# Lectures on discipline “Typology of translation transformations”

# The notion of translation theory

The term ‘*translation theory’ (TT*) is used as a synonym of several other terms accepted with a similar meaning in translation studies by Russian and foreign scholars: *‘translatology’, ‘translation studies’, «переводоведение», «теория перевода*». In works on translation it is currently used with a number of senses. In his dictionary «Толковый переводоведческий словарь» L.L.Nelyubin included the following three meanings of the term «теория перевода»: 1) a logically grounded model of bi-lingual communication; 2) a scientifically based comparison of two language systems which draws upon practitioners’ experience and makes scientific observations of language facts; 3) a scholarly discipline which establishes regular interrelations and correspondences between a source language text (SLT) and a target language text (TLT) and considers major translation topics related to methodology and techniques of translation [Нелюбин 2003:223].

These three interpretations of the notion are equally important as they focus on different interdependent aspects of the complicated phenomenon of the theory and practice of translation and should be considered as part and parcel of a single whole.

It is well known that the practice of translation is one of the oldest activities in the world. Human history shows that “*before there was writing, there was speaking”.* Neighboring tribes and nations spoke different dialects and even different languages, so they needed interpreters in order to engage in trade, to threaten each other and afterwards to conduct peace talks. In the opinion of historians of translation studies, the functions of translation activity were restricted to getting information across to one another and conveying messages [Steiner 1977; Нелюбин, Хухуни 2006]. From the beginning of time, interpreters were considered an important asset for the community. Other functions especially those related to translating belles lettres were not as yet performed by this type of human activity.

Scholars tend to believe that the early **history of written translation** is intertwined with the history of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic world in which three key periods have determined those three civilizations and are characterized by a high level of activity in the field of translation:

1) the ***first*** period is the beginning of the Christian era, at which time nations speaking languages like Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin interacted to create the new Christian civilization and the transformed Judaic civilization;

2) the ***second*** period begins with the birth of Islam in the 7th century and culminates in the 12th-13th centuries when Christian, Muslim and Jewish scholars and translators from all parts of Europe and the Middle East undertook in the Spanish city of Toledo the task of translating the Greek and Arabic classics first into Latin and later into the new languages and cultures of Europe which provided the bridge to the Renaissance and the Modern World;

3) the ***third*** period is connected with the modern civilizations during which the role of translation has been critical in shaping new civilizations, in promoting socio-economic, linguistic and cultural equality. Translation has entered a new golden age in conditions of a new cultural openness and global communications. The Bible has been translated into over 2000 languages and dialects of the world and remains the bestbook for translators because, according to M. Sofer, it has “the attributes of all superior translations – clarity, brevity, simplicity” [Sofer 1999].

Thus, it is clear from the above that the history of translation begins with religion and eventually leads into secular culture. Language has always been a critical element of religion and has been considered sacred which explains why translating religious texts was never taken lightly. Suffice it to mention that it took the Catholic Church centuries before it decided in the 1960s to allow celebrating Mass in the vernacular, rather than in Latin.

The Judeo-Christian-Muslem world is believed to have derived its culture from a common source, namely, a set of books originally written in Hebrew, known to Christians as the Old Testament, to Muslims as the Holy Books and to Jews as the Tanakh [Grollenberg 1988]. The Hebrew Bible was created in roughly 1300-300 B.C.

The early translations of the Bible were made in various areas into the most important languages. In Babylonia, Syria, Palestine the Bible was translated into the Aramaic language, in Egypt it was translated into Greek (this version is known as the Septuagint which played a crucial role in the development of Christianity). Later St. Jerome (347-419), the patron saint of translators in the Catholic Church, translated both the Greek and Hebrew versions of the Bible into Latin and produced the Vulgate, the standard Bible of the Church for the next thousand years. The two brothers, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, introduced Christianity to the Slavic world. They translated the Holy Scriptures into the language later known as Old Church Slavonic. In the 9th century the Bible was translated into English, French, German. An outstanding role in this process was played by Martin Luther who not only broke away from Rome and helped establish Protestantism, but also paid close attention to the principles of translation, including the transmission of meaning to the target language, the emphasis on clarity and simplicity of translation which are regarded as valid in modern translation theory. Translations of the Scriptures were soon to follow in Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Icelandic and other languages. In England the Authorized Version of the Bible was published in 1611 and together with the work of Shakespeare it is believed to stand at the apex of English culture.

In Islam, the Qur’an is considered untranslatable, that’s why hundreds of its translations are known as “explanations” rather than “authorized versions”. As the Muslim empire spread, Islamic scholars started translating the classics including works in philosophy, astronomy, medicine thus building a bridge between antiquity and the modern world.

# Trends in the development of translation theory

**Translation theory** has a long and rich history which bears out the elaboration of various concrete models and theories of translation in various conceptions. G. Steiner in the well-known book on translation “After Babel” singles out 4 periods in the history of translation studies:

(a) the 40-s B.C. – the begin. of the 19th century – **empirical approach** with its focus on empirical observations. The adherents of this approach followed Cicero’s principle “sensus de sensu” (‘sense-for-sense’) instead of the principle of translation “verbum pro verbo” (word-for-word). At this time seminal analyses and pronouncements are believed to stem directly from the enterprise of the translator. This longest period in translation theory included polemics of Saint Jerome, the works by Luther, Montaigne, Chapman, Ben Johnson, Dryden and others. Major theoretical texts are written by Leonardo Bruni, Pierre Daniel Huet. This epoch of primary statement and technical notation may be said to end with Alexander Fraser Tytler’s “Essays on the Principles of Translation” (London, 1792).

(b) The begin. of the 19th century – mid-fifties of the 20th century – **hermeneutic approach**. Translation theory developed under a great influence of Schleiermacher, A.W.Schlegel and V.von Humboldt and had a philosophic aspect. This stage is a period of theory and hermeneutic inquiry when the question of the nature of translation is posed within the more general framework of theories of language and mind. The topic acquires a vocabulary and a methodological status of its own. Translation process was analysed in terms of a general model of meaning and understanding a piece of written and oral speech. The interchange between theory and practical need continued and the activity of the translator and relations between languages were discussed in the works by Goethe, Matthew Arnold, Paul Valery, Ezra Pound, Benedetto Croce, Walter Benjamin and many others, so it is also qualified as a philosophic-poetic age in the history of translation studies.

(c) Mid-fifties – the early 1960s – linguistic trend (**linguistic translation theory – LTT**). The first papers on machine translation circulate at the close of the 1940s. Russian and foreign scholars apply linguistic theory and statistics, information theory to translation. LTT was developed in several new directions: contrastive, literary, logical, semantic, comparative. Structural linguistics and information theory are introduced into the discussion of interlingual exchange. Professional translators constitute international bodies and start journals concerned with translation matters. Major books on translation often resulting from collaborative exploration were published in Russia and abroad. Among them: A.V.Fedorov, «*Introduction to the Theory of Translation*» (*Vvedenie v teoriyu perevoda,*M., 1953), J.R.Firth “*Linguistic Analysis and Translation*” (The Hague, 1956), T.H. Savoury “*The Art of Translation*” (L., 1957), R.O.Jakobson “*On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*” (Cambridge, 1959), E.Nida “*On the Science of Translation*” (Leiden, 1963), J.C.Catford “*A Linguistic Theory of Translation*” (Oxford, 1965), E.Nida and Ch.R.Taber “*The Theory and Practice of Translation*” (Leiden 1964). In 1954 an International Federation of Translators (FIT) was set up which published its own translators’ journal “Babel”. The most well known linguistic translation theories include the semantic, the situational, the denotational, the communicative, the transformational theories of translation. The fundamentals of new directions in translation studies, namely, contrastive, literary, semantic, comparative were set out in two influential books: *On Translation*(1959) edited by R.A.Brower and *The Craft and Context of Translation: A Critical Symposium*(1961) edited by W.Arrowsmith and R.Shattuck.

(d) The early 1960s – the late 1970s – a **reversion to hermeneutic** inquiries into translation and interpretation under the influence of M. Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. The argument between ‘universalist’ and ‘relativist’ positions was brought back to the foreground of linguistic thought and translation studies. In these years, even more, than in the 1950s, the study of the theory and practice of translation became a point of contact between established and newly evolving disciplines. Translation studies draw upon the findings in the field of psychology, anthropology, sociology, ethno- and socio-linguistics. The idea that all communication is translation takes on a more technical, philosophically grounded force. Classical philology, comparative linguistics, lexical statistics, ethnography, the sociology of class-speech, formal rhetoric, poetics, the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of ‘life between languages’.

To conclude his classification, G.Steiner points out that despite the rich history and the calibre of those who have written about the art and the theory of translation, “the number of original, significant ideas in the subject remains very meagre” [Steiner 1977:238]. In fact, over some two thousand years of argument the beliefs and disagreements about the nature of translation have been almost the same.

Over thirty years have passed after the publication of G.Steiner’s influential work on translation which have seen dramatic changes in the development of linguistics. As before, translation offered a critical ground to test linguistic issues. In many ways translation studies still continue trends which were started in the third and fourth phases – logical, contrastive, literary, semantic, comparative. Yet certain differences in emphasis have occurred which makes it possible to single out a fifth stage in the history of translation that began in the 1980s and continues to the present day. The new approaches to translation were elaborated in modern translation science under the influence of several decisive factors in the theoretical study of language:

1) the theory of language is noted today for its **polyparadigmatic** character which means that different theoretical approaches to language should be viewed not as mutually exclusive, but complementary;

2) the study of language can be successful if it takes into account **extralinguistic** factors which are connected with its functioning;

3) a language should be looked upon as an integral **part of culture** within which it originates, takes its shape and functions;

4) a language serves as an important instrument of gaining, preserving and conveying **information**;

5) a language is a sort of analogue of a human being, it is dual in its nature as it combines substance and **spirit**and thus it serves to reveal uppermost secrets of human soul (see the works by Yu.D. Apresyan, A.N. Baranov, A.Ye. Kibrik, Ye.S. Koubryakova, V.A. Maslova,Yu.S. Stepanov, R.M. Frumkina etc).

New conceptions in linguistic studies have naturally brought about changes in views on translation which found their reflection in the following basic ideas:

1) a translation act is not only a bilingual process of communication, but it is also a process of **bi-cultural** intercourse, so its study raises the problems of cultural adaptation and linga-cultural acceptance;

2) a translation should be viewed not as a quest for ready dictionary correspondences, but an **interpretative** act which aims at rendering different kinds of information expressed in the original text;

3) a translation act is a verbal channel of expressing **world views** and **ethnic** mentalities of contacting nations which should overcome not only lingual, but also mental, cultural and ethnic barriers;

4) the notion of a translation text as wholly dependent upon the SLT is replaced by understanding it as “**the after-life of a text**”, so the translator is looked upon as a ‘co-writer, creative writer’;

5) the quest for differences between the SLT and the TLT with a view to estimating the quality of translation gives way to the search **for reasons** that account for those differences which may include both lingual factors, as well as conceptual and textual grids.

A great variety of translation theories that have appeared recently can roughly be qualified as **interdisciplinary translation theories.** The advocates of the new approach view translation in the framework of communication and rely on the findings of cognitive psychology, anthropology, sociology, ethnolinguistics and cultural studies, intertextual linguistics, semiotics. In modern translation studies linguistic and culturological theories develop side by side enriching each other. They look upon a TL text as the ‘after-life” of a SL text. The best known translation theories are cognitive, cultural, and those based on the idea of intertextuality. Mention should be made of the latest works on translation written along these lines: J.Holmes [Holmes 1988], Yu.M.Lotman [Lotman 1990], P.Torop [Тороп 1995; Torop 2002], G. Toury [2003], U.Eco [Eco 2002], V.I.Khairullin [Хайруллин 1995], N.M.Nesterova [Нестерова 2005], T.A.Fesenko [Фесенко 2002].

A translation text is qualified as a secondary one created on the basis of the SLT and it is analysed within the concept of metaliterature uniting into a single system all texts generated on the basis of one (see e.g. J. Holmes, Hans J. Vermeer). But viewed from this angle a translation text should be regarded as a special kind of secondary text which being the equivalent of the SLT possesses a number of ontological features making it different to related phenomena.

\* \* \*

An exhaustive analysis of the history of translation studies in Russia has not been made yet and questions that relate to it are usually discussed in respective sections of monographs and manuals [Фёдоров 1968; Алексеева 2004; Виноградов 2004; Тюленев 2004]. The first attempt to estimate the contribution of Russian translationists into the development of linguistic translation theory was made by V.N.Komissarov who wrote an overview of the findings and research into this field by the twelve major investigators of translation beginning with Ya.I.Retsker [Комиссаров 2002]. A comprehensive overview of translation studies both in this country and abroad was made in the book «*The Science of Translation» (“Nauka o perevode”*) by L.L.Nelyubin and G.T.Khukhuni [Нелюбин, Хухуни 2006].

V.S.Vinogradov singles out three main trends in the development of translation theories in Russia: literary, linguistic and mechanical (applied) [Виноградов 2001].

