основи перекладу: лексичні та граматичні аспекти: навч. посіб / За ред. В.К.Шпака. К.: Знання, 2007. 310 с.

Translation of Proper names

A few English proper names are **transliterated** with the omission or addition of a letter or two in Ukrainian. This kind of rendering becomes necessary when dealing with specifically English spelling forms of proper names and to avoid the violation of the traditionally established spelling rules of the Ukrainian language:

McDonald – Макдональд,

Macintosh – Макінтош,

Dinah – Діна,

Jupiter – Юпітер,

Judah – Юда,

Longfellow – Лонгфелло,

Williamson – Вільямсон.

Some other English proper names of people and geographical names are rendered into Ukrainian partly through **transcription**:

Brooking – Брукінг,

Huntington — Гантінгтон,

Liverpool — Ліверпуль,

Newton — Ньютон,

Jackson — Джексон,

Aberdeen — Абердін,

Melbourne — Мельбурн,

Valentine — Валентайн.

Besides, conveying English proper names in Ukrainian may be predetermined by some lingual and extra lingual factors. The main of them are: absence in Ukrainian of corresponding phonemes and orthographic means to substitute some particular English sounds/ letter combinations or the established tradition according to which some names are translated. It can already be seen on the following examples:

Thorne – Торн,

Ethan — Ітан,

Faith — Фейс/ Фейт,

Graham — Гре(йе)м,

Galsworthy — Голсуорсі,

Hugon — Гюгон,

Hutchinson — Гачінсон/ Гатчінсон,

Ptolemy — Птолемей,

The bulk of all other English proper names, however, are also rendered into Ukrainian with the help of phonetical / phonological level units, i.e., either **transcribed or transliterated**. The degree of exactitude of their rendering depends on the existence/ non-existence of appropriate or similar sounds in the TL. Care should be taken in order to avoid the influence of both the lingual and extra lingual factors.

For example, the well-known names as *Adam*, *David* can be translated into Ukrainian as *Адам and Давид*(Biblical or historical) or as *Едем and Девід*(common people`s names). Similarly with *Matthew*, *Paul*, *Rachel* and some others which can be correspondingly rendered either as *Матфей/ Матвій, Павло, Рахіль* or *Метью, Пол, Ре(й)чл, Роре John, Paul II — Пана Іван, Павло Другий*, etc.

Mostly translated, however, are the names of kings, queens, princes, princesses, tsars and tsarinas. These exceptions from the general rule are observed in the following names:

King Charles/ George, Henry – Король Карл/ Георг, Генріх;

Queen Elisabeth / Mary Stewart — королева Єлизавета/ Марія Стюарт;

King James I (John, William) — король Яків I (Іоанн, Вільгельм).

Nicknames of people are almost always translated irrespective of the language they come from:

King Charles the Great – король Карл Великий;

King Edward the Confessor — король Едуард Сповідник;

King Richard the Lionheart / Lionhearted — король Річард Левине Серце.

Indian chiefs' names and family names of American Indians, which became known mainly from J.F.Cooper`s novels are translated, as a rule, too:

(the) Arrowhead – Гостряк стріли;

Dew of June — Червнева роса.

The so-called generalizing or characterizing names (talking names) used by many authors in their belles-lettres works to point out some determinant (usually negative) feature of their characters are mostly not translated but only transcribed or transliterated. e.g.: Doctor Slammer (cf. *to slam the door* – грюкати/ грюкнути дверима, лікар Слеммер).

A considerable number of English **geographical names** are also rendered into Ukrainian by way of **transcription** only:

Buckinghamshire – Бакінгемшир,

Capetown/ Ohio – Кейптаун/ Огайо,

Dashwood – Дешвуд,

Dundee – Данді,

Freetown – Фрітаун,

Newfoundland – Ньюфаундленд,

Seattle – Сіетл.

Many English place names, along with other geographical and proper names, are conveyed in Ukrainian **partly with the help of transcribing and partly via transliteration**. This can be observed in the two-syllable names in such examples. The first group of the geographical names has the initial syllables transliterated and the closing syllables transcribed, whereas the second group contains geographical names with the initial syllables transcribed and the closing syllables transliterated:

1

Birmingham – Бірмінгем

Kigstown – Кінгстаун

Midway – Мідвей

Sheffield – Шеффілд

2

Brighton – Брайтон

Greensboro – Грінсборо

Houston – Гюстон

Wyoming – Вайоминг

Names of seas, oceans, bays, archipelagos, straits, channels, administrative territories and compound names of countries having the structure of word-combinations are always **translated** (most of them are found in dictionaries):

The Atlantic/ Pacific/ Indian/ Ocean – Атлантичний/ Тихий/ Індійський океан;

The Gulf of Mexico (Salonica) – Мексиканська (Салонікська) затока;

New South Wales – Новий Південний Уельс;

Закарпаття – Transcarpathia (Transcarpathian Region of Ukraine).

CONVEYING THE NAMES OF COMPANIES, CORPORATIONS, FIRMS

Traditionally, **transcribed or transliterated and shortly explicated at the same time** are

1) most names of companies (corporations, firms, etc.):

Concord – Конкорд, *Mersedes* – Мерседес (well-known firms)

2) the names of British/ American publishing houses:

Cambridge University Press видавництво наукової та довідкової літератури при Кембріджському університеті “Кембрідж юніверсіті прес”;

3) the names of news agencies: *(the British) Reuters (New Agency)* англійське інформаційне агентство “Рейтер”.

4) the names of hotels, theatres, cinemas: Київський державний український драматичний театр ім. Івана Франка *the Kyiv State Ivan Franko Ukrainian Drama Theatre*; готель “Колос” *The Kolos Hotel*

5) names of newspapers, journals, and magazines: Газета “Голос України” *The Ukrainian Verkhovna Rada Holos Ukrainy newspaper*.

The names of streets, avenues, roads, and squares may often be simply **transcribed or transliterated**, since the nouns “street”, “avenue”, “road” or “square” are familiar to many Ukrainians: *Dean Street* Дін-Стріт; *Milton Street/ Oxford Street* Мільтон-Стріт, Оксфорд-Стріт.

When used out of context, however, the names of streets, avenues and roads require in Ukrainian an additional explanatory noun *вулиця (бульвар, провулок)*: *Midland Park Road* вул. Мідланд-парк роуд. The streets (avenues) with numbers

instead of the proper names always have the number translated and not given in figures: *Sixth/ Seventh Street* Шоста/ Сьома вулиця (Нью-Йорк).

Ukrainian names of streets (roads, avenues) are translated according to the common rule, **the proper name being transliterated** (rarely transcribed) and the explaining common noun *вулиця, бульвар, провулок* **translated**: Андріївська вулиця *Andriivska Street*; бульвар Лесі Українки/Шевченка *Lesia Ukrainka/ Shevchenko Avenue*.

When the noun *вулиця, бульвар, провулок* is not used in Ukrainian, it should naturally be added in the English translation: Андріївський Узвіз *Andriivskyi Uzviz Road/street*.

Some names of squares may be either transcribed/ transliterated or translated from the English language as well: *Parliament Square* пл. Парлемент Сквер/ Парламенська площа; *Trafalgar Square* пл. Трафальгар Сквер/ Трафальгарська площа.

Names of public bodies, however, are mostly translated:

- *the British Conservative party* консервативна партія Великої Британії;
- спортивне товариство “Динамо” *Dynamo sports society*;

Rendering ABBREVIATIONS in translation:

- translated and then abbreviated: (*CEI* (Central European Initiative)– ЦЄІ (Центральноєвропейська ініціатива); *GDP* (Gross Domestic Product) – ВВП (Валовий внутрішній продукт), *UNO* – ООН, *AIDS* – СНІД
- full form translation: *L-driver* – *Learner-driver* – водій-учень; *BrStd* – *British Standard* – Британський стандарт;
- using equivalent shortening: PC (personal computer) – ПК (персональний комп’ютер)
- transcribed or transliterated: *NASA* (National Aeronautic and Space Administration) – *НАСА* (національний комітет з авіації і досліджень космосу); *INTERPOL* (International Criminal Police Organisation) *ІНТЕРПОЛ*, *Internet* - *Інтернет*, *NATO* - *НАТО*
- preserve the original + explanation: *DME FIX* – відстань за *DME*

- descriptive translation: *DEPU (deportee unaccompanied)*– депортований без супроводу; *DEPA(deportee accompanied)* – депортований із супроводом

What a translator is to do is: a) consult a dictionary; b) consult the context and reference literature.

LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS– substitution of a SL word by a TL word which is not registered as its dictionary equivalent. (Semantically it is substitution by the word or word-combination with a different inner form which actualizes the same of the SL word realized in the given context).

They change the semantic core of a translated word. They can be classified into the following groups:

1. **Contextual substitution**, or putting one word in place of another. It often results from the different semantic structures of the source language and target language words. Thus the word *молодий* is not always translated as *young*; rather, it depends on its word combinability: *молода картопля* is equal to *new potatoes*. It is a regular equivalent for this phrase.

2. **Synonymous substitution:** *advance of science* – прогрес науки,
advance of the army – наступ армії

3. **Calque / loan / verbal / literal/ word-for-word translation:** *yellow press*– жовта преса

4. **Descriptive translation** (when we translate idioms, terms, neologisms, non-equivalent words): *classifiable* – той, що піддається класифікації, *brain drain* – відтік наукових кадрів за кордон

5. **Transcoding:**

Transliteration: server – сервер, marker – маркер

Transcribing: hi-tech – хай тек, peak – пік,

Mixed Transcoding: resistor – резистор

Adaptive Transcoding (adaptation of the word to the phonetic and grammatical norms of the TL): progress – прогрес, platform – платформа

Speaking about transliteration don't forget about **false friends of the interpreter:** data(дані), academic (навчальний), accurate (точний), actual

(дійсний), aspirant (претендент), complexion (колір обличчя), clay (глина), prospect (перспектива)

6. **Antonymous translation:** *small* –невеликий, *unkind*–злий, *not impossible* – можливий

7. **Compression/ omission of words** – decrease of the number of words: *odds and ends* - залишки, *an important task to do* – важливе завдання

8. **Decompression / addition of words:** *The Times* – газета Таймс

9. **Permutation** (change /transposition of location of lexemes): *wage rise* – підвищення зарплати

10. **Specification / concretization**, or substituting words with a wider meaning with words of a narrower meaning: *Will you do the room?* – *Ти прибереш у кімнаті?* *I'll get the papers on the way home.* – *Я куплю газети дорогою додому;* *jewels* – ювелірні прикраси. The underlined English words have larger scopes of meaning than their Ukrainian counterparts and their particular semantics is recognized from the context.

11. **Generalization**, or substituting words of a narrower meaning with those of a wider meaning: *People don't like to be stared at.* – *Людам не подобається, коли на них дивляться.*

12. **Sense (logical) development (modulation)** is a substitution of the dictionary equivalent by contextual, logically bound to dictionary meaning. The quality may substitute for the object, object for process, process for quality, cause for process (It covers various metaphoric and metonymic substitutions): *He is dead*- Він помер, *Time is up*, *Joe*– Час іти, Джо, *He always made you say everything twice* – Він завжди перепитував

TRANSLATION OF ATTRIBUTIVE GROUPS (CLUSTERS)

Attributive cluster is a group of words with a key noun and a number of attributive components modifying it. The English phrase is regressive, it develops to the left, the head noun is the final element/ The Ukrainian phrase is progressive, it develops to the right, the attributes are in postposition: *газета Київ* - *the Kyiv newspaper*

In two-member groups the first component is translated by

- an adjective: *emergency meeting* – позачергове засідання;
- a noun in the genitive case: *budget increase* – збільшення бюджету
- Noun + prep: *strike warning* – попередження про страйк, *mountain war* – війна у горах
- subordinate clause: *wage deadlock* – глухий кут, у який зайшли переговори про підвищення зарплати

The context is necessary: *university books* – університетські чи про ун-т? *Berlin proposals – in Berlin or on Berlin*

In multi-componental clusters it is necessary to identify a head noun and sense-groups: *local authority staff* – працівники місцевих органів влади;

Covent Garden Opera House orchestra performance – виступ оркестру оперного театру Ковент Гарден

Maltese NATO base – мальтійська військова база НАТО, натівська військова база на Мальті, військова база НАТО на Мальті;

British health service – британська служба охорони здоров'я, служба охорони здоров'я Великої Британії

When there are abbreviations in the cluster, the translation starts with the head noun: *UN General Assembly* – Генеральна Асамблея ООН

If attributive clusters have components which are joined by a hyphen, they are translated by subordinate clauses: *a six-point plan* – план, що містить 6 пунктів,

take-it-or-leave-it draft resolution – проект, що має ультимативний х-р

When translating clusters, we use such **transformations**: permutation, transposition, addition, compression, decompression:

profits drive – гоніння за прибутками (addition), *opinion poll* – опитування суспільної думки (addition, modulation), *efficient public transport system* – рентабельна система громадського транспорту (permutation), *Liberation Movement* – визвольний рух (transposition)

TYPES OF SEMANTIC CORRESPONDENCES

There are **three main types** of semantic correspondences between lexical units in different languages. They are: *full correspondence*, *partial correspondence*, *absence of correspondence*.

Full correspondence – when words that have only one meaning in both languages are equivalents. A word of SL and a word of TL may be identical in their meaning. Such words are called equivalents. Equivalents are usually monosemantic words and they are easily translated.

They are: geographical names and names of persons that exist in both languages: *London* - *Лондон*, *Shakespeare* - *Шекспір*, *Ukraine* - *Україна*; scientific and technical terms: *morpheme* - *морфема*, *logarithm* - *логаритм*, *hydrogen* - *водень*, *equator* - *екватор*, *vertebra* - *хребет*, *computer* - *комп'ютер*, *server* - *сервер*; names of the months and days of the week; words denoting family relations; names of some animals: *flamingo*; word-combinations denoting social phenomena or offices: *British Council*.

Partial correspondence – when a word of the SL has more than one semantic equivalent in the TL: one-to-many and many-to-many correlation. There are several types of partial semantic correspondence between words in different languages. They are: *inclusion*, *overlapping*.

Inclusion – when the semantic structure of a word in the SL is broader than that of the corresponding word in the TL or vice versa. In this case a semantic volume of SL word is included in the semantic volume of the TL word: e.g.: *характер-character*. The English *character* has additional meanings: a) reputation b) written testimonial feature, quality, attribute, d) disposition, e) literary image, f) a person in a novel or a play, g) a letter, sign or mark used in a system of writing or printing.

Overlapping – when a word in the SL and its equivalent in the TL have both common and different meanings, i.e. one lexical unit in SL has several corresponding units in the TL. It means that both the words have some meaning (or even meanings) in common, but at the same time each word has some other meanings which do not coincide e.g.: *зручний-comfortable, convenient; годинник-watch, clock; стілець-chair, stool; каша-porridge, gruel; їдальня-mess room, canteen, refectory, dining-room; буд - брунька, бутон; to marry –одружуватися, виходити заміж; crisp – розсипчатий (про сніг), свіжий (про овочі), confident, polite, and firm, but not very friendly(abt people); cherry - вишня, черешня.*

This is more frequent case in the binary opposition of non-cognate languages.

The right variant of translation should be based on two factors: on the knowledge of possible semantic relations between the words of SL and TL and on the information derived from the context. So translation of any word begins with contextual analysis of its meaning after which it becomes possible to choose correctly the corresponding word of TL.

Absence of correspondence – the instances when a lexical unit in the source language has no equivalent in the target language (**non-equivalent units**). The most numerous groups of such units are: *proper names, geographical names, names of offices, organizations, newspapers, hotels, ships*, names of specifically national notions and phenomena such as *lobby, muffin, drugstore, haggis, toffee, butterscotch, grill-room, drive-in, самовар, свитка, вишиванка*...etc. which are not used or even known in other countries and have no fixed equivalents in the lexical system of the TL. The meaning of equivalents practically does not depend on the context, so to translate them one should merely look them up in a dictionary.

The non-equivalent units cover the following lexical groups:

- *lexical lacunas*
- some *neologisms*
- *realia words (units of nationally biased lexicon* (Korunets).

Lacuna is an absence of a word in a particular language.

Lexical lacunas are words, which for some linguistic reasons have no equivalent words in the TL, though the corresponding notions do exist in both languages, e.g.: *readership, privacy, fortnight, sibling, spouse, доба*.

There is the following division of lacunas:

- a) linguistic: an obligatory linguistic expression of absolute lacuna is the absence of a word or an idiom in one of languages to express the appropriate concept;
- b) extralinguistic: absence of a thing (phenomenon) in culture, people's life.

Translating lacunas:

- substitution by the notion that exists in the Target Language (lexical analogue), e.g.: *fortnight* – два тижні; *sibling* – брат або сестра; *readership* – коло читачів; *доба* – 24 hours.

- explicatory translation (made in commentaries (both in-text and after-text),

and in footnotes.)

- reduction in translating lacunas (very undesirable as it often leads not only to the loss of national identity but also to an incomplete rendering of the main message).

Neologisms are words, terms, or phrases that have been recently created (“coined”) – often to apply to new concepts, to synthesize pre-existing concepts, or to make older terminology sound more contemporary. Neologisms are especially useful in identifying inventions, new phenomena, or old ideas which have taken on a new cultural context. Neologisms can also refer, to an existing word or phrase which has been assigned a new meaning. Neologisms are newly coined words or words that have acquired additional meaning due to social, cultural, economic, political changes in human society. The main processes of word-formation of neologisms are as follows:

- Affixation (all-nighter, investigee, divorcee, muson, screendom, fandom, puzzledom)
- Conversion (plastic (credit cards, debit cards, and other plastic cards which can be used in place of money to pay for goods and services).
- Compounding (*troubleshooter, ladybird, get-together*)
- Blending (advertainment – advertisement + entertainment)
- Shortening (WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant),
- Calquing (pineapple – Dutch – pijnappel)
- Reduplication (ping-pong, chit-chat)

Ways of translation of neologisms:

– Selection of an appropriate analogue in a target language think tank – колектив учених)

– Transcription and transliteration (disk jockey - диск-жокей, gadget - гаджет)

– Loan translation/calque (flea market – блошиний ринок, line service – лінійна служба)

– descriptive translation (blue sky laws – закони різних штатів, які регулюють випуск та розміщення цінних паперів для захисту покупців від махінацій).

Realia words (units of nationally biased lexicon)

The term was first introduced by Fiodorov (1941)

Realia (from the Latin *realis*) – words and combinations of words denoting objects and concepts characteristic of the way of life, the culture, the social and historical development of one nation and alien to another. They are **culturally biased words** (denoting element of everyday life, history, culture, national customs, traditions, administrative or political systems, elements of clothing or ethnic cuisine)

Bulgarian translators **Vlahov and Florin** (1980) categorize these items as follows:

1) geographical (geographic formations, man-made geographical objects, flora and fauna that is special to a certain place). E.g.: fjord, mistral, steppe, tornado, tsunami, polder, causeway, kiwi, koala, sequoia etc.;

2) ethnographic (food and drink, clothing, places of living, furniture, pots, vehicles, names of occupations and tools, measures and money). E.g.: paprika, spaghetti, empanada, cider, bistrot, sauna, kimono, sombrero, igloo, double-decker, carabinieri, machete, geisha, mormon, pagoda, synagogue, gallon, perch, ruble, lira, peseta etc.;

3) art and culture (music and dance, musical instruments, feasts, games, rituals and their characters). E.g.: harlequin, corn- media dell'arte, banjo, tarantella, ramadan, Santa Claus; vampire, werewolf etc.;

4) ethnic (names of people, nicknames). E.g.: cockney, yankee, Fritz, gringo, squaw, limey etc.;

5) socio-political (administrative territorial units, offices and representatives, ranks, military realia). E.g.; province, county, canton, favela, promenade, forum, kneset, дума, senate, chancellor, tzar, shah, pharaoh, vizier, cohort, phalanx, arquebus etc.

Mona Baker outlines 11 cases non-equivalence at word level, which the translator also needs to be able to tackle. They are the following: a) culture-specific concepts (realias), b) the SL concept is not lexicalized in the TL, c) semantic complexity of a SL word, d) distinctions in meaning between the SL and TL, e) lack of hyperonym in the TL, f) lack of hyponym in the TL, g) differences in physical and interpersonal perspective, h) differences in expressive meaning, i) differences in form,

j) differences in purpose and frequency of using specific forms and k) loan words in the ST. Further, Baker suggests possible strategies for coping with these problems: use of generalization / particularization, use of neutral and less expressive words, cultural substitutions, loan words and explanations, paraphrasing with related or unrelated words, omission, and illustration.

WAYS OF RENDERING THE MEANING OF NON-EQUIVALENT UNITS
(NATIONALLY BIASED UNITS OF LEXICON,
CULTURE SPECIFIC TERMS)

Since they express local or historical colour they have no equivalents in other languages. They cannot be translated in a conventional way and they require a special approach.

1. **By Transcription or Transliteration Exclusively:** lord, lady, mister, shilling, kozak, hryvnia.

2. **By Transcription or Transliteration and Explication of Their Genuine Nationally Specific Meaning (combined renomination):** *the Tower of London* – лондонська фортеця Тауер; *Covent Garden* – ринок Ковент-Гарден.