The **literary** approach is closely connected with the practice of artistic translation, so many well-known translators were themselves brilliant men-of-letters. In 1918 M.Gorky founded the *Vsemirnaya Literatura* publishing house and made the first step towards creating the theory by writing several sketches on literary translation. He gave his notes over to K.I.Chukovski and commissioned him with the task to prepare a scientific description of the principles of artistic translation, the first in the history of Russian translation studies. The book “*Principy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*” (1919) (“*Principles of artistic translation*”) with contributions from K.Chukovsky, F.Batyushkov and N.S. Gumilev was followed by major publications in this field: A.V.Fedorov “*Techniques and tasks of artistic translation” (“Priemy i zadachi khudozhestvennogo perevoda*”, Moscow, 1930); K.I.Chukovsky and A.V. Fedorov *“The art of translation” (“Iskusstvo perevoda*”, 1930); M.P.Alekseev *“Problems of literary translation” (“Problemy khudozhestvennogo perevoda”,* Irkutsk, 1931), K.I. Chukovsky “*The High art*” (“*Vysokoye iskusstvo*”, M., 1941); A.V.Fedorov *“Artistic translation*” (*“O khudozhestvennom perevode”,*M., 1941), B.Pasternak “*Translating Shakespeare”*(M., 1958), B.Etkind *“Poetry and translation” (“Poezija i perevod*”, Moscow and Leningrad, 1963).

Back in the 60s-70s of the XXth century when there was rigorous division between sciences the adherents to the literary approach to translation claimed that artistic translation has nothing to do with the study of language correlations and language adequacies which they considered as too formalistic and literal (G. Gachicheladze, I.A.Kashkin, A.A.Reformatsky and others).

History of translation bears out that scholars abroad also debated a lot whether translation is an art (skill) or science. E.Nida and C.Taber stressed that “translation is far more than a science. It is also a skill, and in the ultimate analysis fully satisfactory translation is always an art” [Nida, Taber 1969].

Ye.G.Etkind, one of the prominent Russian theoreticians of artistic translation, argued that a purely linguistic approach is incapable of obtaining convincing results in the analysis of artistic translation. In view of this he advanced a scientific philological analysis of artistic translation which should rely on aesthetics, psychology, ethnography, sociolinguistics, linguistics. From the point of view of modern translation theory which is divided into branches studying various aspects of translation process it is noteworthy that some of Ye.G.Etkind’s ideas are in tune with latest developments in this field, though his attempt to undermine the role and place of linguistics is justly criticized.

Literary critics of translation focused on the akseological aspects of translation and tried to evaluate translation from the point of view of its aesthetic equivalence to the original text. They studied the role of target language in developing spiritual culture. Analyzing particular translations of literary texts they showed their merits and demerits, made editor’s comment and offered more adequate variants of translation.

The **linguistic** approach to translation led to the creation in the mid-fifties of the 20th century of the linguistic theory of translation which investigates various issues of the phenomenology and processes of translation between languages with the principal emphasis on modern linguistics. These years witness the appearance of fundamental works devoted to the study of linguistic regularities of translation which laid the basis of the linguistic theories of translation. Mention should be made of such prominent books and monographs as, J.R.Firth *Linguistic Analysis and Translation (1956),*J.A. Catford A *Linguistic Theory of Translation (1965),*M.A.K. Halliday *Comparison and Translation (1966),*R.O.Jakobson *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation (1959),* G.Mounin *Les Problemes theoriques de la traduction (1963),*A. Neubert *Pragmatische Aspekte der Ubersetzung (1968),* E. Nida*Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating (1959),* E.Nida*Toward a Science of Translating (1964),* E.Nida and C.R.Taber*The Theory and Practice of Translation (1964),*A.V. Feodorov *Vvedenie v teoriyu perevoda (1953),*Ya.I.Retsker *Teoriya i practika perevoda s angliiskogo yazyka na russki (1956),* M.M. Morozov*Posobie po perevodu russkoi khudozhestvennoy prozy na angliiski yazyk (1956),*T.R.Levitskaya, A.M.Fiterman*Teoriya i practika perevoda s angliiskogo yazyka na russki (1963),* articles in the translators’ journals “*Tetradi perevodchika”, “Masterstvo perevoda”.*

The fundamentals of the LTT in this country were laid down in the works by L.S.Barkhudarov, V.G.Gak, V.N.Komissarov, Ya.I.Retsker, L.A.Tchernyahovskaya, A.D.Shveitser, A.V.Fedorov and other prominent scholars.

Authorities in the linguistic theory of translation in this country (V.N.Komissarov, A.D.Shveitser, A.V.Fedorov) point out in their books several major reasons, both subjective and objective, accounting for the emergence of the linguistic theory of translation at this particular time.

The historical background in the years following the Second World War (the dynamics of immigration, international commerce, diplomatic, political, cultural and other links between nations) stimulated practice of translation which in its turn was an incentive to further theoretical translation studies.

The need to do much translation into a second language in the process of second language acquisition served as a stimulus and a methodological guide for further research.

A rapid growth of science and technology in different parts of the world brought about an ‘information explosion’ which resulted in a sort of translation boom. In these conditions the fast-growing demand for competent translators could be met only if mass training of well-qualified specialists including military, technical, diplomatic translators and interpreters rested on a solid theoretical basis.

Apart from external causes there were a number of internal changes in the field of translation. These changes were related, first of all, to the character of materials that had to be translated. Throughout centuries, the main kind of translation made was confined to fiction, while intense information exchange involved various other kinds of texts (scientific, business, technical, diplomatic). The linguistic peculiarities of different kinds and genres of texts had to be carefully studied and compared in different languages so that their correlations in SL and TL might be reflected in the form of translation rules to be taken into account and observed in the process of human translation. Such rules could as well be described as translation algorithms for machine translation [Catford 1967].

Besides, as has been noted above, translators of fiction were themselves talented writers and poets who did not require any special training and, as a matter of fact, were skeptical about any attempts to approach translation from a theoretical angle.

These years also witnessed great changes in the variety, scale and volume of translation work as alongside written translation there appeared new types of translation – different varieties of technical translation (synopsis, express-information, précis, patent translation, etc), oral interpretation including consecutive, simultaneous, over-the-phone interpreting, escort interpreting, sight translation, etc. It was necessary to elaborate criteria of adequacy of translation that could be applied to different translation output. Generations of translators and interpreters had to be trained that were capable of handling different types of texts and successfully coping with new translation challenges.

**Machine**translation (MT) is defined as the term used to describe translation performed by a computer software program, rather than by a human translator, which is known as HT (Human Translation) [Sofer1999:155]. Mechanical translation dates back to the fifties and early sixties, but much of the confidence in its scope has now ebbed. Supporters of machine translation connect it with the necessity to develop new models of the process of translation (see the works by I.I.Revzin, V.Yu.Rozetsveig, Yu.N.Marchuk, Yu.D.Apresyan, N.N.Leontyeva, N.K.Ryabtseva, etc). While traditional theoretical models of translation take into account three basic elements of translation process: a SL text – a translator – a TL text, that is they approach translation as a subjective process with human psyche as its central factor, adherents of computational theories of translation try to develop objective models of translation based on interrelation of language, information and communication. Modeling mental processes, including translation, by formal means requires definition of the objective link between thought, language and reality and establishing the place of language in cognition and communication.

In machine translation a text should be studied from the point of view of the three types of its functioning: a text (a) as an element of a certain information system, as (b) an object of study on the part of scholars of various disciplines including linguistics, and as (c) an object of various transformations and changes including compression, expansion, translation, reviewing, etc.

According to scholars who are rather sceptical about mechanical translation, the results of machine translation have been limited for two reasons: (a) while computers have a seemingly unlimited capacity for processing data, they are a long way from having the capacity to think creatively like human beings, and (b) human language is not a merely a collection of signs and symbols which can be easily programmed and computerized. As long as language communicates more than the literal meaning of words, as long as there are shades of meaning that keep changing all the time, as long as people have to make value judgements about the meaning and the intent of a text, it will be necessary to have a human translator in order to get the job done. Translation practice shows that when it comes to translating substantial texts machine-translated texts always require a lot of editing or doing the same work again from scratch.

Today the interest in MT has noticeably ebbed. According to V.N.Komissarov MT can be useful in 3 areas: 1) to translate specialist texts in particular branches, 2) to translate texts very fast in order to acquaint the target audience with their content, 3) to translate texts which have been previously edited to eliminate potential errors [Комиссаров 1999a].

As the twenty-first century begins to unfold, the role of the translator once again becomes critical in shaping human history. Researchers point out two dominant linguistic phenomena at the close of the twentieth century: (1) the growing incursion of American English into the languages of the world through pop culture and high tech and (2) the emergence of national languages throughout the world. In conditions of linguistic diversity and the growing influence of one international language it is argued that we are standing on the threshold of a new golden age for translation. There is a new cultural openness in today’s world, brought about by the end of the Cold war, the incredible progress in global communications, including such technologies as satellite communication, computers, modem, fax, e-mail, the Internet, the fast-growing international trade, as well as new international awareness of many languages and cultures. Hundreds of new dictionaries are being published all over the world, language courses are being offered everywhere and the demand for competent translators is growing at a steady rate. Such diverse practical needs stimulate further translation studies and deepen insight into the overall mechanism of rendering in/from rare languages that should be treated with respect, studied and translated as valuable cultural assets.

# Branches in translation studies

As has been stressed above, translation theory can be defined as a linguistic discipline which relies, to a great extent, on the findings of other disciplines. Since so, a natural question inevitably arises which concerns the place that the translation theory occupies in relation to other linguistic disciplines. This problem has several aspects: the position of translation studies in relation (a) to macro- and micro-linguistics, (b) theoretical (fundamental) and applied sciences, (c) descriptive and prescriptive (normative) studies.

The division of modern linguistics into **micro- and macro-linguistics** is based on the volume and size of the object of study. The former comprises linguistics that studies a language ‘in itself and for itself’ (in the terminology of F.de Saussure) irrespective of extralinguistic factors. Here refer such classical disciplines of language study as phonetics and phonology, grammar, lexicology and semasiology, as well as comparative-historical and contrastive typological linguistics.

To macrolinguistics, that is linguistics in a broad sense of the word, refer such compartments in language study which investigate a language in relation to extralinguistic factors that lie outside a language, but exert a certain effect upon it. There are at present a number of such interdisciplinary sciences as socio-linguistics (interaction of language and social factors), psycholinguistics (psycho-physiological mechanisms of speech activity), ethno-linguistics (language and ethnographic and cultural factors), geographic (areal) linguistics (territorial and geographic factors influencing a language), cognitive linguistics (language and cognition), etc. In the opinion of prof. L.S.Barkhudarov, linguistic theory of translation should be qualified as a macrolinguistic science for which he gives several reasons [Бархударов 1975]:

1) an act of translation like any other act of communication refers to a speech event which involves apart from the language a number of objective and subjective non-linguistic phenomena: the topic of a message, the situation of communication (place, time, circumstances of communication, modality of intercourse), participants in a speech act. These factors interact with language and are used to create a certain speech event. The knowledge of these factors is absolutely essential in order to render properly a given message in any type of text/discourse. While translating specialist texts a translator is required to know the subject situation, dealing with fiction he is expected to be familiar with the author’s world outlook, his / her aesthetic views and tastes, artistic method of literary work, etc.

2) an act of translation is always placed against a broader background exceeding the boundaries of a speech situation which embraces a translator’s knowledge of a broader scope including the knowledge of various aspects of life within a certain community: literature, history, mythology, politics, sports, etc. Correct understanding and proper translation of a certain message depends on the knowledge of habits, traditions, life experience, stereotypes, speech etiquette, mentality of the people speaking a SL. Since this knowledge may be insufficient or absent on the part of the TLT addressee it is a translator’s task to provide it using various techniques. For example, in rendering the following utterance a translator resorts to transformations in order to make the message clear, *«Генерал-поручик! Он у меня в роте был сержантом!.. Обоих российских орденов кавалер!..* (А.С.Пушкин) – *“Lieutenant – General – he was a sergeant in my regiment. And now, Cavalier of the two highest Russian orders”…*(T. and I. Litvinov).

Thus, taking into account the reasons stated above it is possible to conclude that linguistic translation theory should be qualified as a macrolinguistic discipline that studies translation process as a complex phenomenon in which adequate translation of any speech event involves apart from language the knowledge of a lot of non-linguistic factors.

Another division of linguistic disciplines is made between **theoretical** and **applied** sciences, although the terms are rather arbitrary as it is obvious that any applied science is always based on some underlying theory, whereas a theory proves its validity through practical applications. As for LTT it came into being as an applied branch of linguistic studies. It is noteworthy to mention that one of the pioneers of LTT abroad J. Catford qualified his book as an essay in applied linguistics as, in his opinion, translation theory covers varied applications of the theory and categories of general linguistics that exceed the boundaries of explanations and descriptions in regard to a particular language or languages.

With respect to this division translation theory viewed as part of translatology embracing a set of disciplines studying translation process from different angles [Бархударов 1975] is regarded as an applied discipline which like any other applied science is connected with a specific kind of human activity. Some of the disciplines that refer to theoretical translatology have a descriptive force as they are concerned with the investigation of translation as a means of interlingual communication which should be described and explained, while those relating to applied translatology are characterized by prescriptive focus. For this reason, according to A.V.Fedorov [Фёдоров 1963], translation theory has **a prescriptive or normative** aspect as it not only establishes objectively existing regularities of translation process, but on their basis it prescribes for a translator certain rules and norms of equivalent translation following which it is possible to achieve desirable results. The author argues that in terms of applied disciplines translation theory can be qualified as a descriptive-prescriptive science as, on the one hand, it describes and analyses materials drawn from translation practice and, on the other hand, it formulates normative recommendations and rules (‘prescriptions’) that can help a translator in his work.

Other linguists treat the notion of translatology differently and accordingly suggest another understanding of the descriptive and prescriptive aspects of translation theory. V.N.Komissarov interprets the term ‘translation theory’ in two senses: in a broad sense ‘translation theory’ coincides with the term ‘translatology’ embracing all concepts, statements and observations connected with the investigation of translation practice, namely, linguistics of translation, psychology of translation, ethnology of translation, etc. In a narrow sense it includes only a theoretical part of translatology which is opposed to its applied aspects [Комиссаров 1973, 1990]. In keeping with this understanding of translatology the author refers to theoretical (fundamental) translatology such problems of this discipline as the creation of theoretical models of translation, the study of the questions connected with translation equivalence, the investigation of an act of translation as a process of producing a translation text and some other issues. From this approach it follows that applied translatology is concerned with the study of matters which are of practical interest and, above all, with the translator who occupies a central place in this process. The range of problems discussed includes a translator’s knowledge and skills, the content and methods of training translators and interpreters, skills required for different types of translation and some others related to a translator’s job. Another set of issues are related to mechanical translation and the possibility of formalizing a translator’s job, the investigation of correlation of a translator’s and other kinds of speech activity, the place of translation in second-language teaching, etc. Such an understanding of theoretical and applied aspects of translatology underlies the difference between theoretical (**descriptive**) and normative (**prescriptive**) sections of linguistic theory of translation. Prescriptive studies work out practical recommendations, formulate a list of requirements set for measuring the quality of translation, elaborate the notion of translation norm.

The authors of many recent works on translation theory stress a descriptive, rather than a prescriptive approach to it based on the study of concrete language data collected from real translation acts as any *a priory* demands set for translation can hardly be accepted [Ревзин, Розенцвейг 1963]. We can refer to Th.H.Savoury who tried to compare various requirements made of translation by different authors proving that most of them are mutually exclusive, cf.

i. a translation must transfer words of an original text,

ii. a translation must convey thoughts of an original,

iii. a translation must read like an original,

iv. a translation must read as a translation,

v. a translation must retain the style of an original,

vi. a translation must reflect a translator’s style, etc.

(T. Savory. The Art of Translation).

In the opinion of V.N.Komissarov, the absence of scientifically grounded unified criteria set for adequate translation is an important argument against the normative approach to translations [Комиссаров 1973].

The founders of modern foreign translation studies which comprise “all research activities taking the phenomenon of translating and translation as their basis or focus” [Routledge …. 2001] not only stress its descriptive rather than prescriptive character, but point out a diagnostic nature of translation studies. J. Holmes developed the most comprehensive division of translation studies into branches in his book “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” [Holmes 2003] which he called the map of translation. According to J. Holmes, translation studies can be divided into **pure** and **applied**, the latter being concerned with practical tasks of translator training, various translation aids, translation criticism. Pure translation studies are further subdivided into **theoretical** and **descriptive.** Theoretical translation studies include **general** and **partial** branches the difference between which is conditioned by a wider variety of problems of general character considered in the former that refer to any translation, and a restricted character of the latter (cf. medium, area, rank, text type, time, problem restricted translation studies). Descriptive translation studies focus on the three main aspects of translation: product-oriented (analysis of target texts aimed at establishing their differential features), process-oriented (the study of mental processes in a translator’s mind) and function-oriented (analyzing the functioning of a TT in another socio-cultural environment accepting this text).

Thus, the comparison of different points of view shows that there was a shift in modern translation studies in the 80-es from a prescriptive to a **descriptive / diagnostic** approach to translation. Translation studies as a self-contained discipline began to be regarded as a fundamental science in the framework of which all the three branches – theoretical, descriptive and applied – are equally important, interconnected and complementary.

**The object of investigation, aims and tasks
of linguistic translation theory. Methods of analysis**

Like any other scientific discipline linguistic translation theory has its own object of analysis, tasks and aims of research, as well as methods of investigation.

According to A.D.Shveitser**, the object** of LTT is the process of translation as a special kind of speech communication viewed in a broad socio-cultural context with account taken of social, cultural and psychological determinants [Швейцер 1988:8]. V.N.Komissarov considers the object of investigation in regard to different facets of translation activity studied in different branches of translatology: psychology of translation, the theory of literary (or artistic) translation, ethnographic translation theory, linguistics of translation, etc. He argues that LTT is the theoretical part of *linguistics of translation* which is concerned with the study of translation as a linguistic phenomenon viewed as a specific means within the framework of interlanguage communication [Комиссаров 1990: 34; 1999a: 41]. Prof. L.S.Barkhudarov stresses a very important aspect in the object of LTT which presupposes a contrastive study of SL and TL speech events, that is a SLT and a TLT, underlying a scientific description of translation process viewed as an interlanguage transformation [Бархударов 1975].

As is seen from the quoted definitions of the object of investigation of LTT, they differ in some important features which is due to the fact that the authors have elaborated their own models and theories of translation that differ considerably. In our opinion, the conception of translation as a two-way speech act in intercultural communication may be specified by shifting accent onto the ethno-cultural aspect of the object of studies. In keeping with this approach we can define the object of translation studies viewed as a fully-fledged discipline as an act of verbal inter-lingual and inter-ethno-cultural communication which is mediated through a translator/interpreter.

**The aim** of LTT is to reveal and describe the most common, typical and repetitve objective regularities of translation process which make it different from other forms of human intercourse. As translation is viewed as a transfer of meaning across cultures, LTT aims at analyzing and synthesizing meaning, both while understanding the source text and creating the target text. With account taken of the object and the subject matter of investigation, the aims of LTT analysis are varied and depend on its division into several branches: (a) general LTT which is aimed at studying the most general linguistic regularities of translation; (b) particular LTTs which have three varieties with their particular goals of research:

a) LTTs concerned with the study of translation problems that arise when dealing with particular genres and types of texts;

b) LTTs devoted to the investigation of different problems of oral and written translation;

c) LTTs confined to the study of translation issues that arise in relations between a particular SL and a particular TL.

**The tasks**of general LTT are manifold and varied, but the most important are as follows:

1) to bring to light the essence of translation as a special kind of interlanguage and intercultural human interaction, reveal its linguistic basics;

2) to elaborate the principles of classifying different kinds of translation activity;

3) to reveal the essence of translation equivalence and adequacy;

4) to work out criteria for evaluating the quality of translation;

5) to establish types of interlanguage correlations and classify translation correspondences of various levels;

6) to describe translation techniques and procedures;

7) to determine the role of translation in the development of culture;

8) to study the influence of pragmatic and socio-cultural factors on translation process;

9) to define the notion of translation norm.

**The methods**of investigation used in LTT are numerous as it draws upon findings of other disciplines. Various theories of translation proposed within different approaches to translation make most of a number of methods of analysis, cf. componential analysis, transformational analysis, the method of filters, the method of sense-analysis, etc.

The oldest and time-tested method of investigation is the comparative method which is based on comparison of texts which provides essential information about the nature of translation. According to V.N.Komissarov, modern translatology employs four procedures of such an analysis:

1) target text is compared with the original text which enables to gain valuable data about the degree of proximity in the content and structure of a SLT and a TLT, discover various means used to achieve equivalence, regular translation techniques and transformations and some other important features of translation process;

2) several target versions of the same source language text which have been made by different translators are compared in order to reveal common regularities of translation process that do not depend upon the competence and individual peculiarities of the translators;

3) translation texts are compared with original texts created in target language in order to discover what changes in TL are brought about under the influence of translation texts. It is argued that translators broaden communicative capacities of TL by resorting to borrowings, loans, word-for-word translation which helps them more fully convey the content of a SLT and its peculiarities. In the author’s opinion such deviations from the TL norm may be justified in translation and can be regarded as a kind of translation norm;

4) various SL texts and their TL translations which are related in their content and belong to the same functional style and genre are compared to bring to light differences between the two languages in the use of language means and devices in respective texts which can be further taken into account in the process of stylistic adaptation of the SLT in translation [Комиссаров 1999a: 23-24].

Since comparative analysis of a SLT and a TLT presupposes establishing similarities, differences and correlations not only on the level of texts as linguistic and speech entities, but also on the level of their parts and fragments it is obvious that translation theory employs other methods of investigation including componential analysis, methods of transformational analysis and the method of statistical studies.

Componential analysis initially used in semasiological investigations to decompose word-meaning into elementary semantic components or features (semes) allows to get results which are vitally important for the theory and practice of translation. The description of lexical meaning of correlated words in SL and TL in terms of their componential structure helps to establish the degree of their semantic proximity and look for means to overcome their difference. For example, the English verb *clamber*has the following semantic structure, *to climb slowly, using your hands and feet*(LDCE)*.* In the following passage it is used to characterize an old woman who moves with difficulty, so in translation this important component of meaning is rendered by means of a word-combination, *A woman clambered out with a basket* (E. Blyton). – *С трудом сошла со ступенек какая-то женщина с корзиной*(В.Исакович).

Transformational analysis which is understood in linguistics as repatterning of various distributional structures in order to discover difference or sameness of meaning of practically identical distributional patterns (N.Chomsky, E.Nida) has two-fold uses in the translation practice. First of all, as the definition suggests, it is a reliable procedure to verify the content expressed in a TLT because the surface structures may seem to be misleading and ambivalent at first sight. Cf.

*He will make an excellent house – He will build an excellent house.*

*He will make an excellent teacher -- \*He will build an excellent teacher*.

The impossibility of the second transform proves the difference in the meanings of the verb *make*in the two structures which affects its translation, cf.

*Он построит отличный дом.*

*Из него получится отличный учитель*.

Besides, transformational analysis is difficult to overestimate if we understand translation process itself as a sort of interlanguage transformation, that is changing lexical and syntactical structures of the original texts into TL structures following certain established rules of their transference.

In theoretical translation studies an important role is played by the method of linguistic modeling, i.e. constructing theoretical models of the process of translation. Such models try to reveal mental processes that take place in a translator’s mind which are hidden from direct observation. They are built by linguists that stick to various linguistic theories and reflect their understanding of the nature of human language and the process of interlingual communication. The most well known models of translation include the situational (denotative) model (J.Catford, V.G.Gak, A.V.Fedorov, etc), the transformational theory of translation (N.Chomsky, E. Nida, I.I. Revzin and V.Yu. Rozentsveig, etc), the componential method of translation (J.J. Katz, A.D.Shveitser), the semantic model (C.J.Fillmore, A.K.Zholkovsky, M.A.Melchuk), the communicative model (O. Kade, V.N. Komissarov) and some others. Various models of translation are discussed in more detail below.

**Interconnection of contrastive linguistics and translation studies**

Despite the complexity of the translation process there are many aspects of it which admit of a purely linguistic approach. Viewed as an act of interlingual communication translation involves at least two languages that enables to bring together translation theory and contrastive linguistics. J.C. Catford, one of the forefathers of linguistic translation theory abroad, argued that since comparative linguistics is understood as an extension of descriptive linguistics which establishes relations between two or more languages then the theory of translation which is concerned with a certain type of relation between languages should be considered an applied branch of comparative linguistics [Кэтфорд 2004 ].

Yet the majority of scholars believe that though contrastive linguistics and translation theory have much in common and draw upon the findings of each other they should be regarded separately. According to V.G. Gak [Гак 2001], there are three major areas in which issues of contrastive linguistics and translation theory overlap:

1).translation theory as an applied discipline draws upon results of contrastive studies and observations concerning concrete languages, makes use of them in further theoretical translation studies;

2) translation is a sort of bi-lingual experiment in which major problems of general linguistics are tested, compared and verified on the basis of two and more languages;

3) translation is used as a method of research in contrastive linguistics, as many conclusions made in regard to languages compared are drawn on the basis of translation regularities.

The contention that translation is often used as a method of research is also supported by E.M. Mednikova [Mednikova 1976] who claims that translation is one of the basic aspects of comparative study of languages which can be employed with the aim of observing similarities and differences in the two languages. As a matter of fact, it was first exemplified by famous Canadian linguists J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet who completed in 1958 the first best known book in comparative French-English stylistics where translation occupies rather a prominent place.

Besides, interlingual translation is viewed as an indispensable part of bilingual lexicography and a convenient tool at all stages of second-language learning.

**Major points of difference between contrastive
linguistics and translation studies**

The differences between contrastive linguistics and translation studies have been made explicit in various publications (see the articles by E. Coseriu, H.W. Kirkwood, T.P. Krzeszowski in [Новое в зарубежной … 1989]).

According to K.R. Bausch, it is necessary to distinguish three kinds of synchronic comparison of languages in modern linguistics (see the article by Baush K.R. in [Новое в зарубежной … 1978]):

* analytical comparative linguistics studies languages synchronally irrespective of the degree of kinship between them;
* contrastive comparative studies of applied character focus on differences between languages which may cause errors in second-language acquisition;
* translation comparative studies bring to light both common and divergent features of the two languages, and establish them in regard to both language systems and their functioning in speech.

V.N. Komissarov points out various aspects of the method of comparison used in contrastive linguistics and translation studies [Комиссаров 1973]):

(a) comparative linguistics compares **systems**of the two languages bringing together language units belonging to the same levels (phonetics, lexis, morphology, syntax), whereas comparison in translation studies is based on speech utterances (**texts**) in SL and TL which may involve units that belong to different language levels (e.g. a word may be compared with a phraseological unit *бандероль – book parcel*, a morpheme can be compared with a word *запеть – start singing*);

(b) in comparative linguistics comparison of any two languages is considered valid no matter which of them is chosen as a starting point depending on a researcher’s aims and tasks, while in translation studies of a SLT and a TLT the result of comparison is believed to be a description of a **SL** lexis, grammar, as well as genre and stylistic peculiarities from the translation point of view. That means using alongside traditional units and categories of comparison in comparative linguistics such objects of comparison which are relevant in translation process (e.g. words having no equivalents, i.e. lacunary lexis) or offer special aspects of analysis (e.g. neologisms are studied not so much because they are found in the vocabulary system, but because of translation problems that arise when dealing with them).