3. **By Descriptive Explaining / paraphrase** *shepherd`spie* – картопляна запіканка з м`ясом та цибулею, *cubbing* полювання на лисиць (у якому беруть участь мисливці-початківці, та молоді собаки-гончаки),

4. **By Translation of Componental Parts and Additional Explication of Units of the Nationally Biased Lexicon:**

question time день запитань (у палаті громад)

Labour Day was past (M. Wilson) – День Праці (національне свято) був позаду.

5. **By Waysof Word-for-Word or Loan Translation:** *skyscraper* – хморочос, *first (second, third) reading* – перше(друге, третє) читання, внесення законопроекту в англійський парламент; *Bluestocking* – Синя панчоха, *continental breakfast* – континентальний сніданок

6. **Translating by Means of Semantic Analogues** (lexical units which are not direct literal correspondences but express the same idea):

Sir – Пан,

”Oh, I beg your pardon. I m terribly sorry, gentlemen”

”Ах, *перепрошую вас, дуже перепрошую, панове...*”

student`s everyday recordbook– щоденник (учнівський), вареник – *dumpling*

7. **hyponymic translation (interlingual generalisation)**: porter, ale – пиво, frankfurter – сосиска, кожух –coat, печериці – mushrooms

INTERNATIONAL WORDS

International word or internationalism is a borrowed word that occurs in several languages with the same or at least similar meaning and etymology. These words exist in several different languages (at least 3) as a result of simultaneous or successive borrowing from the ultimate source. Pronunciation and spelling are similar so that the word is understandable between the different languages.

The international words may be divided into three groups: *genuine internationalisms, loan internationalisms and pseudo-international units.*

The units of ***genuine international lexicon*** are identified on the basis of their common in different languages lexical meaning and identical or similar lingual form. The latter never considerably change their lingual (orthographic or sounding) form nor their internationally established meaning: *radius* – радіус, *Geography* – географія. The main characteristic feature of genuine internationalisms is their semantic singularity. It means that their lexical meaning and orthographic form in the source language and in all target languages remain unchanged.

Loan internationalisms, on the other hand, are identified mainly on the basis of their common sphere of use, their lexical meaning, functional significance and partly structural form. Depending on their structure as well as on their denotative meaning and their sphere of use international loan units *can be rendered* into Ukrainian in one of the following three ways:

- by direct translation of the componental parts without changing considerably their structural form: *literal/verbal translation* – буквальний/дослівний переклад;
- by componental translation and some replacements, omissions, substitutions arising from the national peculiarities of the target language: *living standard* – *життєвий рівень*;
- by descriptive translation: *pluralia tantum* – іменники, що вживаються тільки у множині.

Translation of pseudo international words. There is a distinct group of words which constitutes a special difficulty for the translator, the so-called pseudo-international words. They, as part of the lexical system of different languages, acquired in these languages new semantic features – different semantic structures, additional lexical-semantic variants, different connotations and different usage. The Ukrainian language borrows these words most often as terms and they tend to be monosemantic while in the English language they are usually polysemantic. Although warned against them translators are often deceived into making errors by purely formal resemblances: e.g., *complexion* колір обличчя, not комплекція

The Ukrainian loan word *окупантiс* used only in a special sense as a military term with negative connotations whereas the English word is polysemantic (also means мешканець).

Questions and Topics for discussion

- What are the basic translation devices for rendering proper names?
- What are the basic translation devices for rendering geographical names?
- What is transformation? What lexical transformations do you know?
- What is descriptive and antonymous translation?
- Speak on different kinds of transcoding
- What is concretization and generalization? Give examples of Ukrainian-English translation.
- Speak on peculiarities of Translation of attributive groups
- Speak on different kinds of non-equivalent units.
- What are the ways of rendering the meaning of nationally biased units of lexicon?
- Speak on the notion of International words, kinds of International words and ways of their rendering in the Ukrainian language.

Topic 4. Lecture 6-7. GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION.GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS

Key terms: *divergencies, contextual meanings, theme, rheme, verbals, emphatic constructions, elliptical sentences, subordinate clause, transposition, sentence partitioning, integration, grammar substitution / replacement.*

The tasks: to study the rules of rendering some morphological and syntactical structures in translation; basic translators' devices at grammatical level applied as tools to ensure adequate translation

Plan

1. Translation of articles
2. Translation of verbals
3. Translation of emphatic constructions
4. Translation of elliptical sentences
5. Grammar transformations

References

1. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2003. с.167-170, 208-215, 253-310
2. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. с. 109-113
3. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. – Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. с.90-101.
4. Основи перекладу: лексичні та граматичні аспекти: навч. посіб / За ред. В.К.Шпака. К.: Знання, 2007. 310 с.

English and Ukrainian belong to two different branches of Indo-European languages and have lots of divergencies in their structure, sets of grammatical categories and constructions, which causes lots of difficulties in translation

Rendering of the contextual meanings of the definite and indefinite articles

The article (both the definite and indefinite) is a functional word serving to identify or determine the noun (to work – the work), the superlative degree of its quality (the tallest tree) or the order of nouns in a word group (the first step) or in a row of similar nouns. In some prepositional phrases and word-combinations the definite and indefinite articles, however, may change their lexico-grammatical nature (become a particle), as in the expression: *the more, the better* (чим більше, тим краще) or acquire some peculiar grammatical, functional and lexical meaning (*The Browns* – подружжя Браунів). The article may be lexicalized as in *the Alps/ The Carpathians* гори Альпи/Карпати, *at the baker`s/ butcher`s* у хлібному/ м`ясному магазині.

Other examples: He lived more poorly than an artisan. (S. Maugham) Жив він бідніше за будь-якого ремісника. Carot never sold a picture (Ibid) Каро не продав жодної картини/ ні однієї картини.

Realization of contextual meanings of the definite article

The definite article when endowed with the lexical meaning in a sentence or passage can have various realizations in Ukrainian.

- as the demonstrative pronoun *цей (ця, ці)*

What his sister has seen in **the** man was beyond him. (J.London) *Що його сестра знайшла у **цьому** чоловікові, він не міг збагнути.*

- as the identifying pronoun *весь, вся, все/цілий*

He looked up, and it seemed that the room was lifting... *Він підвів голову, і йому здалося, що вся кімната ходить ходором...*

- as an adjective or adjectivized participle (according to the contextual meaning)

Martin Eden didn't go out to hunt for a job in the morning. *Мартін Іден не пішов **наступного** ранку шукати роботи.*

- As a particle emphasizing the attributive pronoun, numeral or some other part of speech:

But the story was grand just the same, perfectly grand. *А так це оповідання – чудове, ну **просто** чудове.*

In many a case **the definite article** may point to **thematic** functioning of the noun which is usually in the initial position in the sentence: *The old man stared at the open door.* *Старий з острахом дивився на прочинені двері.*

The rheme, the new notional element in the utterance, is more frequently indicated in **English by the indefinite article** determining the noun in the initial position. When translated into Ukrainian, however, the rhematic noun occupies a final position: A light fog began to drift through the air, and the stars were swallowed in it. *У повітрі потяглися легенькі пасма туману, і вони заволокли й поглинули зірки*

Realization of contextual meanings of the indefinite article

The most frequent and common of the meanings can be expressed in one of the following ways:

- By the cardinal numeral один (одна, одне): He said something about a schooner that's getting ready to go off. (O. Wilde) *Він розповідав щось про одну шхуну, яка готується відпливати.*

- By the indefinite pronoun якийсь only, without the attendant meanings of the cardinal or ordinal numerals: *He lived more poorly than an artisan.* (S. Maugham) *Жив він бідніше за будь-якого ремісника.*

- As the negative pronoun жоден or the negative particle ані: You were not following a word. *Ви не чули жодного слова/ані слова.*

- As the relative adjective цілий which is lexically equivalent in the sentences below to the Ukrainian identifying pronoun весь (вся, все): Martin rented a typewriter and spent **a day** mastering the machine *Мартін узяв напрокат друкарську машинку і **цілий (весь) день** вчився друкувати на ній.*

- The contextual meaning of the indefinite article may sometimes be expressed in Ukrainian through different adverbs: He had the conviction that he could sit in **a draught** if he wanted to. *У нього було таке переконання, що він міг сидіти **навіть** на протязі, якби того захотів...*

- The contextual meaning of the indefinite article may be expressed through the interrogative or indefinite pronoun also enforced by some emphatic particles:

What **a lovely day!** *Який же гарний день!*

• Sometimes the article may substitute an implicit indentifying/ interrogative pronoun and a particle expressing the contextual meaning of the emphatically used noun with the definite article.

The pity of it! **The** pity of it! **Як** жаль! **Який** жаль! **А** шкода! **Дуже** шкода!

So, when translating articles we use such transformations: *addition, omission, transposition*

Translation of verbals

Translation of the infinitive and infinitive complexes

1. Translation of the infinitive depends on its syntactic **form and function**.

Infinitive in the function of **the subject**, the nominal part of the compound predicate and adverbial modifier of purpose is easy for translation. In these functions, it is translated by the infinitive in the function of the subject, by a noun or adverbial modifier of purpose.

It was impossible *to repeat* anything she said for the fun, like certain wines, would not travel. *Повторити те, що вона говорила, було неможливо, адже жарти, подібно деяким винам, не люблять мандрів.*

Mrs. Tower paused to take breath. Місіс Тауер зупинилась, щоб перевести подих.

Infinitive in the function of **the object** is usually translated by the infinitive, sometimes by a subordinate clause.

Mr. Kelada found it utterly impossible to leave the spot. Містер Келада вважав абсолютно неможливим покинути це місце.

Infinitive in the function of an **attribute** is usually translated by an attributive clause with modal verbal predicate, expressing the possibility or necessity: *Here is the text to translate.* Ось текст, який треба перекласти.

After the word *the last* and ordinal numerals, infinitive in the function of an attribute is translated by a finite verb in the same tense as the predicate of the principal clause: *He was the last to come.* Він прийшов останнім.

Infinitive as **a parenthesis** is translated with the Ukrainian set expressions: *to put it in other words* – *іншими словами*, *to put it simply* – *простіше кажучи*, *suffice to say* – *достатньо сказати*, *so to say* – *так би мовити*

The passive infinitive form being an attribute is usually translated into Ukrainian by an impersonal sentence.

I made a list of things to be taken. Я склав список речей, які треба було взяти.

The infinitive in the function of **the adverbial modifier of result** after the words *such ... (as) enough, so ..., too ..., only*, often has a modal meaning and is translated by the infinitive or an independent sentence that is introduced by a subordinate conjunction.

This question is too difficult to be settled. Це питання нелегко вирішити. (Це питання занадто складне, щоб його можна було вирішити).

Perfect Infinitive is often translated as subordinate clause, introduced by a conjunction *що* where the perfect form becomes the verb in the past tense,

It's very nice of you to have come here. Дуже добре, що ти прийшов сюди.

Continuous Infinitive expresses continued action that occurs simultaneously with the action expressed by the finite verb and can be translated as an infinitive or finite verb in a subordinate clause.

It was a pleasure to be walking with you.