(c) comparative linguistics aims at creating exhaustive systemic **level-by-level** descriptions of the two languages investigated, whereas translation comparative studies aim at building a system of complex c**orrespondences** between a SL and a TL which may comprise interlevel correlations often neglecting the differences between them, but drawing different level units together on the basis of their interchangeability.

(d) in translation comparative studies comparison can be made on the basis of a **TL** system which raises peculiar problems conditioned by the nature of the language and its categories. If a category is compulsory in a TL that means that a translator will have to make a proper choice between the linguistic forms (at least two) constituting the respective grammatical category. This requires a careful study of these forms in TL and a thorough analysis of correlation between such categories and SL related phenomena that predetermine the choice.

E.Coseriu revealed quite striking differences between contrastive linguistics and translation studies because, in his opinion, not all levels of comparative studies are equally important for them, cf. contrastive studies involve various levels (the type of language, its system, language norm, functioning within a text), whereas translation is mostly concerned with the level of a text [Косериу 1989]. The author argues that this in its turn also implies that a translator is confronted with categories that arise only on a textual level and involve a set of problems that relate to sense which is created by a combination of both linguistic and non-linguistic factors. The author mentions the following points of difference:

1) contrastive linguistics studies a particular language from the point of view of ‘**free language technique’**, while a text abounds in phraseology, idiomaticity in a broad sense of the word;

2) contrastive linguistics is created on the basis of contrasting **entire**language **systems** (‘single functional language’), while a text may incorporate various functional languages simultaneously such as different dialects, styles, etc;

3) contrastive linguistics takes into consideration only ‘existing, **ready correspondences’** established between designations in different languages, whereas a text may contain contextually modified units, new designations, authors’ individual coinages;

4) **text-production** is made in SLT and TLT in keeping with certain traditions which do not coincide in the two languages; there may be differences in particular types of texts and preferred usage of certain language devices in them, etc;

5) a text in translation is connected with **sense** which may arise from and be based on the combination of both linguistic and extra-linguistic means including the knowledge of the world conditioned by the cultural frames.

Thus, the above mentioned 5 points of difference prove the significance of the textual level for translation with all the consequences that stress the leading role of the functional aspect of contrastive linguistics for translation studies.

# Levels of comparative translation studies

Translation practice shows that comparative translation studies can be carried out on 3 levels [Комиссаров, Рецкер, Тархов 1960]:

1) **lexico-phraseological** level which comprises 4 groups of problems:

a) connected with rendering words and related to establishing differences in the semantic structures of correlated units, their nomination characteristics, the degree of dependence upon a context, situational equivalence, etc.

b) connected with peculiarities of translating various lexico-semantic groupings of words within the vocabulary system of a language that share translation problems and are handled in translation along similar lines (terms, neologisms, proper names, cultural words, etc);

c) related to problems of translating free (variable) and stable word groups including phraseological units;

d) connected with the use of special translation procedures and techniques employed on this level;

2) **grammatical level** of comparative translation studies which include 3 sublevels expressing grammatical meaning:

1) related to grammatical peculiarities of a word, problems of rendering different parts of speech, non-verbal forms, the articles, linking elements, etc;

2) connected with problems of translating word groups including gerundial, infinitival, participial complexes, various comparative and other structures;

3) located on the level of a sentence and related to problems of rendering sentences of different communicative types, word order in translation, restructuring of sentences in translation, etc;

3) **genre and stylistic level** of translation studies which comprise two sublevels:

1) translation problems involved in rendering expressive means and stylistic devices located on the lexical, grammatical, phono-graphical levels;

2) translation problems arising when dealing with texts of different functional styles, sub-styles and genres.

It must be stressed in conclusion, that apart from the three levels of comparative translation studies outlined above it is no less important to take into account whether comparison is made on pretextual or textual level.

# Models based on componential analysis

Translation scholars (or to use H.J. Vermeer’s terms translationists or translatologists) have made endless attempts to come up with new ways of describing of what they understood by translation. In the opinion of A. Neubert, so far many theoretical studies enjoy a low reputation which is “directly linked to the insufficiency and hence non-acceptance of reductive models” that simplify and neglect quite important aspects of translation concentrating on some very peculiar problem areas instead of studying the overall field [Neubert 1989]. Nevertheless, it is obvious that most well-known models of translation have undoubtedly contributed to our understanding “of the pervasive heterogeneity of our elusive object of study” [ibid.] and require a most careful analysis.

Among the most well known approaches to translation are linguistic and pragmatic models some of which are considered below. The early theoretical models of translation are primarily linguistic in their character as their proponents linked the understanding of translation process with theoretical views on language and the interaction of languages in this process and they set themselves the aim of studying the relevant translation area from a selected point of view.

**Componential method** and practice of translation both relate to the analysis and interpretation of meaning hence the findings of this semasiological procedure were heavily relied upon in attempts to throw light upon semantics of correlated words in the two languages. The supporters of the componential analysis of meaning (J.J. Katz, J.A. Fodor, M. Bierwisch, E. Nida, O.N. Seliverstova, E. M. Mednikova, etc) proceed from the assumption that the smallest units of lexical meaning (semantic components, semes) of correlated words in any two languages seldom coincide in their quality, number, combination and order of arrangement which must be taken into account in translation. This model of translation singles out several stages in the process of translation including (a) establishing in SLT elementary units of content, (b) analyzing their componential structure which is then followed by (c) looking for such correspondences in a TL that are either analogous or closest in meaning to the units of translation. The equivalence of two texts is understood here as being measured on the basis of semantic equivalence of their elements. This model of translation provides a reliable tool for comparison and proper choice of units on various levels:

* correlated words may differ in the quality, number and arrangement of semantic components, cf. *изба (деревянный крестьянский дом) – hut (a small, simple building with only one or two rooms); кроватка – (dimin. and affect. from кровать) – предмет домашней обстановки, служащий для спанья – длинная рама на ножках, с двумя спинками, на которую кладутся матрац и постельные принадлежности) – bed (a piece of furniture for sleeping on), cot (a small bed with high sides for a young child).*
* correlated synonymic sets may differ in the number and semantic peculiarities of their members, cf. *armistice (an agreement to stop fighting, usually for a short time), cease-fire (an agreement to stop fighting for a period of time, especially so that a more permanent agreement can be made), truce (an agreement between enemies to stop fighting or arguing for a short time, or the period for which this is arranged)*[Апресян 1979] – *перемирие; прекращение военных действий; прекращение огня; передышка, затишье (*НБАРС).

So, in view of the specified semantic differences between the synonyms in SL, as well as particular nuances in meanings between dictionary correspondnces in TL the choice of the proper way of translation is strictly delimited, e.g. *‘I began this book almost immediately after the Armistice …’*(R. Aldington*). – «Я начал писать эту книгу почти сразу же после перемирия …».*One more example to prove it*, ‘The first stage is a cease-fire. …The second is the signing of a truce agreement.’ – «Первая стадия переговоров должна привести к прекращению огня. На второй – подписывается соглашение о перемирии*» (АРСС).

* Combinability of correlated words in the two languages where the difference often stems from the dissimilarities in their semantic structures, cf. the word *issue*contains the semantic component *important*, that’s why to translate the Russian word group *важный вопрос*it is necessary to resort to another adjective to avoid the repetition of the same semantic component*, a vital* / *burning issue.*
* Correlated semantic / conceptual fields may not coincide in SL and TL as different languages map differently respective spheres which accounts for the difference in the semantic volume of their members, cf. the semantic structure of the English adjective *purple* is rather broad and the role of markers in it is greater than that of distinguishers so in various contexts it may be translated by a number of Russian correspondences – *фиолетовый, тёмно-лиловый, бордовый, пурпурный, пурпуровый, багровый, багряный, лиловый*(БАРС)*.*

Thus, translation models based on the principles of componential analysis of related units prove their value and use in the process of taking correct decisions and estimating the quality of translation. And yet, despite numerous merits, translation practice reveals limitations of such models since they cannot apply to and account for such correspondences in TL that result in adequate translation though there may be no complete coincidence in the componential structure of correlated units.

# Sense-text model of translation

**Sense - text** model of translation is based on the ideas of generative semantics the supporters of which (C.J. Fillmore, J.J. Katz, etc) developed N. Chomsky’s theory. Since they investigated the regularities of the process of transforming sense into a text, they believed that a similar process takes place in an act of translation. Like generative grammar, this model distinguishes between surface and deep structures, while the latter is divided into two aspects – deep syntax and deep lexis. Deep syntax expresses content links between elements of an utterance, deep lexis includes only symbols of the so-called lexical functions which can be of two categories: equivalent substitutions (i.e. words that can substitute for the key word) and semantic parameters (that refer to expressions used with the key word to convey elementary sense). Both lexical functions are important in translation as they underlie lexical rules of paraphrasing and restructuring aimed at retaining equivalent relations between different ways of expressing the same thought. The model “sense – text” is based on the use of strictly formalized procedures which is quite justified as it contains a set of rules for machine processing a text by means of a computer. The importance of lexical functions was proved in a number of languages (see the works by E. Steier, V.Yu. Rozenzveig, A. Zholkovsky, I. Melchuk, V.G. Gak). Thus, this model draws together various surface phrases and structures associated with the same deep sense and it works well in relation to cases of lexico-syntactic paraphrasing the causes of which are manifold including:

a) structural differences between SL and TL. A.D. Shveitser gives the following example of a specific English structure which has no correspondence in Russian, *Amber, destroyer of a million jobs*. The phrase offers two restrictions – morphological (the Russian correspondence of *job*(*работа)* cannot be used in the Plural form) and lexico-syntactic because the Russian correspondences of the English word *destroyer* (*«уничтожать», «истреблять», «разрушать»)* do not combine with the word *работа*, hence it is necessary to look for the Russian word which satisfies this lexical function, which is «лишать». The result of this paraphrasing in translation will be «*Эмбер, лишивший работы миллион человек»*[Швейцер 1973].

b) Difference in the theme-rheme correlation of a SLT and a TLT, cf. *На наших глазах в естественных науках произошли многие величайшие открытия – We have witnessed many breakthroughs in natural sciences.*

c) Arrangement of semantic components in a lexical meaning of a key word which may have no correspondence in TL, so its components are regrouped in the process of translation, e.g. *‘In response to cries for help Dr. Richter and his staff depth-probed the situation – Откликнувшись на мольбу о помощи, д-р Рихтер и его сотрудники глубоко проанализировали ситуацию.*In this sentence the English verb coined by means of conversion has been translated by means of a word combination, as respective converted verbs are not found in Russian, so its meaning is rendered by means of a verb-adverb group.

# Situational models of translation

**Situational (or referential, denotational) model** of translation (see the works by J. Catford, V.G. Gak) was developed under the influence of linguistic views of major British scholars (J. Firth, A.K. Halliday, etc) who argued that every human language possesses its own systems of meaning understood as a matrix of relations into which this or that unit enters. It follows from this that such systems differ from language to language and account for the specific features of particular languages. In view of this, translation should not be understood as a mere transfer of meanings as different languages often use different sets of semantic components to describe the same or similar situations. In other words in keeping with the situational model of translation various semantic shifts (deletion or addition of some semantic components, their replacements) may take place as a result of paraphrasing, hence semantic equivalence of a SLT and a TLT is established not on the basis of respective sets of semantic components, but on the basis of identity of the situation described in the two languages. It must be stressed that a situation is understood as objects of reality and relations between them described in an utterance, but not as a speech context in which an act of communication takes place. According to V.G. Gak, there are five kinds of semantic changes in the ways of naming an object including synonymic substitutions, antonymic translation, semantic processes of expansion or narrowing, as well as the process of transfer. Such changes may involve interlevel re-distribution of semantic components, reduction in the number of semantic components, their repetition, as well as vector substitutions. This model is reliable when comparing similar ways of describing the same situation despite various other differences:

1) the difference in word-building resources of SL and TL, e.g. *It is convenient for a money-losing factory to blame suppliers for its own fault. – Плохо работающему производству удобно винить смежников.*

2) The difference in ways of describing a given situation in the two languages, e.g. *It would really make the whole evening – Это будет настоящим гвоздем программы (*C.П*.*Романова, А.Л. Коралова).

3) The difference between lexico-semantic systems of SL and TL in verbalizing notions of different degrees of abstractedness, e.g. English has no generic term for the Russian *любитель*, but only a number of particular words, cf. *coffee drinkers, cinema goers, nature lover, dog fancier.*

4) Peculiarities of expressive resources and stylistic devices of SL and TL, e.g. *It won’t be skin off my nose. – Плевать мне с высокой горы.*

From the above review of some of the linguistic models of translation it is clear that they are interdependent, and as they each concentrate on some aspect of translation process they should be considered as complementary in the study of the complex nature of translation.

In the last few decades there was a shift in scholarly interest in translation to the pragmatic aspect of translation which gave birth to a number of pragmatic models of translation. The traditional approach to translation as a mere linguistic transcoding of a text from ‘one language to another’ was given up for the sake of integrating translation into a wider network of social interactions.