Було приємно прогулятися з тобою. (Було приємно, що я гуляв з тобою).

2. **For-to-infinitive construction** can have different functions in a sentence, for example: a subject, object, attribute, adverbial modifier, nominal part of the predicate, therefore it causes some difficulties in translation.

This complex is translated into Ukrainian by using the infinitive, subordinate clause with some transformations, the noun or noun group.

What we want is for you to understand the matter clearly.

Все, що нам потрібно, це щоб ти чітко зрозумів проблему.

3. **Objective with the Infinitive Construction** – is a construction of a pronoun in the objective case or a noun in the nominative case with the infinitive. This construction performs the function of a complex object. Such complexes are translated by complex sentences with a subordinate clause, introduced by conjunctions : *що, щоб, як*, by the infinitive or a noun.

He saw the boy come and take the book. Він бачив, як хлопчик підійшов і взяв книжку.

4. **Subjective with the Infinitive Construction.** There are two kinds of Subjective with the Infinitive Construction: with a form of active and passive verb-predicate.

Sentences with a passive form of the verb *announce, declare, report, say, state, mean, consider, understand, find, feel, watch* and others are translated by complex sentences with a subordinate clause:

The above-mentioned method is thought by some to be very difficult.

Деякі вважають, що згаданий вище метод занадто складний.

Sentences where Subjective with the Infinitive Construction is used with active form of the verb-predicate *seem, appear, prove, turn out, happen, chance, be likely, be unlikely, be sure, be certain* are translated in different ways. There are two main ways of translating of such a construction:

1) finite form of the verb-predicate of the English sentence transforms into parenthesis, the infinitive turns into the finite form of the verb-predicate of the ukrainian sentence: *But this camp seems to be better guarded.* Але цей табір, здається, краще охороняється.

2) finite form of the verb-predicate of the English sentence goes into the main sentence and the infinitive became a form of the verb-predicate in the clause. For example: *He happened to be there.* Трапилося так, що він там був.

While translating this construction it is necessary to pay attention to the form of the English infinitive – non-perfect infinitive is translated in the present tense, and perfect infinitive – in past tense.

He turned out to be a good doctor. Виявилось, що він хороший лікар.

The period of the highest civilization of ancient Egypt seems to have been that of the Middle Empire. Здається, що періодом найвищого розвитку цивілізації стародавнього Єгипту, була саме Середньовічна імперія.

If the first part of the English predicate is expressed with phrases *to be certain, to be unlikely, to be sure* тощо, so in the translation the future tense is used. In this

case non-perfect infinitive is used only :*He is sure to come on Monday.* Він точно прийде у понеділок.

Translation of Gerund and Gerundial complexes

Depending on the function in the sentence, gerund can be translated into Ukrainian by:

1) a noun.

Cycling is his hobby. Катання на велосипеді — його улюблене заняття.

2) the infinitive.

He showed a positive gift for saying the wrong things in the wrong words at the wrong time. Він демонстрував природний дар казати не те, що треба, не так, як треба, і не тоді, коли це потрібно;

3) participial construction or clause:

In Washington there is satisfaction that the French by joining the float have indirectly acknowledged that the U.S. was right all along. У Вашингтоні виражають задоволення тим, що Франція, яка приєдналась (приєднуючись) до країн з плаваючим курсом валюти, тим самим непрямо визнала, що США були цілком праві.

Gerundial complex (noun/pronoun + gerund) is translated by a clause, rarely by a noun. For example:

Everything depends on your participating in the conference. Усе залежить від того, чи ти візьмеш участь у конференції (від твоєї участі у конференції)

Translation of Participle and Participial complexes

Participle I is translated by

1. a defining relative clause with the conjunction *що, який*.

The pipe-line being built in this region passes under a big lake. Трубопровід, що будується в цьому районі, проходить під великим озером.

2. Adverbial clause.

Considering the matter he encountered many difficulties. Коли вони обговорювали це питання, він зіткнувся з багатьма проблемами.

Participle II is translated by :

1. an adverbial clause.

Asked if the United States is rendering military aid to the forces opposing the lawful government in that country the senator gave an evasive reply. Коли його запитали, чи надають Сполучені Штати військову допомогу силам, які протистоять законному уряду цієї країни, сенатор ухилився від відповіді.

2. a defining relative clause.

These are some of the problems dealt with at the conference. Ось деякі з проблем, що розглядались на конференції.

Some participle I and II have constant equivalents in Ukrainian language. Among them are such conjunctions **provided** “заумови, якщо”, **granted** “зважаючи на те що; враховуючи; за умови; якщо дійсно”; prepositions **given** “за наявності; з урахуванням; з огляду; беручи до уваги; зважаючина; якщо (враховувати, що)”, **failing** “завідсутністю”, **assuming** “якщо припустити”, **considering** “беручи до уваги” and others.

Given the necessary prerequisites, the talks could bring about a final settlement. За наявності необхідних передумов, переговори, ймовірно, можуть призвести до укладання кінцевої угоди.

Translation of the Absolute Participial Construction

These structures are called absolute because they do not depend on any part of the sentence, even though they cannot be used without it as they don't have a finite verb.

The most common is **the nominative absolute construction with the Participle I**. When translating such structures only its location matters – it can start a sentence, or end it.

Such a construction can be introduced with a help of a preposition *with*.

Structures that are at the beginning of the sentence can be translated by:

a) time clauses, that are introduced by conjunctions *коли, якщо, оскільки*. When translating we should find out what is the function of the structure (Adverbial Clauses of purpose, condition and cause).

The last document having been signed, the director put it into the safe.

Коли останній документ був підписаний, директор поклав його до сейфу.

It being late, they went home. Оскільки було пізно, вони пішли додому.

b) participial construction.

His face smiling, John entered Mr. Green's office. Усміхаючись, Джон увійшов до офісу містера Гріна.

Structures that are at the end of a sentence are translated in several ways:

a) by a compound sentence, that is introduced with a help of conjunctions *i, але, та*.

To my surprise it opened at once, and Davy came out, his cheek grazed and bleeding, his face ghost white, his eyes bulging like calf's. На мій подив двері відчинились відразу, і вийшов Дейві, та його щока була подряпана і кровоточила, обличчя бліде, як полотно, очі, вилуплені, як у теляти.

b) adverbial clauses, that are introduced by conjunctions : *причому, оскільки, дещо*.

The Czech Republic comes in a distant third with average daily trading volume of \$ 9.5 million. Чеська Республіка лише на третьому місці, причому середній обсяг денного продажу становить 9,5 мільйонів доларів;

c) a separate sentence.

The Estonian Song Festival, twin event held in July, involve thousands of amateur singers and dancers. На естонському пісенному фестивалі виступають тисячі співаків і танцюристів-аматорів. У липні відбудеться ще один подібний фестиваль;

d) a defining relative clause.

Microsoft of the GE is the biggest company in the USA with a market value of \$360 billion. Після Дженерал Електрік Майкрософт є другою за величиною компанією в США, ринкова вартість якої складає 360 мільярдів доларів.

Very rarely absolute constructions with infinitive are found in English. They are translated by adverbial clauses or asyndetic sentences:

There they remained, some of them to be entirely forgotten. Вони залишилися там, про деяких з них повністю забули.

Absolute constructions with Participle II usually perform the function of time clauses or adverbial modifiers of attending circumstances.

Absolute constructions with Participle II, which stand at the beginning of the sentence, are translated by participial constructions and adverbial clauses: *Breakfast served, Mr Brown entered the room.* Коли подали сніданок, містер Браун увійшов до кімнати.

Final absolute constructions are translated by adverbial clauses or separate sentences, which are often joined asyndetically to the last one.

She pictured him as she had seen him last in the cage that was his prison, his clothes torn and filthy. Вона уявила, як бачила його востаннє в клітці, яка була його в'язницею, його одяг був розірваний та брудний.

Absolute nominative constructions can have no verbal forms. They can include adverbs, adjectives, and nouns with preposition. Such structures can be translated by participial constructions, complex or simple sentence.

He stepped forward, his face red with anger. Він ступив уперед. Обличчя його було червоне від злості. *Tea over, they went into the yard.* Попивши чаю, вони вийшли на подвір'я.

Translation of emphatic constructions

Emphasis – foregrounding of any element of the utterance to enhance the expressiveness of speech. Various means of expressing emphasis could be found in the fiction style, in newspaper and journalistic style, where both have strong emotional coloring. The most commonly used emphatic constructions include:

1) emphatic construction with *it*. In this case emphasis usually is expressed by emphatic particles: *саме, якраз* and others.

It is the gravitation that makes the satellites move round the earth. Саме гравітація примушує супутники рухатися навколо Землі;

2) emphatic construction *this is what (where, when, why, how), that* is translated like *ось, саме*.

That's when world war broke out in the electronics industry. Саме тоді розпочалась світова війна в електронній промисловості;

Translating emphatic subject clauses we often use complex sentences in preposition. *What I need is a good rest.* Усе, що мені потрібно, це гарний відпочинок.

What you are seeking is a quiet place. До чого ви прагнете, це тиха місцина.

For translation of sentences with an emphatic particle *do / does / did*, use not only the particle *таки*, but also *нарешті* (according to the context): *He did come.* Він нарешті прийшов.

Translation of elliptical sentences

Elliptical constructions express an opinion in a shortened form. When translating, this idea should be expanded. Elliptical constructions are often used in subordinate clauses, in conversational and scientific English

1. Elliptical constructions *if any, if anything, if at all, if ever, if only, if then* have expressive meaning and are rendered in Ukrainian by conditional clauses with conjunctions *якщо, хоча, майже* or descriptively.

Very little, if anything, could be advanced in the defense of his policy.
Просування у захисті цієї політики є дуже малими, якщо взагалі можливими

2. Elliptical constructions with conjunctions *whatever, however*, that has no predicate (sometimes subject) are translated by a subordinate clause with conjunctions *який би не, яким би не*.

Whatever the problem we can solve it. Якою би не була проблема, ми можемо її вирішити.

3. Elliptical complex sentences, that consist of the connection of: *if + participle II (or adjective)* are translated by adverbial clauses: *If asked, you are to tell the truth.* Якщо вас запитують, ви повинні сказати правду.

4. *if only because* is translated – *хоча б тільки тому*: *Old Giles must be spoken about, if only because his fate was so remarkable*

if only is translated – *хочай, хоча б*: *I wanted to see her, if only for a few minutes. Tom must speak to them, if only to justify his actions*

Modal verbs translation

The translator must be able to understand various **modal relationships** expressed by different means in SL and choose appropriate means in TL as most modal verbs in English are polisemantic. There are no direct correspondences between English and Ukrainian modal verbs: e.g. **Must** expresses obligation and probability: *You must go; He must be ill*

Sometimes in Ukrainian equivalents there are no modal forms:

She can paint well – Вона гарно малює

I can see him already – Я вже його бачу

Why should I listen to you? – Чого це вас слухати?