# Pragmatic models of translation

**The pragmatic model** developed by H.J. Vermeer is based on the belief that translation is ‘transpresentation’ which brings something (relatively) new into the target culture, enlarging it by offering and introducing into it new and hitherto unknown features [Vermeer 1994: 5]. Any translation, no matter whether it is grammatical, altering or mythical translation (in terms of H.Vermeer’s classification), is culture-specific. This is accounted for by the fact that creative value of an artistic production is estimated “according to standards which themselves are relative to a given culture and time and individual” [ibid]. Translation involves an adaptation, i.e. a partial cultural transpresentation changing the form, and meaning and “sense” in the process of bringing a text into another culture. The central notions the scholar works with are the cultural background (or cultural embedding, as K. Raiss calls it) of translations, ‘skopos’, target culture. In his overview of various models of translation H.J. Vermeer conceives the work of historiographer of translation theories in two ways: on the one hand, he tries to interpret the documents at his disposal as carefully as possible and on the other hand, since ‘documents are not just dead and dusty pieces of parchment’, he tries to look upon them as communication partners today and thus make sense of them for our time and situation. In other words, there should be ‘a modern exegesis’ of a text opposed to its “historical interpretation”. Similar considerations apply to a translator’s job since translating is a **culture-sensitive process** and translation is a **cultural product** which presupposes going beyond a mere linguistic rendering of a text in another language. Besides this aspect of translation H. Vermeer discusses one more feature which is no less important, it is “the way a translation is ‘received’ in the target culture since this is also culture-specific” [Vermeer 1994]. Thus, this model of translation describes it in the following way: a “sender” (or “transmitter”, e.g. an actor, a businessman) needs a text and procures it from a text producer (e.g. a technical writer) to be used under given circumstances for a given person and a given communication partner. The role of a text in such a model is two-fold. On the object level it serves as a vehicle of transmitting a message encoded in it by one partner (the verbal part is estimated to be no more than 30% of the total message) to be decoded by the recipient. On a meta-level the text serves as one factor among others in achieving an intended aim – *skopos*. According to this model the translator’s task is two-fold: first, to convey an intended meta-meaning in such a way that the ultimate aim (“skopos”) of the communicative act is achieved; second, to transform the form and meaning of the message on its object level into a target text in such a way as to make this target text fit the intended *skopos.* The author of the model stresses that the achievement of the *skopos*is one of the translator’s main social tasks “for he is the expert who knows how to socially bring about transcultural communication and lead it to its intended aim”[ibid]. What is very important in this model of translation is that it takes into account not only the translator’s social responsibility, but also the public, the commissioner and the recipients of a translation.

# Cultural-semiotic and cognitive models of translation

**Cultural-semiotic** approach to translation is based, on the one hand, on R. Jakobson’s works that initiated a semiotic turn on the borderline of translation studies and cultural semiotics. His ideas were developed or transformed in later publications (see J. Holmes, A. Popovic, G. Toury) who contributed to his classification of translations. U. Eco, for example, offers a tripartite classification of translation. Firstly, there is interpretation by transcription. This involves simple substitution of codes as, for example, in case of the Morse alphabet. Secondly, there is intrasystemic interpretation that can, in its turn, be divided into three subcategories including intrasystemic interpretation (a) within the same natural language (synonymy, definition, paraphrase, etc), (b) within other semiotic systems (e.g. changing a piece of music from major to minor) and (c) performance (e.g. the staging of a ballet). Thirdly, U. Eco introduces *intersystemic* interpretation including two types: (a) with marked variation in the substance (such as translation between natural languages, re-writing) and (b) mutation of continuum (such as parasynonymy as when amplifying the phrase *that one over there*by pointing at the object with a finger) and adaptation or transmutation such as adapting literature to film or to theatre ) [Eco 2001].

These works show that meaning can be lent to any kind of translation activity, methodologically the semiotic tradition has been characterized by bringing the concepts of meaning, interpretation and translation close to one another. These scholars put together inter-linguistic, intra-linguistic and intersemiotic translations which was crucial not only for translation studies, but also for developing the general notion of culture as the process of total translation.

On the other hand, translation viewed as a working mechanism of culture is connected with semiotics of culture and thus it follows the traditions of M. Bakhtin and Yu. Lotman [Torop 2002]. M. Bakhtin introduced the notion of dialogism in analyzing the language of literature which was further applied to a translation text as a place for two different logics of two different languages to meet in (see the works by M.de Michiel, L. Robel, etc). Yu.M. Lotman also stressed the importance of dialogue as an elementary mechanism of translating [Лотман 1987].

Thus since translation studies are closely connected with the theory of culture the semiotics of culture has introduced the notion of *intersemiosis* beside the concept of semiosis. Translation studies draw upon such ideas developed in semiotics of culture as the intertwining of the languages of culture through the processes of the integration of languages of culture (e.g. creolization of cultural codes).

It is very important to stress that this model has two important advantages compared to other theories: firstly, bringing semiotics into linguistics it broadened the boundaries of human communication which involves extralinguistic codes accompanying speech messages and is directed by socio-anthropologic, socio-cultural and other factors; secondly, viewing a text (or a set of cultural texts) as a code instead of looking upon a text as a message produced on the basis of language alone it enabled to reconstruct cultural codes in their diversity and simultaneity. Besides, as opposed to the traditional (linguistic) approach it replaces the notion of deciphering a text by circulation of a text in culture which involves different processes, namely, communication of the addresser and the addressee, communication between the audience and cultural tradition, communication of the reader with him/herself, communication of the reader with the text, communication between the text and cultural tradition [Lotman 1990].

**Cognitive** model of translation developed in this country by T.A.Fesenko [Фесенко 2002], M.Ya.Zvilling, O.A.Burukina [Перевод как… 2003], N.M. Nesterova [Нестерова 2005] and some prominent scholars abroad (A.Holscher, D. Mohle, G.R. Hayes, L.Flower, K.A.Schreiver, etc) within the framework of cognitive translatology is believed to incorporate the entire experience gained by translationists from Cicero, Saint Jerome and other great thinkers of the past. It is argued that a translator’s main task is to reproduce in translation all the thoughts, expressed in a SLT, both in form and content while the reproduction of actual words is determined by the TL resources. M.Ya.Zvilling claims that any comprehension of a text is based, first of all, on contextual interpretation of our own mental models and in a translation act comprehension and production of a text starts not with the opening words of a text but with activating respective scenarios which are expressed in frames that coincide as fully as possible with those underlying the speech fragment of the SLT.

As a matter of fact, this approach was the main principle in various normative translation conceptions and it was used as a basis in a number of other well known gnostic models. According to this understanding, translation is viewed as human cognitive activity in the context of its socio-cultural functions. The authors try to establish correlations between verbal and mental structures within national cultural space. The central role is played by a translator who interprets the sense code contained in a SLT. Complex sense categories are determined by the content of a concept defined as a certain image of an element of reality which has been projected onto the language level of human consciousness after its cognitive processing. Since translation involves not verbal forms, but concepts embodied in them the decisive role in the process of sense transfer is played by conceptual systems which are formed by shared background knowledge of people, socio-cultural environment. The supporters of the cognitive approach to translation claim that translation is a very complicated phenomenon and so various translators may have different mental images («метальное образование») when interpreting the same utterance. To illustrate this difference N.M. Nesterova gives examples of translating sentences in which some translators modify the situation described, while others retain it trying to achieve a desirable pragmatic effect, cf.

*Then the Queen left off, quite out of breath, and said to Alice,”Have you seen the Mock Turtle yet?”* (L. Carroll)

*Наконец Королева бросила игру и, переведя дыхание, спросила Алису:*

*- А видела ты Под-Котика?* (Н. Демурова).

Such modifications of the original situation components may be multiplied as they are very numerous, which may be contrasted to the opposite approach aimed at retaining the original situation described,

*I found myself stroking his arm murmuring, “OK now, easy, easy”, as if he were a race-horse that had been frightened by a van*(H. Fielding).

*Я быстро схватила его за руку, пробормотав: «Все нормально, спокойно, спокойно», как будто он беговая лошадь, которую напугал грузовик.*

From the above overview it follows that various models of translation basically tried to give an answer to the central dichotomy: ‘letter’ or ‘spirit’, ’word’ or ‘sense’. It is believed that a mature theory of translation presumes a systematic theory of language with which it overlaps completely or from which it derives as a special case. Since there is no such a general universally accepted model of language, there are various models of translation linked with pure (formal) linguistics and contrastive, anthropological, cultural semiotic, cognitive and other macrolinguistic areas. Such translation models as those connected with the N. Chomsky theory schematize the materials and neglect social, cultural, historical determinants of human speech that must be taken into account in translation.

# The notion of translation

The theory of translation is an independent and new field of research in the sphere of language studies. Though the literature on the theory, practice and history of translation is large, most of the basic notions and categories are not clearly defined as yet. This is true of the key notion of the object of translatology, namely, that of *translation* the understanding of which varies greatly from author to author even today. L.L. Nelyubin has collected 33 definitions of *translation* in his dictionary which was made on the basis of 224 sources [Нелюбин 2003].

The main point of difference is connected with the dual interpretation of the term *translatio*n that is offered in the literature on translation studies and lexicographic sources. On the one hand, translation is understood as a process and, on the other hand, as a product of the previous process. The new approach offers one more dimension of translation which is connected with TLT **functioning** in the target language and culture.

Traditionally, English dictionaries give definitions of translation that treat it both as a process of translating and as a result of the previous process. Cf,

**MacMillan. English Dictionary for Advanced Learners [MED 2007]**

a. the activity of changing spoken or written words into a different language

b. a word or phrase that means the same thing as a word or phrase in a different language (p. 1593)

**Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English [LDCE 1995]**

1. the act of changing speech or writing into another language

2. smth that has been changed into another language (p.1538);

**The Oxford Dictionary and Thesaurus [ODT 1997]**

1. the act or an instance of expressing the sense in another language

2. a written or spoken expression of the meaning of a word, speech, book, etc in another language (p.1660).

The comparison of the dictionary definitions shows that when translation is understood as an act / instance of activity/ process it reveals its dynamic aspect and it is based on a *process-oriented* approach to translation. When translation is regarded as an end product which is based on a *text-oriented approach* it is described in terms of a static view on translation and lays stress on estimating the resultant text.

The similar dual interpretation of the notion of translation can be traced in the books on the theory of translation as well. True, various schools of thinking attach different importance to the two aspects of translation. According to St. Campbell, supporters of orthodox translation studies were mostly interested in *the product*, not in the process of translation. J.C. Catford in his pioneering work “A Linguistic Theory of Translation” (1965) was mostly concerned with the match or mismatch of a SLT and TLT.

In 1969 E.Nida and C.Taber shifted focus on the *translator-factor* when they advised how to establish project teams consisting of native speakers and foreigners in translating the Bible.

During the last 30 years the *translator oriented* studies have become increasingly important in the framework of investigating practical problems of human communication and language education under the influence of the general shift in linguistics to the human/personality factor. Scholars argue that it is insufficient to study only target texts, but no less important to take into account the translator as a participant in communication who possesses linguistic and cognitive skills, as well as the knowledge of the language and culture and the extra-linguistic world. This approach underlies empirical research in the process of practising translation, the effect of the psychological attitudes the translator brings to the task and in second-language acquisition.

In view of the two-sided interpretation of the word *translation* as shown above it is assumed in modern translation studies that both aspects of translation are equally important and they should be studied in two branches of the TT which are described by W. Koller as **Translatology of Text** and **Processual Translatology**. This Process- Product (Text) dichotomy has been a pivotal point of all major translation studies.

Translatology of text investigates various aspects of translation equivalence, equivalence and adequacy of translation, the methodology of translation analysis of a text and text typology on translation principles, the correlation of various linguistic, stylistic and textual features of a SLT and their correspondences in a TLT, problems of translating different types of texts belonging to different genres and requirements set for their adequate translation. In traditional theories of translation stress was laid on a SL text which served as the main criterion in estimating the quality of translation. Recently focus was shifted on a translation text (G.Toury, P. Torop, etc) which is treated on its own value since it is created in a new language and should fit in a new culture.

Processual translatology is concerned with mental work of a translator and thus it studies translator’s strategies when perceiving, comprehending, analyzing a SLT, choosing proper ways in the process of creating a TLT, deciding upon this or that form of expressing the author’s ideas and thoughts.

It should be noted that many languages have two sets of terms to refer to translation viewed as a process or activity which may proceed in oral and written form, as well as to people engaged in it: cf.

English: interpret/interpreter (oral) – translate/translator (written)

German: dolmetschen/Dolmetscher (oral) – ubersetzen/Ubersetzer (written)

Russian: толмач (устный) (borrowed from Turkic languages) – переводчик (письменный).

The first member in these sets appeared much earlier and it implied interpreting an oral message of a foreign speaker; the second term appeared later around the XVIth century with the advent of printing which gave an impulse to the practice of written translation.

In modern translation theory the term *translation* is used in 3 meanings:

1) in a broad and general sense it means any kind of translation (oral and written);

2) in a narrow meaning it refers to the process of written translation;

3) in another narrow sense it means the end result of written translation in the form of written texts.

The term *interpretation* is used in ME in two senses:

1) an explanation of the meaning or importance of smth;

2) rendering oral messages in a different language.

The term *interpreter*denotes someone whose job is to translate what a speaker is saying in one language into another language so that someone else can understand it (MED 2007: 793).

Alongside these terms some authors use the word *version*which initially meant translation from classic languages into modern, now it stands for “a form of something that is different from other forms or from the original” (MED).