The pen won't write – ручка не пише

GRAMMAR TRANSFORMATIONS

Grammar transformations are morphological or syntactical changes in translated units.

One should note, however, that the majority of syntactic transformations in English-Ukrainian translation are occasional, i. e. the translator transforms the source syntactic structures on case-by-case basis, each case being dependent on the context, situation, pragmatic intent and many other factors some of which are unknown and the translator's decisions relevant to the case are often intuitive.

To put it differently, it is impossible to formulate the rules for the overwhelming majority of such occasional transformations and one simply cannot list all occasional transformations that are observed in English-Ukrainian translation.

In English-Ukrainian translation *occasional* transformations are often the matter of translator's individual choice and, in general, strongly depend on stylistic peculiarities and communication intent of the source text.

To put it differently, it is impossible to formulate the rules for the overwhelming majority of such occasional transformations and one simply cannot list all occasional transformations that are observed in English-Ukrainian translation.

Yet, in English-Ukrainian translation there are also cases of *regular syntactic transformations*, where a translator is expected to observe certain transformation rules more or less strictly

Regular syntactic (grammatical) transformations are the matching rules for the grammars of the two languages involved in translation

Grammar transformations are subdivided into the following types:

1. Transposition / Word order change. Usually the reason for this transformation is that English and Ukrainian sentences have different information structures, or functional sentence perspective. For example, *A new press conference*

was held in Washington yesterday is naturally equivalent to *Вчора у Вашингтоні відбулася нова прес-конференція*, where the adverbial modifiers, subject and predicate are positioned in a mirror like fashion.

2. Sentence partitioning is the replacement of a simple sentence in the source text with a complex sentence (inner partitioning), or a complex sentence with several independent sentences in the target text (outer partitioning), for structural, semantic or stylistic reasons: *I want you to understand this transformation.* – *Я хочу, щоб ви зрозуміли цю трансформацію (regular transformation).*

Моя машина не завелась, тому я не змогла заїхати за вами. – *My car wouldn't start. Therefore, I couldn't pick you up. (occasional transformation).*

3. Sentence integration is a contrary transformation. It takes place when we make one sentence out of two or more, or convert a complex sentence into a simple one: *In ancient Rome, garlic was believed to make people courageous. Roman soldiers, therefore, ate large quantities of it before a battle.* – *Перед боєм римські воїни з'їдали багато часнику, оскільки у древньому Римі вважали, що часник робить людей*

4. Grammar substitution / replacement, when a grammar category of the translated unit is changed.

Typical substitutions include:

- **changes of voice:** *A new press conference was held in Washington yesterday* is naturally equivalent to *У чора у Вашингтоні відбулася нова прес-конференція*

- **changes in grammatical tenses** due to the sequences of tenses in English: *Вона поскаржилась, що почувається втомленою.* *She complained that she was tired.*

- **changes in the number of a noun:** *They demand higher wages.* – *Вони вимагають підвищити заробітну плату.*

- **substitutions of Parts of Speech:**

- replacing Verbs by Nouns (nominalization) and Nouns by Verbs (verbalization): *Ми сподіваємося, що...* – *It is our hope that...*

- replacement of a noun by an adjective, and vice versa: збільшення прозорості – greater transparency, гранична швидкість – speed limit

- replacement of English 'Nomina agentis' (drinker, sleeper, etc.) by Ukrainian Verbs: *He is a heavy drinker*– Він багато п'є

- replacement of a noun by a gerund: Читання–*моє улюблене заняття*.
Reading is my hobby.

- replacement of an “adjective + a noun” by “a noun + preposition of + a noun” construction, e.g. *добра справа* – *act of kindness*, *правовий акт* — *Act of law*

- English adjectives used predicatively are replaced by Verbs :*She was silent* –
Вона мовчала

- English Gerund is replaced by Ukrainian verb/verbal noun, and vice versa:
copying – зняття копій

• **Replacement of a sentence member:** the subject is replaced by an adverbial modifier: *The airliner crash killed 50 people* – *У результаті авіакатастрофи загинуло 50 людей*

Last year saw many events – *Минулого року відбулося багато подій*

Questions and Topics for discussion

- Speak on realization of the contextual meanings of the indefinite and definite article in translation
- What are the peculiarities of translation of verbals?
- What is grammatical transformation? What grammatical transformations do you know?
- What is partitioning and integration? Define them and give examples.
- What is replacement? Define it. What are the basic types of replacements in practical translation? Give examples.

Topic 5. Lecture 8. TRANSLATION AND STYLE

Key terms: *functional styles, stylistic equivalence, communication intent, stylistic transformations, metaphorization, remetaphorization, demetaphorization, Logization, expressivation, modernization, archaization.*

The tasks: to learn the rules of achieving stylistic equivalence, ways of rendering idioms; to be able to distinguish stylistic transformations

Plan

1. The relation between translation equivalence and style
2. Translation of fiction texts. Rendering expressive means and stylistic devices.
3. Translation of idioms.
4. Stylistic Transformations

References

1. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2003. с.405-418.
2. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. с.125-131.
3. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. с.68-78.
4. Основи перекладу: лексичні та граматичні аспекти: навч. посіб / За ред. В.К.Шпака. К.: Знання, 2007. 310 с.
5. Yefimov L.P., Yasinetska E.A. practical Stylistics of English. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2004.
6. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. M., 1981.

The problem of translation equivalence is closely connected with the stylistic aspect of translation – one cannot reach the required level of equivalence if the stylistic peculiarities of the source text are neglected. Full translation adequacy includes as an obligatory component the adequacy of style, i. e. the right choice of stylistic means and devices of the target-language to substitute for those observed in the source text. This means that in translation one is to find proper stylistic variations of the original

meaning rather than only meaning itself.

For example, if the text *You'll see... everything will be hunky-dory* is translated in neutral style (say, *Побачиш...усе буде добре*) the basic meaning will be preserved but colloquial and a bit vulgar connotation of the expression *hunky-dory* will be lost. Only the stylistically correct equivalent of this expression gives the translation the required adequacy: (e. g. *Побачиш.... усе буде min-mon*).

The expression of stylistic peculiarities of the source text in translation is necessary to fully convey the communication intent of the source text.

Stylistic peculiarities are rendered in translation by proper choice of the target language translation equivalents with required stylistic coloring. This choice will depend both on the functional style of the source text and the individual style of the source text author.

The types of texts distinguished by the pragmatic aspect of communication are called functional styles. Modern stylistics distinguishes the following varieties of functional styles (Galperin I.R. Stylistics. M., 1981):

1. belles-lettres (prose, poetry, drama);
2. publicistic style;
3. newspaper style;
4. scientific style;
5. official documents

L.P. Yefimov adds colloquial style.

Any comparison of the texts belonging to different stylistic varieties listed above will show that the last two of them (scientific style variety and official documents) are almost entirely devoid of stylistic coloring being characterized by the neutrality of style whereas the first three (belles-lettres (prose, poetry, drama), publicistic and newspaper style) are usually rich in stylistic devices to which a translator ought to pay due attention.

First of all a translator is to distinguish between neutral, bookish and colloquial words and word combinations, translating them by relevant units of the target language. Usually it is a routine task. However, it sometimes is hard to determine the correct stylistic variety of a translation equivalent, then – as in almost all instances of

translation – final decision is taken on the basis of context, situation and background information.

For example, it is hard to decide without further information, which of the English words - *disease*, *illness* or *sickness* - corresponds to the Ukrainian words *хвороба* and *захворювання*. However, even such short contexts as *infectious disease* and *social disease* already help to choose appropriate equivalents and translate the word *disease* as *інфекційне захворювання* and *соціальна хвороба*, accordingly.

This example brings us to a very important conclusion that style is expressed in proper combination of words rather than only in stylistic coloring of the individual words.

Stylistic devices are based on the comparison of primary (dictionary) meaning and that dictated by the contextual environment; on the contradiction between the meaning of the given word and the environment; on the association between words in the minds of the language speakers and on purposeful deviation from accepted grammatical and phonetic standards.

The following varieties of stylistic devices and expression means are most common and frequently dealt with even by the translators of non-fiction texts.

TRANSLATION OF FICTION TEXTS.

RENDERING EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES.

The main difficulty in translating artistic texts is the need to interpret the author's intentions, preserve his literary style, psychological and emotional elements and aesthetic value.

Special language media securing the desirable communication effect of the fiction text are called *stylistic devices* and *expressive means*.

The expressive means of a language are those phonetic, morphological, word-building, lexical, phraseological and syntactical forms which exist in language-as-a-system for the purpose of logical and / or emotional intensification of the utterance [Galperin 1977, 27].

A stylistic device is a conscious and intentional intensification of some typical structural and / or semantic property of a language unit (neutral or expressive) promoted to a generalized status and thus becoming a generative model [Galperin 1977, 30].

Metaphor is the transfer of some quality from one object to another.

A Metaphor is a rhetorical element that generally involves using a specific word to express an abstract concept and which takes the form of an elliptical comparison based on an analogy between two objects, two concepts, or two situations that possess a common characteristic

Usually the metaphors (especially trite ones, commonplace, not new) are rather easy for translation. Metaphors can be translated in the following ways :

1. by keeping to semantic similarity & preserving **the same** imagery (word for word / calque translation): *a ray of hope* – промінь надії

black book / black list – чорний список, *чорний ринок* – black market

2. with a metaphor in the TL with **different** imagery (equivalent metaphor)

занепалий духом – *heartsick*

flood of tears – море сліз

She makes clouds with one hand, rain with the other – Ліва рука не знає, що робить права

3. with a non-metaphorical **imagery-free** unit

чорна робота – unskilled labour

white-collar job – високооплачувана робота

blue-collar job – низькооплачувана робота

4. substitution of a trope: *не ..., а...*

не машина, а мрія – *a dream of a car* (*metaphoric epithet*)

We can observe the following **semantic metaphoric modifications**: metaphorization, remetaphorization and demetaphorization.

Metaphorization involves the change of a non-metaphoric expression into metaphoric, e.g. *старий (банальний) жарт* - *a threadbare joke*, *плаксуха* - *a crybaby*, *балакун* - *a windbag (gasbag)*, *успішні бізнесмени* - *whizz-kids of business*.

Він вирішив почати жити по-новому. – *He decided to turn over a new leaf*

Remetaphorization – the change of metaphors, mostly in translation of phraseological units, e.g. *in for a penny, in for a pound* (to be already involved in something and have to complete it whatever time, money, or effort is needed) –

обізвався грибом – лізь у кіш (борщ); to be on cloud nine (informal to be very happy about something) – бути на сьомому небі.

Demetaphorization– metaphoric expression loses its expressiveness in translation, e.g. *Every president should remember that charity begins at home.* *Кожен президент повинен пам'ятати, що в першу чергу треба навести лад в своїй країні.*

POTENTIAL PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATING METAPHORS

1. There are ancient anthropomorphic forms of world perception. People tend to endow objects with the category of gender: Turtle, Fish, Frog, Caterpillar – “he” in English, “вона” in Ukrainian);
2. Difference in axiological (emotional-evaluative) associations, in Ukrainian “кінь” –сильний, великий незграбний роботящий in English “horse” - of good pedigree, gracious .

Metaphoric transformations are based on transferring the meaning due to the similarity of notions.

The target language can re-metaphorize a word or a phrase by using the same image (*Don't dirty your hands with that money!* – *Не брудни руки цими грошима!*) or a different one (*Він поверне нам гроші, коли рак свисне* – *He will pay us our money back when hell freezes over*). The source language metaphor can be destroyed if there is no similar idiom in the target language: *Весна уже на порозі.* – *Spring is coming very soon.* Or, on the contrary, the target text is metaphORIZED either to compensate a stylistically marked word or phrase whose coloring was lost for some reason, or merely to express a source language lacuna: *Він вирішив почати життя по-новому.* – *He decided to turn over a new leaf* (expressivation)

Metonymy

Metonymy is similarity by association, when usually one of the constituents of an object replaces the object itself.

Ukrainian metonymic units are usually translated into English in the following way:

1. with the corresponding metonymic unit with the same imagery. In this case as a rule translators keep to literal translation. For example, *crown* (meaning the royal

family) is usually translated as *корона, hand - рука* (e. g. in: *He is the right hand of the president. Він сильною рукою розправився з опозицією. He took care of the opposition with a strong hand. У Києві зрозуміли, що ...Kyiv has realized that...*), etc.

2. with a metonymic unit with different imagery:

The rumor was leaked from the Government **corridors**. Чутки поширилися з урядових кіл.

3. by substituting a metonymic unit for a metonymy-free unit:

Втім, українській владі незабаром прийдеться точніше визначити свої позиції.—But **Ukrainian leaders** will soon have to define their position more clearly.

Закрити двері від сторонніх очей. – To close the door to **outsiders**.

Він попросив мене купити Мальборо (metonymy will be preserved as brand Marlboro is known all over the world).

But in :*Він попросив мене купити кілограм „Ромашки”* the metonymy will be lost.

4. by substituting a metonymic unit for a different stylistic device.

Advertisement: “These wheels will drive you at your pleasure” (“these wheels” is used as metonymy (синецдоха) instead of “this car”. If we translate this ad as „Ці колеса гарантують вам чудову поїздку”, we lower the style, as in Ukrainian „колёса” (as in „Бери якісь колеса і їдь за нами” is typical of colloquial style and expresses careless attitude of the speaker. Besides, in Ukrainian it sounds like we are talking about some wheels proper, not the car itself. Thus more appropriate is the *paraphrase*: «Ваш друг на колесах гарантує вам чудову поїздку» or paraphrase with addition “Ці надійні колеса, сучасний дизайн і автоматичне управління гарантують вам чудову поїздку”

Zeugma

Semantic and syntactic irregularities of expression used as stylistic devices are called *transferred qualifier* and *zeugma*.

A good example of a *transferred qualifier* is *he paid his smiling attention to...* - here the qualifier *smiling* refers to a person, but is used as an attribute to the state (*attention*). Translator's task in this case consists in rendering the idea in compliance with the lexical combination rules of the target language. For instance, in Ukrainian it

may be expressed as *Посміхаючись, він звернув увагу...*

Zeugma is also a semantic irregularity, e. g. if one and the same verb is combined with two or more nouns and acquires a different meaning in each of such combinations. For example, *He has taken her picture and another cup of tea*. Here again the translator's task is to try to render this ironical comment either by finding a similar irregularity in the target language or, failing to show a *zeugma* (and irony of the author), stick to regular target language means (i. e. 1– separate the two actions *Він зробив її фото і випив ще одну чашку чаю* or 2 – try to render them as a *zeugma* as well *Він зробив її фото іще один ковток чаю з чашки*).

Pun

A pun (so called 'play of words') is righteously considered the most difficult for translation.

Pun is the realization in one and the same word of two lexical meanings simultaneously.

A pun can be translated only by a word in the target language with similar capacity to develop two meanings in a particular context. English is comparatively rich in polysems and homonyms, whereas in Ukrainian these word types are rather rare. Let's take an example of a pun and its fairly good Ukrainian translation.

- What gear were you in at the moment of impact?(gear - одяг, передача)
- Gucci's sweats and Reebok.
- На якій передачі ви були під час зіткнення?
- «Останні новини».

Paraphrase

Another stylistic device is a *paraphrase*. Its frequent use is characteristic of the English language. Some of the paraphrases are borrowed from classical sources (myths and the Bible); others are typically English. To give an example, the paraphrases of the classical origin are «*Beware Greeks...*», «*Prodigal son*» (*Бійтеся данайців...*), «*Блудний син*») whereas «*Lake Country*» («*Озерна країна*») is a typically English paraphrase. As a rule paraphrases do not present difficulties for translation, however, their correct translation strongly depends on situation and appropriate background information.

Irony

Irony is expressed through words contradicting close text environment.

Cases of irony do not present serious problems for translation and the approaches similar to those mentioned above (semantic or pragmatic equivalence) are commonly used. For example, the ironical expression *paper war* may be translated as *паперова війна* or *війна паперів*.

Very often the irony can be rendered into the TL with help of quotation marks:

“When I left my public school I had an extensive knowledge of Latin Greek literature, knew a certain amount of Greek and Latin history and French grammar, and had **“done”** a little mathematics”.

- “Закінчивши приватну гімназію, я непогано знав античну літературу, мав уявлення про античну історію і французьку мову, а також **“пройшов”** ази математики”

TRANSLATION OF IDIOMS

Idioms are frozen patterns of language which allow little or no variation in form and often carry meanings which cannot be deduced from their individual components (*to bury the hatchet* - *законати сокиру війни, припинити ворожнечу; the long and short of it* - *коротше кажучи, суть тому, що...*).

Some idioms are “misleading”; they seem to be transparent because they offer a reasonable literal interpretation and their idiomatic meanings are not necessarily signaled in the surrounding text. A large number of idioms have both a literal and an idiomatic meaning (*to go out with somebody* - *гуляти з ким-небудь; зустрічатися; to take somebody for a ride* - *підвезти когось (кудиь); обдурити*). In this case, a translator who is not familiar with the idiom in question may easily accept the literal interpretation and miss the play on idiom.

An **idiom’s semantics** is a complex entity. It has 5 aspects that influence the translator’s choice: the idiom’s figurative meaning, its literal sense, its emotive character, stylistic register, national colouring.

One of the most challenging issues in the realm of translation is translating phraseological units/idioms from one language into another with the maximal success in conveying the same conceptualization, connotation and shades of meaning. Hence,

there are two main problems in this case: 1) how to understand the meaning of idioms and fixed expressions of a language; and 2) how to recreate the same sets of idioms and fixed expressions of one language in another language in a way that they might convey exactly the same ideas of the original language. The first difficulty that a translator comes across is being able to recognize that s/he is dealing with an idiomatic expression. **M. Baker** classifies the problems of translating idioms into four subcategories:

- an idiom or fixed expression may have no equivalent in the target language;
- an idiom or fixed expression may have a similar counterpart in the target language, but its context of use may be different;
- an idiom may be used in the ST in both its literal and idiomatic senses at the same time;
- the very convention of using idioms in written discourse, the contexts in which they can be used, and their frequency of use may be different in the source and target languages.

The way in which an idiom or a fixed expression can be translated into another language depends on many factors; questions of style, register, and rhetorical effect must also be taken into consideration.

The **methods of translating** phraseological units:

Absolute equivalent means using a phraseological unit of similar meaning and form in a way that the TL unit conveys exactly the same meaning by the use of the same equivalent lexical items to the SL ones. This kind of match can only be achieved occasionally. Such units are mostly based on some historical, biblical, mythological references. They can also belong to the Latin or Greek borrowings that were later borrowed by both source and target languages. For example: *Achilles' heel* – *Ахіллесован 'ята*; *To cut the Gordian knot* – *розрубати Гордієв вузол*.

Relative (near) equivalent The units in SL and TL may differ in some aspects, for instance, a lexical component, grammatical structure, image they are based on. For example: *to sell the bear's skin* – *ділити шкуру невбитого ведмедя*, *to buy a pig in a poke* – *купити kota в мішку*; *as old as a hill* – *стари йя квіт*.

Phraseological analogue or a semantic equivalent means using a phraseological unit of similar meaning but dissimilar form in a way that a fixed expression in the target language has a meaning similar to that of the source idiom or expression, but consists of different lexical items. For example: *Can the leopard change his spots?* – *Горбатого могила виправить*; *a fly in an ointment* – *ложка дьогтю в бочці меду*; *by hook or by crook* – *всіма правдами і неправдами*.

Loan or word for word translation. Sometimes it is possible to preserve the image underlying a phraseological unit in the source language even in the case when there is no corresponding unit in the target language. For example: *liars must have good memories* — *брехунам потрібна хороша пам'ять*; *to keep a dog and bark oneself* - *тримати собаку, а гавкати самому*; *to bring coals to Newcastle* – *возити вугілля до оНьюкаслу*; *the wind cannot prevent from blowing* – *вітрові дуги не заборониш*; *when two ride on a horse one must sit behind* – *коли двоє на одному коні, комусь їхати ззаду, сидіти, склавши руки* - *to sit with one's arms folded*

Descriptive translation or translation by paraphrase. This is by far the most common way of translating phraseological units, when a match cannot be found in the target language or when it seems inappropriate to use idiomatic language in the target text because of differences in stylistic preferences of the source and target languages. But, while being paraphrased some of the idioms may bear a “loss” in some specific characteristics of their connotative meanings. For example: *to cut off with a shilling* – *залишитись без зспадщини*; *to dine with Duke Humphrey* – *залишитися без обіду*; *lovely weather for ducks* – *дощова погода, не горить* - *there is no need to hurry, ні напу з вуст* - *to keep silent obstinately*.

Omission: *to add something for good measure* – *додавати, доповнювати*.

The factors which determine the choice of strategy include not only availability of an idiom with a similar meaning in the TL, but significance of the specific lexical items constituting the original idiom and appropriateness of using idiomatic language in a given register in the TL.

While looking for a corresponding equivalent of some phraseological unit, a translator should be very attentive and take into consideration all possible connotations of the unit in question in the TL. For example, while translating the sentence: “*Вам*

необхідно взяти себе в руки”, one should take into consideration what kind of stress is implied in this case: permanent “*You must take yourself in hand*” or temporary “*You must pull yourself together*” ,

A translator is to be ready to render **dialect forms and illiterate speech** in the target language forms. It goes without saying that one can hardly render, say, cockney dialect using the Western Ukrainian dialect forms. There is no universal recipe for this translation problem. In some cases the *distortions in the target grammar* are used to render the dialect forms but then again it is not 'a cure- all' and each such case requires an individual approach.