Translation viewed as a process raises two sets of problems which are related on the one hand to understanding the nature of translation process and on the other hand the translator’s mental cognitive work connected with this process.

The nature of translation as ***a process*** is not understood in the same way by different authors as various definitions have been advanced in the framework of .different theories (models) of language: componential, situational, semantic, transformational, etc [Швейцер 1973]. It can be proved by the following definitions of translation which use different generic notions for this purpose:

J. Catford: “It is a process of *substitutin*g a text material in one language by equivalent text material in another language” [Catford 2004];

Prof. L.S. Barkhudarov: “ translation is a process of *transformin*g a text of SL into a text of TL which presupposes semantic invariance of the two texts”[Бархударов 1975];

Prof. A.V. Fedorov: to translate means “to *express fully and precisely* what has already been expressed in a different language” [Федоров 1968];

Prof. V.N. Komisssarov: a process of *producing* in the TL a text which has an identical *communicative value* with the source text [Комиссаров 1990];

Prof. V.G. Gak: it is a “process of *describing* those *referents* (i.e. the situation and its elements) which were described in the original text [Гак 2001];

E.A. Chernyahovskaya: it is “*transforming*the structure of a speech event which results in changes in the outer means of expression while the content of a text remains unchanged” [Черняховская 1976].

R.O.Jakobson suggested the broadest understanding of translation as different kinds of *interpretation*: 1) intralingual translation understood as interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language (= paraphrasing), 2) interlingual translation defined as an interpretation of verbal signs of one language by means of verbal signs of a different language (= translation proper), 3) intersemiotic translation viewed as interpretation of verbal signs by means of non-verbal sign systems (Morse code, communication by flags, gestural language, etc) (transmutation) [Якобсон 1985].

The above quoted definitions (see also other definitions of translation in Appendix II) testify to the complexity of the nature of this human activity and it is reasonable to regard at least some of them as complementary as they take into account various aspects of translation process.

When translation is understood ***as an end result*** of the previous process, then it is usually described in terms of its quality. The authors of the most well-known theories of translation which are based on comparing a SLT and a TLT try to work out reliable criteria for estimating the adequacy and equivalence of translation, the demands made of technical or literary translation, translation of prose or poetry, etc.

Apart from answering the basic issue of processual translatology connected with the understanding of what is involved in the process of translation there is another set of problems concerning translator’s mental work. When the translator-factor becomes the centre of study then it is necessary to take into account general cultural, cultural psychological and cultural cognitive aspects underlying translator’s mental activity. It stands to reason to assume that these processes are quite different when translation is made into a native tongue or into a foreign (second) language. It should also be noted that traditional (orthodox) translation studies were based on the belief that all translation should be made by translators into their native tongue. Recently there appeared books on translation that shift interest onto translating into a second (foreign) language. St. Campbell, the author of “Translation into the Second Language” (London, 1998) deals with a set of four problems that arise in this context:

1) second-language acquisition, because individual translating into a second language is seen as a means of acquiring that language;

2) the idea of inter-language connected with the methodological view that gives us a chance to study errors second-language translators make;

3) the organization of language above the level of the sentence (i.e. the level of text-linguistics, discourse analysis), as translation checks a translator’s ability to produce stylistically correct authentic texts;

4) the levels of language competence including translation competence.

Both views on translation as a process (dynamic aspect) and as a result of a previous process (static aspect) seem to be equally important and have to be taken into account in order to get a many-sided and comprehensive analysis of translation.

But apart from the combination of the dynamic and statical approaches to translation A.D. Shveitser claims that it is no less important to consider two types of situation in translation: the situation of producing a SL text and a situation of translation which shows the interaction of **languages** and **cultures** [Швейцер 1988].

Thus, as is clear from the above, the traditional *Process-Product* dichotomy is supplemented with one more dimension, namely, *functional* which takes into account acceptability of a target text functioning in a new socio-cultural community.

In the 80-es and the early 90-s of the XXth century many foreign authors (J. Holmes, McFarlane, S. Bassnett, Lefevere) introduced one more dimension in the understanding of translation. Developing this approach the founder of the so-called total theory of translation, P. Torop and his followers started analyzing the functioning of a target text in a new socio-ethno-cultural environment and elaborated the idea of acceptability of a TLT by people belonging to a different cultural community. This approach is based on the assumption that translation should be viewed as an interlingual and intercultural process of communication (Yu.A. Sorokhin, V.N. Komissarov, L.K. Latyshev). From this point of view it is necessary to look for various additional criteria for evaluating the quality of a target text. The main aspect of a TLT functioning in a new environment is that connected with its acceptability. This quality of a target text is still unsolved and there are no universally accepted features taken into account, moreover many scholars view it as contrasted to the criterion of adequacy of translation. Yu.M. Lotman who studied translation in a semiotic framework of language and culture argues that a target text should resemble both a SL culture and language and a TL culture and language containing the most conspicuous features of both [Лотман 1999]. However, the problem remains what features of the two cultures and languages should be retained, how they should be retained, to what extent some elements should be preserved in translation and others adapted to a receiving culture and other problems.

The main problem which arises in this connection is the problem of proper and acceptable correlation of “us” and “them” in translation which involves both whole texts and textual elements. The translator may choose one of the two translation strategies when solving the problem of acceptability [Чанышева 2007]:

(a) the so-called **adaptive**approach when the translator applies a number of transformations aimed at facilitating reception and comprehension of verbal and cultural signs in a source language text by TL addressee. For example, *Are you O’K? – Ты жив?*

(b) the opposite, so-called **conservative** approach when the translator attempts to preserve the national coloring of a SLT by retaining its peculiar elements. For example, *Are you O’K? – Ты в порядке?*

Concrete observations of ways of translating Russian cultural words into English show that both translation strategies are employed and there are no hard and fast rules governing their choice. Compare,

*conservative* translation strategy as in *показательный суд – a show trial, рынок вторичного жилья—“secondary” housing market, вертикаль власти – the power vertical;*

*adaptive* translation strategy as in *самопал – bootlegging, фабрика звезд – Fame academy, American Idol show,киллер – hitman;*

*both strategies* competing with each other as in *невозвращенец – non-returnee, non-returnik / defector; прописка – passport registration, residence registration in a passport /residence permit*[Чанышева, Дьяконова 2007]*.*

In conclusion it must be stressed that all the aspects of translation investigated in process-oriented, product-oriented and function-oriented approaches to this phenomenon contribute to our understanding of translation which viewed as an act of interlanguage and intercultural communication aims at overcoming linguistic, ethnocultural and mental differences and barriers between members of any two nations and thus facilitating intercourse and preventing the so-called cultural shock. A translator must be aware of differences not only in languages, but also in life experience, life styles, world views, cultural concepts, cultural codes (including systems of gestures, proxemics, prosody and voice qualities), speech and other stereotypes characteristic of the two peoples and so on. The knowledge of such nationally specific facts and phenomena is hard to overestimate.

The analysis of different points of view shows that various definitions of translation depend on the general underlying ideas of language, communication, thinking; on the respective schools of thinking moulding this or that conception, as well as individual interpretations of this complex phenomenon. For this reason, some linguists are rather pessimistic about giving at present a more or less exhaustive definition of translation as its subject matter is not confined to elements of a language system (phonetics, grammar, lexis, etc) and the/a language in its entirety, nor this or that kind of speech activity or even products of this activity (utterances, texts, discourses, etc). The treatment of translation as a special kind of ‘transbarrier’ interlanguage communication reveals in it equal participation and active interaction of all levels of language systems presupposing their paradigmatic, syntagmatic, semantic, emotional and pragmatic aspects, as well as taking into account differences between SL and TL resulting in compatibility/ incompatibility of linguistic, ethnocultural, mental and other peculiarities. Besides, a lot of various extralinguistic factors (situational, aesthetic, social, technical, etc) are active in translation that cannot be overlooked. R. Lurie compares two related words in Russian and English: *коммуналка* and *communal flat*: Английский термин напоминает кухню в г. Беркли в Калифорнии, где группы хиппи развлекаются тем, что варят рис для вкусного вегетарианского обеда, в то время как русское слово вызывает образ ряда больших комнат, выкрашенных в мрачный, коричневый цвет, в каждой из них живёт целая семья, и у всех у них одна общая маленькая кухня, на которой царит удушливая атмосфера от того, о чём нельзя говорить.

In view of the above, translation should be regarded as the focus of interest of scholars in different sciences concerned with various aspects of this complicated human activity the study of which has not, even today, formulated its own methodology properly and largely relies in translation research on the methods of investigation adopted in other disciplines.

# Typology of translation

The analysis of various manuals on translation testifies to a great variety of conceptions and models of translation which focus on the study of different types of translation. In modern translatology of text scholars distinguish between artistic and special text translation, interpretative translation and translation-transcoding, language and culture oriented translation, free and literal translation, etc. Like any other scientific classification, the description of different kinds of translation is based on some underlying principle.

The category of the **agent** of translation is the basis of distinguishing between *human* and *machine* translation; the **time correlation** between perception of an original text and its translation underlies the division of oral translation into *simultaneous* and *consecutive;* the **conditions** under which an original text is perceived and translation is made serve as a basis for distinguishing between four kinds of translation: *written – written, oral – oral, written – oral, oral - written*, and other principles of classification.

Traditionally, main types of translation are singled out on the basis of two criteria: predominant communicative function of the SL text and the form of speech involved in translation [Komissarov, Koralova 1990]. According to the first criterion all translations are divided into literary and informative. Literary translation involves literary texts (prose, poetry, drama) the main function of which is to make an emotional or aesthetic impression upon the reader. Informative translation deals with such texts which have for their primary concern to convey some information to the reader. To non-literary texts in the specified sense we refer scientific, technical texts, diplomatic, newspaper materials, official and business papers, public speeches. True, the line of demarcation between literary and non-literary texts is not very rigid as both the types combine in various proportions some elements of rational (technical) and emotional language that should be properly rendered in translation.

In keeping with the second criterion – the form of speech involved - translations are divided into written and oral with a further subdivision of both into several groups which are singled out on the basis of several combined criteria. So we can speak about full written translation of technical texts and their abridged versions – synopsis, précis, express-information translation. Within oral translation it is possible to speak about consecutive, simultaneous, whispered translation, sight translation, escort and some others.

Besides the two criteria mentioned above there are a number of others. Of great theoretical and practical value is the classification of types of translation elaborated by the late professor L.S. Barkhudarov who used the criterion of the degree of adequacy of a TLT to a SLT [Бархударов 1974]. Accordingly, the author singles out three types of translation: adequate, literal and free. It is believed that literal and free translations should be described as faulty, though for different reasons. Literal translation retains not only the spirit, but also the letter of the original text often to the detriment of the content and the norms of TL. Free translation was most favoured in the so-called corrective translation period since translators were more interested in perfecting the original text than its adequate rendering, hence there was more of a translator’s personality than that of the author in a translation text. True, it should be admitted that even today there is no unanimity of opinion concerning this division of types of translation especially with regard to the so-called literal translation. Since scholars now shift their attention to a particular status of the language of translation texts they justify a translator’s desire to retain in translation semantic and structural components of a SL text in order to achieve certain communicative tasks (see articles in [Проблемы обучения… 2005]).

Adequate translation is regarded as the best in dealing with any type of text, literary or informative, written or oral. However, the question of criteria set for adequate transaltion is still not solved. The advocates of microlinguistic theories of translation mention such criteria of adequacy as correct and full reproduction of the content of a SLT, retaining functional and stylistic uses of its formal features, identity of information conveyed by both texts, etc. Communicative theories of translation emphasize precise correlation of the two texts in their communicative value, similar effect upon the addressee of both texts. Th. Savory compiled a list of criteria set for adequate translation by various authors and showed that most of them are mutually exclusive. Ezra Pound claimed that a translator should stick to the principle ‘more sense and less grammar’.

E. Nida discriminated between ‘formal’ and ‘dynamic’ equivalence equating the latter with the so-called ‘equivalent effect’. According to him, formal (or ‘linguistic) equivalence of translation (qualified by the author as gloss translation) implies reproduction by a traslator of the form and content of the SL text as close to the original as possible. In this type of translation a message against the cultural background of a TL is constantly contrasted with a message against the cultural background of a SL and thus necessitates a lot of explanatory notes and comments. ‘Dynamic’ (or, to be more precise, pragmatic) equivalence permits greater freedom in the choice of language means used in translation provided they create an effect upon the TLT recipient comparable to that of the SLT upon the original text reader. In other words, a TL recipient is not expected to understand the Tl cultural context.

In modern translation theories accent is laid on the correlation not only between SLT and TLT, but also on the correlation between mental structures of speakers of the two languages (cognitive approach), the criterion of TLT acceptability in the new ethnocultural environment.

For the practical purposes it is possible to sum up the most important criteria that apply to evaluate the adequacy of translation:

(1) it fully and correctly renders the sense of an original text,

(2) it follows the rules and norms of TL,

(3) it retains stylistic peculiarities of a SLT, the functions of expressive means and stylistic devices used in it, peculiarities of the author’s individual language and style,

(4) it conveys the author’s message and intent,

(5) it arouses a reaction on the part of a TLT reader similar to that of a SLT reader.

The last criterion was introduced by E.Nida who claims that the dynamic equivalence suggests the so-called “equivalent effect” of the two texts that presupposes the choice of natural means of verbal expression in TL, while the recipient of the TLT is expected to display a pattern of behaviour relevant to the context of his own culture.