Thus, any good translation should be fulfilled with due regard of the stylistic peculiarities of the source text and this recommendation applies to all text types rather than only to fiction.

Stylistic Transformations

№ пп	Stylistic transformations	Стилістичні трансформації	Examples
1	Logization	Логізація	Maiden, <i>poet.</i> , younglady, <i>form.</i> , chick, <i>sl.</i> – дівчина
2	Expressivation	Експресивація	Togo – чимчикувати, woman – газдиня, house – хата, coat – кожух
3	Modernization	Модернізація	Ait – <i>заст.</i> острівець, churl – <i>іст.</i> простолюдин (не кріпосний), yeoman – <i>іст.</i> фермер
4	Archaization	Архаїзація	Theclothes – шати, lady – бояриня

Logization – using substitution of the emotional-expressive or ethnomarked unit of SL by its stylistically neutral equivalent in the TL, that removes or lessens aesthetic function of the origin, e.g.: *maiden*, *poet.*, *young lady*, *form.*, *chick*, *sl.* –

дівчина, *bucks* – долари, *bungalow* – будинок, *squaw* – жінка, *tomahawk* – сокира, *alligator skin* – дефект поверхні, *to give a sack* – звільнити з роботи.

Expressivation – using substitution of the neutral unit of SL by its stylistically marked equivalent in the TL, that provides emotionally expressive colouring, e.g.: to go — чимчикувати, woman — газдиня, house — хата, coat — кожух, jacket — свита, cigarette — самокрутка.

Modernization – is a mean of translation of obsolete, archaic words and word-combinations, and also historicisms by its more contemporary equivalents, that lessens origin's aesthetic function, e.g. *ait* — заст. *острівець*, *churl* — іст. *простолюдн* (не кріпосний), *yeoman* – іст. *фермер*.

Grammatical level of the modernization consists in substitution of archaic constructions by more contemporary syntactical forms and grammatical constructions, e.g.: *Methinks.* - *Я думаю; Would be you so kind as to supply us with additional information.* – *Надайте нам, будь-ласка, додаткові відомості.*

Archaization – is a means of translation of modern common lexis by archaic words and word-combinations, and also by historicisms for reproduction of historical realities or providing TL with necessary stylistic coloring, e.g.: *the clothes* – *шати*, *lady* – *бояриня*. Grammatical level of the archaization consists in substitution of modern syntactic structures by syntactical forms and grammatical constructions characteristic to certain period of development of TL or by those which came out of active use, e.g.: *Don't hesitate to apply for further information.* – *Якщо ваша ласка, надайте нам додаткові відомості.*

Questions and Topics for discussion

- What is the role of preserving the stylistic peculiarities of the source text in translation equivalence?
- What are the peculiarities of the fiction text translation?
- What are the possible ways of rendering metaphors?
- Speak on methods of translating phraseological units.
- What stylistic transformations do you know?

Topic 6. Lecture 9. BASIC TRANSLATION APPROACHES, THEORIES, STRATEGIES

Key terms: *source language SL, target language TL, process of translation, bilingual communication, transformational approach, denotative approach, communicational approach, morphological equivalencies, lexical equivalencies, syntactic equivalencies, denotatum, concept, thesaurus, language thesaurus, subject thesaurus, extralinguistic information, purpose, skopos, Skopos theory, 'alienating', 'naturalizing', domestication, foreignization*

The tasks: to get students acquainted with basic translation models, theories and strategies, to study correlations between translation models and kinds of translation

Plan

1. Transformational approach
2. Denotative approach
3. Communicational approach
4. Skopos theory
5. 'Foreignization' and 'domestication' strategies

References

1. Мірам Г.Е. Основи перекладу. Курс лекцій з теорії та практики перекладу / Мірам Г.Е., Дейнеко В.В., Тарануха Л.А., Грищенко М.В., Гон О.М. – Київ: Ельга, Ніка-Центр. 2002. с. 40-49.
2. Munday J. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. p.113-131.
3. Vermeer, H. (2000). *Skopos and commission in translational action*. *The Translation studies reader* [edited by Lawrence Venuti]. New York: Routledge.p.220-232.

Roughly, the human translation theories may be divided into three main groups/models which quite conventionally may be called transformational approach, denotative approach, and communicational approach [Mірам, с.44].

1. The transformational theories consist of many varieties which may have different names but they all have one common feature: the process of translation is regarded as transformation.

According to the **transformational approach/model** translation is viewed as the transformation of objects and structures of the source language into those of the target.

According to this interpretation a transformation starts at the syntactic level when there is a change, i.e. when we alter, say, the word order during translation. Substitutions at other levels are regarded as equivalencies, for instance, when we substitute words of the target language for those of the source, this is considered as equivalence.

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

In the process of translation:

- ◆ at the morphological level morphemes (both word-building and word-changing) of the target language are substituted for those of the source;
- ◆ at the lexical level words and word combinations of the target language are substituted for those of the source;
- ◆ at the syntactic level syntactic structures of the target language are substituted for those of the source.

This kind of transformation is especially frequent when translation involves an analytical and a synthetic language, e. g. English and Ukrainian. From the above you may conclude that *according to the transformational approach translation is a set of multi-level replacements of a text in one language by a text in another governed by specific transformation rules.*

However, *the transformational approach is insufficient when the original text corresponds to one indivisible concept which is rendered by the translator as a text in another language also corresponding to the relevant indivisible concept.* For instance, the translation of almost any piece of poetry cannot be explained by simple substitution of target language words and word combinations for those of source language. This kind of transformation is especially frequent when translation involves an analytical and a synthetic language, e. g. English and Ukrainian.

2. According to **denotative approach** the process of translation is not just mere substitution but consists of the following mental operations:

- translator reads (hears) a message in the source language;
- translator finds a denotatum and concept that correspond to this message;
- translator formulates a message in the target language relevant to the above

denotatum and concept. So links btw the forms of different languages are established via conceptual equivalents

It should be noted that, according to this approach during translation we deal with similar word forms of the matching languages and concepts deduced from these forms, however, as opposed to the transformational approach, *the relationship between the source and target word forms is occasional rather than regular.*

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

(1) *The sea is warm tonight* – *Сьогодні вечер море тепле.*

(2) *Staff only* – *Службове приміщення.*

In the first instance *the equivalencies are regular and the concept, pertaining to the whole sentence may be divided into those relating to its individual components* (words and word combinations): *sea - море, tonight – сьогодні ввечері, is warm - тепле.*

In the second instance, however, *equivalence between the original sentence and its translation is occasional (i.e. worth only for this case) and the concept, pertaining to the whole sentence cannot be divided into individual components.*

The indivisible nature of the concept pertaining to the second example may be proved by literal translation of both source and target sentences – *Тільки персонал* and *Service room. Service – Тільки* or *room - персонал* are hardly regular equivalencies (i.e. equivalencies applicable to other translation instances).

3. The communicational theory of translation was suggested by Otto Kade and is based on the notions of communication and thesaurus, it is about matching of thesauruses.

Thesaurus is a reference work that lists words grouped together according to similarity of meaning (containing synonyms and sometimes antonyms), in contrast to a dictionary, which provides definitions for words, and generally lists them in

alphabetical order. The main purpose of such reference works is for users "to find the word, or words, by which [an] idea may be most fitly and aptly expressed," Peter Mark Roget, author of Roget's Thesaurus.

Translation will be successful if the translator knows the user's *language* and the *subject matter of the translation*.

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

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

Thus, in order to communicate, the *message sender* formulates the mental content of his or her message using subject thesaurus, *encodes* it using the verbal forms of language thesaurus, and conveys it to the *message recipient*, who *decodes* the message also using language thesaurus and interprets the message using subject thesaurus as well. This is a simple description of monolingual communication.

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

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

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

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

O. Kade's communicational theory of translation describes *the process of translation as an act of special bilingual communication in which the translator acts as a special communication intermediary*, making it possible to understand a message sent in a different language.

According to communicational approach *translation is a message sent by a translator to a particular user and the adequacy of translation depends on similarity of their background information rather than only on linguistic correctness.*

Let the original message expressed by a native speaker of English (encoded using the English language as a code to convey the mental content of the message) be: *e.g. Several new schools appeared in the area.*

Let us assume then that the message sender, being a fisherman and using relevant subject thesaurus, by *schools* meant large number of fish swimming together rather than institutions for educating children, and the correct translation then had to be: *У районі з'явилися нові косяки риби*

whereas the translator who presumably did not have relevant information in his subject thesaurus translated *schools* as institutions for educating children:

У районі з'явилися нові школи,

which naturally lead to misunderstanding (miscommunication).

The above example shows a case of miscommunication based on the insufficiency of extralinguistic information. However, there are also cases of miscommunication caused by the insufficiency of linguistic information.

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

Thus, the communicational approach to translation, though saying little about translation as such, highlights a very important aspect of translation.

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

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

Ideas similar to TEL are expressed by Y. Retsker who maintains that any two languages are related by «regular» correspondences (words, word-building patterns, syntactical structures) and «irregular» ones. The irregular correspondences cannot be formally represented and only the translator's knowledge and intuition can help to find the matching formal expression in the target language for a concept expressed in the source language.

According to J. Firth, in order to bridge languages in the process of translation, one must use the whole complex of linguistic and extralinguistic information rather than limit oneself to purely linguistic objects and structures.

J. Catford, similar to V. Komissarov and J. Firth, interprets translation as a multi-level process. He distinguishes between «total» and «restricted» translation - in «total» translation all levels of the source text are replaced by those of the target text, whereas in «restricted» translation the substitution occurs at only one level.

According to J. Catford a certain set of translation tools characteristic of a certain level constitutes a *rank of translation* and a translation performed using that or another set of tools is called *rank bound*. We have borrowed this terminology and call the theories that divide the translation process into different levels theories with *translation ranking*.

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

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

Besides, you may observe evident similarity between the transformational approach and primary translation ranks within theories suggesting the ranking of translation (Komissarov, Retsker, Catford and others).

The transformational approach forms the basis of machine translation design - almost any machine translation system uses the principle of matching forms of the

languages involved in translation. The difference is only in the forms that are matched and the rules of matching¹.

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

This is also true, especially in such cases where language expressions correspond to unique indivisible concepts. Here one can also observe similarity with higher ranks within the theories suggesting the ranking of translation.

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

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

Summing up this short overview of theoretical treatments of translation we would again like to draw your attention to the general conclusion that any theory recognizes these three basic components of translation, and different approaches differ only in the accents placed on this or that component. So, the basic components are:

- **Meaning** of a word or word combination in the source language (concept or concepts corresponding to this word or word combination in the minds of the source language speakers).
- **Equivalence** of this meaning expressed in a word or word combination of the target language (concept or concepts corresponding to this word or word combination in the minds of the target language speakers).

- **Extralinguistic information** pertaining to the original meaning and/or its conceptual equivalent after the translation.

So, to put it differently, what you can do in translation is either match individual words and combinations of the two languages directly (transformational approach), or understand the content of the source message and render it using the formal means of the target language (denotative approach) with due regard of the translation recipient and background information (communicational approach).

The hierarchy of these methods may be different depending on the type of translation. Approach priorities depending on the type of translation are given in Table below

Choice of translation methods

Type of translation	Translation method
Oral Consecutive	Denotative, communicational
Oral Simultaneous	Transformational, communicational
Written (general and technical)	Transformational
Written (fiction and poetry)	Denotative

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

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

In written translation, when you seem to have time for everything, priority is also given to simple transformations (perhaps, with exception of poetic translation). This is no contradiction, just the path of least resistance in action - it is not worthwhile to resort to complex methods unless simple ones fail.

It should be born in mind, however, that in any translation we observe a combination of different methods.

Speaking about translation theories we can't but mention **Skopos theory**.

4. Skopos theory takes seriously factors which have always been stressed in action theory, and which were brought into sharp relief with the growing need in the latter half of the twentieth century for the translation of non-literary text types (see commercial translation; scientific and technical translation). Translation is viewed not as a process of transcoding, but as a specific form of human action which is determined by its purpose. The word *skopós*, derived from Greek, is used as a technical term for the purpose, aim, goal or objective of a translation.

Skopos must be defined before translation can begin; in highlighting skopos, the theory adopts a prospective attitude to translation, as opposed to the retrospective attitude adopted in theories which focus on prescriptions derived from the source text. This prospective view is reflected in the following definition: ‘To translate means to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances’ , states *American linguist Hans Vermeer*. Vermeer (1978: 100) postulates that, as a general rule, it must be the intended purpose of the target text that determines translation methods and strategies.

From this postulate, he derives the skopos rule: Human action (and its subcategory: translation) is determined by its purpose (skopos), and is therefore a function of its purpose.

The three main rules of the Skopos Theory are:

1. *The Skopos rule*
2. *The Coherence rule*
3. *The Fidelity rule*

The second rule, the *Coherence rule*, imposes onto translators the requirement that any target text should make sense according to the target culture of the target language and should be coherent with the receivers’ situation so that the receivers can make sense of it.

The coherence rule stipulates that the target text must be sufficiently coherent to allow the intended users to comprehend it, given their assumed background knowledge and situational circumstances..

The fidelity rule concerns intertextual coherence between the text that is the outcome of the translational action and the source text. It necessitates intertextual

coherence between the source and target texts as target texts are produced in accordance to the information offered by source texts. In accordance to this, the form of the target text would be determined by both the translator's interpretation of the source text and the translation's purpose.

Skopos theory should not, therefore, be understood as promoting (extremely) free translation in all, or even a majority of cases. The important point is that no source text has only one correct or preferred translation and, consequently, every translation commission should explicitly or implicitly contain a statement of skopos. The skopos for the target text need not be identical with that attributed to the source text; but unless the skopos for the target text is specified, translation cannot, properly speaking, be carried out at all.

5. 'Foreignization' and 'domestication' strategies

In 1813, the German theologian and translator Friedrich Schleiermacher wrote a highly influential treatise on translation, 'On the different methods of translating'.

The real question, according to Schleiermacher, is how to bring the ST writer and the TT reader together. He moves beyond the issues of word-for-word and sense-for-sense, literal, faithful and free translation, and considers there to be only two paths open for the 'true' translator:

"Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader toward the writer, or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer toward the reader."

Schleiermacher's preferred strategy is the first, moving the reader towards the writer. This entails not writing as the author would have done, had he written in German, but rather 'giving the reader the same impression that he as a German would receive reading the work in the original language'. To achieve this, the translator must adopt an '**alienating**' (as opposed to '**naturalizing**') method of translation, orienting himself or herself by the language and content of the ST. He or she must valorize the foreign and transfer that into the TL.

The 'alienating' and 'naturalizing' opposites are taken up by **Venuti** (1995) as '**foreignization**' and '**domestication**'. These strategies concern both the choice of text to translate and the translation method. According to Venuti: foreignization

(values and norms of foreign texts are unchanged as much as possible so recipient moves to them) and domestication (when text is modified and adapted to meet the ideology, taboos and codes of the target culture). Domestication is ethnocentric and foreignization is ethnodeviant.

Questions and Topics for discussion

- What are the basic theoretical approaches to translation?
- What is translation according to the transformational approach?
- What are the steps involved in translation according to the denotative approach?
- What are the principal differences between transformational and denotative equivalencies?
- What is translation according to the communicational approach? What is the key to successful translation according to this approach?
- What is the essence of Skopos theory?
 - What is 'foreignization' and 'domestication'?

REFERENCES

Basic

1. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2003. 448 с.
2. Науменко Л.П. Практичний курс перекладу з англійської мови на українську. Навч. посібник / Науменко Л.П., Гордєєва А.Й. – Вінниця: «Нова Книга», 2011. 136 с.
3. Основи перекладу: граматичні та лексичні аспекти: Навч. посіб. / За ред. В.К. Шпака. К.: Знання, 2005. 310 с.
4. Основи перекладознавства: навчальний посібник / Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2020. 352 с.

Additional

5. Бархударов Л. Язык и перевод. М.: Международные отношения, 1975. 249 с.
6. Білозерська Л.П. Термінологія та переклад. Навч. посібник для студентів філологічного напрямку підготовки / Білозерська Л.П., Возненко Н.В., Радецька С.В. Вінниця: НОВА КНИГА, 2010. 232 с.
7. Василюк І.М., Рудик І.М. Основи теорії і практики перекладу. Навчальний посібник. Житомир: ПП Перегуда, 2006. 120 с.
8. Гудманян А.Г., Сітко А.В., Єнчева Г.Г. Вступ до перекладознавства. - Вінниця: «Нова Книга», 2017. 296 с.
9. Корунець І.В. Вступ до перекладознавства: Підручник. – Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2008. 512 с.
10. Захарова Л.М. Basic translation. Теорія перекладу (A course of lectures on translation theory) / Режим доступу:<http://www.twirpx.com/file/746112/>
11. Зорівчак Р.П. Реалія і переклад (на матеріалі англомовних перекладів української прози) / Зорівчак Р.П. Львів, 1989. 216 с.
12. Зорівчак Р.П. Фразеологічна одиниця як перекладознавча категорія. Львів, 1983. 196 с.
13. Казакова Т.А. Translation Techniques. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Союз, 2000. 320 с.

14. Карабан В.І., Мейс Дж. Переклад з української мови на англійську мову. Навч. посібник для студентів вищих закладів освіти. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. 608 с.
15. Карабан В.І. Попередження інтерференції мови оригіналу в перекладі (вибрані граматичні та лексичні проблеми перекладу з української мови на англійську) / Карабан В.І., Борисова О.В., Колодій Б.М., Кузьміна К.А. Навч. посібник. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. 208 с.
16. Карабан В.І. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури. Граматичні труднощі, лексичні, термінологічні та жанрово-стилістичні проблеми. Вінниця: «Нова Книга», 2004. 576 с.
17. Коптілов В. В. Теорія і практика перекладу. К. : Юніверс, 2003. 264 с.
18. Комиссаров В. Н. Лингвистика перевода. М.: Междунар. отношения, 1980.
19. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. М. : Высшая школа, 1990. 235с.
20. Кузенко Г.М. The world of interpreting and translating. Миколаїв: МДГУ ім. Петра Могили. 2008. 129 с.
21. Мірам Г. Е. Основи перекладу: Курс лекцій: Навчальний посібник. Київ : Ельга, Ніка-Центр, 2003. 240 с.
22. Нестеренко Н., Лисенко К. A course in Interpreting and Translating: посібник. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2006. 248 с.
23. Практичний переклад з англійської мови: Навчальний посібник / В.Б. Крамар, Ю.П.Мельник, О.В. Ємець, Л.Д. Бурковська та ін.; за заг. ред. В.Б. Крамара. Хмельницький: ХНУ, 2007. 215 с.
24. Прошина З.Г. Теория перевода : Уч. на англ. яз. Владивосток: Изд-во Дальневост. ун-та, 2008.
25. Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. М. : Междунар. отнош., 1974.
26. Свідер І.А. Translation of English non-equivalent units: навчально-методичний посібник. Кам'янець-Подільський: Аксіома, 2015. 112 с.

27. Терехова С.І. Вступ до перекладознавства. К: Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2002. 163с.
28. Шмігер Т.В. Історія українського перекладознавства ХХ сторіччя. К.: Смолоскип, 2009. – 342 с.
29. Baker M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Routledge, 2001. 654 p.
30. Bassnett Susan. Translation Studies. 3rd Edition. Routledge, 2002. 176 p.
31. Bermann Sandra, Wood Michael (eds.) Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation. Princeton University Press, 2005. 413 p.
32. Yefimov L.P., Yasinetska E.A. practical Stylistics of English. Вінниця. «Нова книга», 2004.
33. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. M., 1981.
34. Munday J. Introducing Translation Studies. Routledge, 2016. 376 p.
35. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. New York a. o.: Prentice Hall, 1988.
36. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation . New York and London: Prentice-Hall, 1988. 215 p.
37. Nida E. A., C. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1969. 218 p.
38. Robinson D. Becoming a Translator. An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation / Режим доступу: <http://www.twirpx.com/file/111505/>
39. Samuelsson-Brown G. A Practical Guide for Translators. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2004. 186 p.
40. Vermeer, H. Skopos and commission in translational action. The Translation studies reader [edited by Lawrence Venuti]. New York: Routledge. 2000.

CONTENTS

Topic 1. Lecture 1. Theoretical and methodological aspects of translation. A short historical outline of European and Ukrainian translation	3
Topic 2. Lecture 2-3. The process of translation and communication. Adequate and equivalent translation	22
Topic 3. Lecture 4-5. Lexical aspects of translation. Lexical transformations	39
Topic 4. Lecture 6-7. Grammatical aspects of translation. Grammatical transformations	55
Topic 5. Lecture 8. Translation and style	69
Topic 6. Lecture 9. Theories of translation	81
References	92

**Introduction to Translation Studies:
курс лекцій (англійською мовою)**

Укладач: О. В. Галайбіда

Здано в набір 12.05.2022. Підписано до друку 16.05.2022.

Формат 60x84/16. Папір офсетний, друк трафаретний.

Гарнітура Times New Roman.

Ум.-друк. арк. 5,58. Авт. арк. 4,43.

Наклад 50 прим. Зам. 5121

Макет та друк – видавничо-поліграфічне підприємство “Апостроф”,
вул. Уральська, 2, м. Кам’янець-Подільський, Україна, 32302