It should be noted, however, that the last demand of adequate translation is not universally accepted as unlike the other four requirements its validity is difficult or even impossible to check practically.

Prof. R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev believes that an exhaustive classification of kinds of translation should be founded on five mental mechanisms which govern translator’s activity (connected with perception of an original text, its retention in memory, transfer from one language to another, choice of the form of translation, temporal distribution of translation operations). These mental mechanisms are in their turn linked to diverse conditions that characterize different kinds of translations. For example, conditions of perception of an original text can be connected with either auditory or visual channels, single or repeated perception of a text; conditions of retention in memory of a text depend on its size and so on. The scholar tries to verify the validity of this approach on the basis of the most popular kinds of translation: written, simultaneous, sight, consecutive, paragraph-phrasal, two-way translation [Миньяр-Белоручев 1980]. Each of these kinds of translation is described in terms of mental mechanisms involved in them and concrete conditions of bilingual intercourse.

It seems that the above mentioned approach provides a solid foundation for describing different kinds of translation, but firstly, it lays stress on a psychological basis leaving linguistic aspect in the shade; secondly, it brings together a variety of different kinds of translation which differ greatly in their nature (cf. two-way and sight translation); thirdly, it contrasts kinds of translation which share their basic features (cf. consecutive and paragraph-phrasal translation).

For practical purposes it is convenient to use, with some amendments, the typology of classification advanced by prof. P.G. Chebotarev that brings together a number of classificatory criteria: content, form, and genre [Чеботарев 2006]. The author uses the terms: types, kinds and genres of translation.

**Types** of translation are singled out on the basis of the character of relationship between the SLT and TLT and the volume of information retained in translation. Accordingly, it is possible to distinguish the following 4 types:

· full translation,

· abridged translation,

· enlarged translation,

· modified translation.

The first one retains the full volume of information expressed in SLT, the second selects some passages for translation or reduces the information retained in a TLT only to the most important points and leaving out less important, the third type includes various comments, explanations, etc by a translator which contribute to a better understanding of an original text and the fourth type refers to synopsis and precis translation. In our opinion, this classification into types needs some clarification as it is not quite clear how to distinguish between abridged and modified translation. Modified translation including in the given approach both synopsis and precis translation should be looked upon as a variety of abridged translation.

**Kinds**of translation take into account the form of the language that is involved in the translation process. Hence, this criterion underlies the division of translation into the following kinds:

1) oral (simultaneous, consecutive, sight, escort interpreting, whispered interpreting, conference interpreting, etc),

2) written,

3) combined oral-written (written translation of a lecture, tape-recording, abridged sight translation, etc).

In the above classification of kinds of translation it might be useful to single out two subvarieties within the third group: combined oral-written and written-oral.

Besides, in actual conditions of international communication in various spheres it seems to be more appropriate to speak about a new type of translation – the so-called *multi-medium* translation. It is widely used today in translating films (subtitling and dubbing), translation for the theatre and advertising, song lyric translation, on-line multi-lingual programmes and some other kinds of intercourse.

**Genres** of translation include the following varieties:

a) translation of political and publicistic texts,

b) technical (scientific, speciality) translation,

c) military translation,

d) fiction translation,

e) legal translation,

f) commercial translation,

g) translation of religious texts, etc.

New principles of classifying types of translation were recently elaborated in translation theories which view translating as inseparable from the concept of culture. The semiotic interpretation of translation in R. Jacobson’s tripartite theory linked translation studies and cultural semiotics because “the general notion of culture might be described as the process of total translation” [Torop 2002: 593]. In keeping with a broad interpretation of culture as operating largely through translational activity P. Torop singles out 4 translation types on the basis of the model of a universal translation process [Тороп 1995] which include: 1) textual translation or ordinary translation; 2) metatextual translation or description in the form of criticism, advertising, etc; 3) intextual and intertextual translation or transmitting or introducing a foreign word into a text; 4) extratextual translation or translating out of a text (e.g. adapting literature to a film, etc). These types of translation are based on viewing culture as a mechanism of translation and viewing translation as a working mechanism of culture.

# The problem of the unit of translation

When a text is being translated it is usually segmented into smaller parts which are easy and convenient to translate. Such segments of a text are known as units of translation. Though the unit of translation is one of the basic notions of TT which is widely used in books on translation there is no universally accepted definition of it even today. V.N.Komissarov uses the term “переводема” to refer to this notion. One of the foreign pioneers of the theory of translation J. Catford introduced the term ‘rank of translation’ in his book “A Linguistic Theory of Translation” (London 1965) which was used in a similar meaning. Still debatable today is the problem of terminology to be used in regard to this notion which is shown in articles by participants in the international conference on translation recently held in Moscow [Проблемы обучения … 2005]. Some scholars, for example, contrast the terms *transleme* (транслема) which is established in a SL text, and *unit of translation*which is found in a TL text (Ye.V. Ovsyannikova)*.* According to S.B. Tyulenev, the unit of translation should be termed *translateme* (транслатема)and defined as a combination of a linguistic unit of the source language expressing a certain contextual meaning and the minimal corresponding linguistic unit of the target language with the same meaning [Тюленев 2004: 331]. Some scholars confine the understanding of the unit of translation only to problem units of a text («проблемная единица перевода»).

The term ‘unit of translation’ was first used by J-P. Vinay, J. Darbelnet who claimed that its size may be variable as it serves only practical purposes. In this connection P. Torop who investigates translation in close connection with language and culture points out that for a translator/interpreter it is necessary to operationally distinguish elements of culture and language both on the level of a text and the level of language units [Тороп 1995: 59]. J. Lyons holds a similar view as he claims that though a language is integrated in culture in which it functions it is necessary to identify cultural and language features separately and later establish correlations between them [Лайонз 1978].

In our approach to this central notion of translation theory we think it reasonable to keep apart three aspects of the unit of translation that should be discussed separately and not confused as they arouse their own particular problems:

(1) **theoretical:**its understanding and definition which should take into account the most important features of a unit of translation;

(2) **size-of-the-unit**: relation of a init of translation to language levels;

(3) **operational:**criteria applicable in the process of their identification in a SLT, i.e. segmenting a SLT into textual elements that are convenient to translate.

The definition of the unit of translation may be given from three points of view:

1) with reference to a SLT,

2) with reference to a TLT,

3) with reference to both a SLT and a TLT.

Within the above three approaches scholars may take into account various criteria: (a) content, or (b) form, or (c) both content and form.

**The first aspect**of the unit of translation is connected with its definition.The most well-known definition of the unit of translation based on the criterion of content with reference to a SLT was suggested by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet. According to them, a unit of translation is a unit of sense.

The criterion of form is very important in form-oriented translation when formal peculiarities serve as an additional channel of conveying some information, e.g. English favours alliteration as a stylistic device which it is possible to render in translation often at the expense of its content (cf. *Papa, potatoes, poultry, prunes and prism are all very good words for the lips (Ch. Dickens. Little Dorrit). – Папа, пряники, палисандр, персики и призмы – прекрасные слова для губ (Е. Конашева).*

The definition which takes into account both content and form in Russian translation studies was suggested by prof. Komissarov V.N. who defined a unit of translation as a minimum language unit in SLT which is chosen as an independent object of translation process.

With reference to a TLT, definitions of the unit of translation first appeared in the works of scholars who tackled the problems of machine translation. A unit of translation was understood as a combination of certain lexemes and grammemes which corresponds to a certain lexical or grammatical category in TLT (I.I. Revzin, V.Yu. Rozenzweig).

Definitions of the unit of translation which are formulated with reference both to a SLT and a TLT are also numerous. The most wide-spread definition based on these criteria was given by prof. Barkhudarov L.S. It runs as follows: It is a minimum language unit in a SLT which taken as a whole has a certain correspondence in TLT, but the constituent parts of which taken separately do not have a correspondence with a similar meaning in a TL [Бархударов 1975: 175].

To sum up the discussion of the understanding of this category of LTT it is necessary to stress its main features which are as follows:

(a) a unit of translation should always be found in a SL text, not in a TL text,

(b) it is established as a special category relevant from a translator’s point of view and therefore it has no correlation with the existing language levels,

(c) it is a minimum unit in a sense that it cannot be segmented in translation into smaller parts without detriment to its sense.

The ***second aspect*** of the unit of translation has to do with its relationship with language levels.

At present there are various approaches to the solution of this problem.

1. Some scholars believe that the unit of translation is always larger than a separate word. It may be a sentence or a clause, a group of sentences, a paragraph or even a whole text. This point of view is supported by Ya.I. Retsker, V.N. Komissarov, etc. They claim that a word cannot be chosen as a unit of translation for several reasons: 1) its boundaries are not always clear-cut; 2) words blend together in speech forming various semantic and structural complexes, the elements of which must be viewed together by a translator in order to retain in translation the meaning of a whole unit; 3) the outer (formal) aspect of a speech event to be rendered in translation may be often more important than the semantic one. E.g. in actual speech stylistic effect is often due to special devices that are based on the formal aspect of speech units recurring in a succession of words in a speech string (repetition of some sounds, sound symbolism – e.g. the effect of the sounds [d], [i], [ing] recurrent within one or even more than one utterances.

2. V.N. Komissarov points out that a sentence is usually chosen as an operational unit of translation since it provides a microcontext necessary and sufficient to comprehend its meaning properly [Комиссаров 1999a]. True, he admits the possibility of choosing other units of translation within a sentence which are of a lower rank, and associated with a word-level or a word-group level. In other words, the author introduces the idea of hierarchy of units of translation which may be chosen on different levels (higher and lower).

3. K. Reiss and H. Vermeer hold that a unit of translation should be chosen on the level of a text as it may help to overcome contextual ambiguity and ambivalence of words and even sentences that arise from differences in languages and cultures; a text realizes the speaker’s intention (‘scopos’) (K. Reiz, H.J.Vermeer and others).

Translation practice testifies that the unit of translation can be chosen on various language levels:

**(a) phonemes** which is usually the case in dealing with proper and geographic names, sport, space, computer and other sets of terms, etc: *Challenger – Челенджер, bobsleigh – бобслей, minority interests – миноритарные интересы, prime time – прайм-тайм, merchandising – мерчандайзинг.*

The method of reproducing SL phonemes by corresponding phonemes in TL is called transcription. It is regarded as one of the types of borrowed translation and underlies borrowing of the so-called international words.

Since words have not only a sound form, but also a graphic form, graphemes may also serve as units of translation. In practice it may be a combination of both phonemes and graphemes chosen as units of translation: *off-shore – офшор, Waterloo – Ватерлоо, poster - постер*. The method of reproducing graphemes of SL by similar graphemes of TL is known as transliteration and it is very popular today alongside transcription when translating neologisms, terms, etc.

**(b) morphemes** may be chosen as units of translation when translating bymorphemic and polymorphemic words: *самореклама – self-promotion, вневедомственная охрана – non-departmental security guard, отказник -- refusenik*. The method of segmenting words into morphemes which are further translated into TL which reproduces the morphological structure of a word is called loan translation. It is also qualified as a kind of borrowed translation because the translator not only reproduces the morphemes, but also retains the morphological structure of a word and arrangement of morphemes.

**(c) words** are often chosen as units of translation. Their proper translation depends on two main factors: 1) semantic peculiarities, i.e. whether a word is monosemantic or polysemantic, the correlation of denotational and connotational components of meaning and some other features; 2) the degree of dependence on a context and a situation of discourse. From this point of view words are divided into context-free and context-bound words. In the former case the translation does not depend on a context, e.g. here refer units of precision lexis, proper and geographical names, *inch – дюйм, New Zealand – Новая Зеландия.*In the latter case the context plays a great role, especially when translating polysemantic words, e.g. *to make an assault upon a fortress – штурмовать крепость; some music is an assault on the ears – есть музыка, которая оскорбляет слух; assaults upon the prerogatives of Parliament – резкие выступления против прерогатив парламент*

**(d) word-groups** as units of translation are especially important when translating from English into Russian because in analytical (lexical) languages like English the dependence of a word on its environment is much greater than in synthetical (grammatical) languages like Russian. E.g*. Three hundred workers went on strike over a bonus claim. – Триста рабочих забастовали, требуя выплаты премиальных.*

**e) sentences** serve as units of translation in two main cases: 1. when translating utterances used to describe identical situations in the two languages in their own idiomatic ways, cf. *Authorized Personnel only – Посторонним вход запрещен / Служебный вход* 2. when translating proverbs and sayings which are based in different languages on different images, though they are related in sense, cf. *Still waters run deep. – В тихом омуте черти водятся.*

Apart from these two cases the unit of translation may be chosen on the level of a sentence to retain a proper stylistic effect. E.g. *Their bodies were covered with fur. – Они были одеты в меха. (Их одежда была сшита из меха. – пер. Н.Волжина).*Word-for-word translation of the sentence would sound misleading, cf. *Их тела были покрыты мехом*.

**f) a text**. The term ”text” itself needs some clarification since linguists are not at one concerning its understanding and definition. O.I. Moskalskaya, for instance, qualifies any stretch of speech that expresses a complete thought as a text. It may be a single word in a telegram message. According to I.R. Galperin a communicative speech unit only then turns into a text if it possesses a number of text-forming features such as the category of information, modality, cohesion, and some others. Without going into details on this complicated matter we confine our understanding of a text for the purposes of translation as a combination of several sentences which forms a connected stretch of speech possessing as a whole unit certain content and formal features. Practitioners of translation claim that the unit of translation on the level of a text is often chosen when translating poetry. In dealing with prose it is hard to overestimate the importance of a text to achieve an adequate translation. Though a prosaic text as a whole cannot serve as a unit of translation it influences to a great extent correct translation of its parts. This influence can be easily observed in translations of titles of books. The title of the famous novel by J. Braine “*Room at the top*” was translated by several variants from word-for-word to more adequate, cf. «*Мансарда*» > «*Место наверху*» > «*Путь наверх*». For this reason translation of the titles of books very often undergoes varied transformations, *«На всякого мудреца довольно простоты»* (А.Н. Островский)*- “Even a Wise Man Stumbles”, “Even the Wise Can Err”, “Scoundrel”.*

Thus, in conclusion it must be stressed that the unit of translation should not be tied in with any particular language level since as has been shown above it can be located on various levels on condition that it satisfies the criteria and requirements stated in the quoted definition.

**The third important aspect** of a unit of translation is connected with criteria on which a translator may rely in order to identify it in the process of segmenting a hSL text. The analysis of various approaches testifies to diverging solutions to this problem. Most translatologists contend that such criteria do not include the criterion of the size of a unit of translation as it is variable in this respect in various translation acts. Some linguists connect the size of the unit of translation not with a SLT, but with the capacity of the TL to express the same notion that is expressed in the original [Тюленев 2004]. According to L.S. Barhkudarov, we should depend in this matter on the existence of TL correspondences for certain segments of a text.

In search of reliable criteria some linguists associate units of translation with translation problems, hence the only criterion of a unit of translation is claimed to be connected with its being sufficient for making proper translation solutions (cf. «Величина отрезка текста не может быть критерием единицы перевода. Таким критерием должна быть возможность принять решение на перевод» [Миньяр-Белоручев 1999]). In other words, units of translation call for an individual translation solution. Such an approach to the criteria of a unit of translation was elaborated by Ye.V. Breus who defined units of translation in connection with a text which is viewed as a matrix («сетка») of translation problems. This matrix covers problem translation areas and problem-free translation areas. In the former case a translator deals with units of translation which he has to translate creatively and of his own accord, while in the latter case he transcodes a text using regular correspondences according to Ya.I. Retsker’s theory.

Thus apart from the theoretical aspects of understanding and defining a unit of translation there arise practical difficulties associated with segmenting a SLT into minimal translation units. It is obvious that the knowledge of SL and TL systems alone is not sufficient to cope with this task. In fact, the process of segmenting a SL text into units of translation should be viewed as a multi-stage procedure the success of which depends to a great extent on both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. As a rule, translatologists establish three stages in this process: 1) considering linguistic units of a certain level (usually words), 2) evaluating their contextual interdependence and 3) modifying it in various ways (enlarging initially chosen linguistic units to the size of word-combinations, sentences and even entire paragraphs and texts; or diminishing them and choosing on a lower level or combining several into one; or dropping in translationl.

We believe that it is not enough to take into account only linguistic factors (systemic and contextual), but it is also necessary to pay attention to such important aspects of translator’s activity as translation norm, situational and broader cultural parameters which determine the sense and implications of a SL text affecting the choice of proper units of translation on a given occasion. Thus, in connection with these factors and parameters of a SLT it is possible to single out the following stages in the text-segmentation procedure:

1) segmenting a text, depending on our knowledge of the language, into minimal units of sense (in regard to meaningful language units) or minimal units of outer expression (phonemes or graphemes) which cannot be further segmented into smaller parts without detriment to either sense or form (cf. This is a new building – I’m fond of new potatoes, where *new*for translation purposes should be singled out on a word-level in the first sentence (*новое)*and a word-group - level in the second case (*молодой картофель)*;

2) analyzing all contextual modifications of established semantic and formal features of those units (cf. ...*Не проси, мин херц, сейчас и не думай об Монсихе* (А. Толстой, 102) – *Don’t ask for that, myn Herz. You mustn’t even think of the Mons girl now…(*A. Miller)

3) considering all situational and background factors which determine particular uses of the established units (cf. *I made out your voucher* (W. Saroyan. Selected short stories) – *Я выписал тебе расчёт* (пер. Л. Натан);

4) enlarging, diminishing or dropping selected units of translation under the influence of translation norms as a verification of their correct choice in a given context (cf. *In a panic he shoveled hay over the puppy with his fingers. – В испуге он быстро зарыл щенка в сено* (Хайруллин 1997).

5) applying the principle of interchangeability , e.g. *Don’t turn over – Не кантовать.*

6) taking into account the addressee factor (cf. *recycling – рециклирование/вторичная переработка),*

7) choosing a proper translation strategy, cf.

*Бог с ними! – God with them!* (word-for-word translation)

*God is with them!*(literal translation)

*Never mind about them!*(adequate translation).

Thus, it is apparent that segmenting a SLT into units of translation is a complicated procedure of its interpretation which is the decisive factor of adequate rendering in a TL and at various stages the SLT analysis and segmentation into parts depend upon both linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

We may conclude that the discussion of the unit of translation should bring to light its main aspects: theoretical (connected with the understanding and definition of this notion), the size-of-the-unit aspect (connected with the choice of units of translation on different language levels on the basis of identificatory criteria), operational aspect (connected with principles of segmenting a SLT into units of translation).

# Equivalence and adequacy of translation

**Equivalence and adequacy of translation: points of difference**

The terms equivalence and adequacy of translation have both been used in translation studies for a long time, yet the borderline between the two is not always clear-cut. Not infrequently the notion of translation equivalence is treated as the adequacy of translation. In view of such a discrepancy, it is necessary to consider each term separately first.

The term *equivalence*is considered by many scholars as one of the most important ontological features of translation, and yet its proper definition is still a matter of debate. There are several reasons for it. The first cause is connected with its polyfunctional character when it is used in the translation theory, therefore it is necessary to specify what equivalence is really meant in each particular case. According to L.L. Nelyubin [Нелюбин 2003: 253-255] it can be used in a most general sense as a sense proximity of any two elements which are equated with each other, as well as in more narrow senses it is common to speak about (a) equivalence of a SLT and a TLT, (b) equivalence as a type of lexical correspondence between SLT units and TLT correspondences, (c) equivalence of translation which presupposes identity of all levels of a SLT and a TLT content and (d) equivalent translation.

Besides, it is possible to compare equivalent and adequate translation, equivalent substitutions, etc. Very often *equivalence* is used indiscriminately to refer to cases which should be termed properly by the term *adequacy.*

The term*translation equivalence*is one of the key notions in LTT which can be accounted for by several reasons. Many well-known definitions of translation include equivalence as its basic feature and a condition for qualifying a certain act of interlingual communication as translation (see P.M. Toper, G. Jeger, N.M. Nesterova, etc). Translation equivalence is considered as the most important criterion in determining the status of a secondary text [Нестерова 2005].

W.Koller treated equivalence in a broad sense spreading it to various content levels and singled out 5 types of equivalence:

1) *denotational* (provides for “content invariance” which takes into account the subject content of the text);

2) *connotational* (or stylistic equivalence that presupposes purposeful choice of language means in TL);

3) *textual-normative* (points to the genre attributes of a text, as well as to the language and speech norms);

4) *pragmatic* equivalence (or communicative equivalence in translation studies),

5) *formal* equivalence (established on the level of transferring artistic, aesthetic, individualizing and other formal attributes of the original) [Koller 1983].

Prof. V.N. Komissarov has advanced the theory of the levels of equivalence which is based on the understanding of equivalence as a measure of semantic community of a SLT and its translation on various levels. In keeping with this principle the author establishes 5 levels of equivalence:

· the level of the aim of communication

· the level of the situation described

· the level of the way of describing the situation

· the level of the meaning of syntactic structures

· the level of the meanings of lexical units [Комиссаров 2002].

Compare translations of the following sentences that are made on different levels of equivalence:

«*На дне»* (М. Горький)*- “Down and Out”*(G.Rapall Noyes and A. Kaun)*, «Одноэтажная Америка»* (И.Ильф и Е. Петров)*– “Provincial America”* (J.H.C. Richardson)*, «Крутой маршрут»* (Е. Гинзбург)*- “Within the Whirlwind”* (Ian Boland) (equivalence on the level of the aim of communication);

*Watch the head! – Осторожно, низкий потолок. Сюда, пожалуйста – This way, please* (equivalence on the levels of the aim of communication and the situation described);

*This summer saw a number of terrible air-crashes. – Этим летом произошло несколько ужасных авиакатастроф* (equivalence on the levels of the aim of communication, the situation described and the way of describing the situation).

*She was driven away, never to re-visit this neighbourhood. – Она была вынуждена уехать и больше не вернулась в эти места* (equivalence on the levels of the aim of communication, the situation described, the way of describing the situation, the meaning of syntactic structures).

*The fog stopped the traffic – Из-за тумана остановилось движение транспорта* (equivalence on the levels of the aim of communication, the situation described, the way of describing the situation, the meaning of syntactic structures and the meaning of lexical units).

The comparison of the two approaches shows that W. Koller singles out types of equivalence that can co-exist on one and the same language level pointing at various aspects of a speech unit, while V.N. Komissarov’s classification brings different levels of equivalence into a hierarchical structure moving from the top level (the aim of communication) which is a decisive factor of equivalence to the lowest.

Thus, it is important to stress that although translation is always an approximation to the original source text due to formal and semantic differences between the SLT and the TLT, theorists and language users accept a translation as the functional, structural and semantic equivalent of the original text.

Adequacy is also used in several meanings with reference to: adequacy of translation, adequate translation and adequate substitutions [Нелюбин 2003]. *Adequacy of translation* is understood in two senses: (1) it is the reproduction of the unity of content and form of a SLT by means of another language; (2) it is identical information conveyed by similar or identical means of a different language.

*Adequate translation* has over 10 meanings with which the term is used in different contexts: (a) a TT which fully and without distortions renders a SLT; (b) which takes into account a broad context and retains stylistic peculiarities of a SLT; (c) which evokes a reaction of a TL reader which is in keeping with the communicative intent and purpose of the sender of a SL message: (d) an adequate translation is an equivalent translation, etc. (ibid.).

There is no less controversy of opinion concerning differentiation of the terms equivalent / adequate translation. A few authors regard them as synonymous, and yet the majority treat them as related to different features of translation.

The difference was studied in great detail by K. Reiss and H. Vermeer [Reiss, Vermeer 1984]. As the starting point, they stress that it is necessary to use the term equivalence in two senses: equivalence of texts and equivalence of textual segments. There is no one-to-one dependence between the two, as the equivalence of texts does not imply equivalence of textual elements, and vice versa, the equivalence of textual elements does not ensure the equivalence of texts. The authors argue that equivalence of texts has a cultural dimension. This is a very important conclusion, though it seems logical to apply the notion of cultural equivalence to the level of textual language units as well. This is true even of proper names which have a rather simplified semantic structure as compared to most common nouns, cf. *Waterloo* which has a correspondence in Russian – *Ватерлоо*, but the English word has three meanings: (1) *a battle fought in 1815 near Brussels, Belgium in which Wellington led the British and Prussians and defeated Napoleon and the French; (2) a severe and deserved defeat after a time of unusual success; (3) one of the mainline railway stations in London just South of the Thames* [LDELC]. It is generally known to the average Russian reader only in the first meaning. Hence, it is not so simple to translate the English phraseological unit ‘*to meet one’s Waterloo’*which means ‘*to suffer a very severe defeat or failure, especially one which causes people to finally give up what they are trying to do*’ (ibid). So, instead of the English idiom there is no other way of translating it into Russian preserving the same image, than by means of a word-combination: *потерпеть неожиданное сокрушительное поражение.*The comparison of these phrases shows that besides the difference in their character in English and in Russian there is also a culturally relevant semantic component in the English phraseological unit linked with the cultural symbol of the historic battle of Waterloo which is not retained in translation.

The difference between equivalence and adequacy of translation can be established in regard to the character, object and the content of the two categories:

in terms of the *character* adequacy of translation is viewed as an evaluative category, thus an adequate translation means a good translation; an equivalent translation is a technical category referring to an established standard which implies the greatest possible identity or similarity of all content levels of a SLT and a TLT. The questions asked in both cases are not the same, namely: if the final text version corresponds to the initial one (equivalence), and if translation corresponds to the communicative situation and conditions (adequacy).

In terms of the *object* adequacy of translation refers to the procedure (process) of translation and thus it relates to the conditions of an interlingual and intercultural communicative act and determines the use of speech filters (semantic, combinatorial, word-building, etc), the choice of translator’s strategies that meets the communicative situation. Equivalent translation is aimed at a desirable result and establishes to what extent the TLT corresponds to the SLT as both perform similar communicative functions in various cultures.

In terms of the *content* adequacy of translation is based on the actual practice of translation and approves of translation solutions of a compromise nature on condition that they better correlate with the communicative situation; equivalent translation presupposes maximum possible transference of the communicative functional invariant of the SLT.

These points of difference between adequate and equivalent translation bring us to an important conclusion that a translation text that is fully equivalent to the original does not always meet the demands of an adequate translation. On the other hand, an adequate translation does not always imply relations of full equivalence between the SLT and the TLT and their textual segments. Compare the two translations of the Russian sentence into English: *Он думал о тяготах, выпавших на долю людей –*

*1) He learned of the hardships that had befallen the people.*

*2) He saw the hardships the people were suffering.*

The first version makes use of dictionary equivalents, and yet the editor has improved it by replacing some of them by the contextual substitutions which prove to be more adequate for the situation described and in keeping with stylistic register, adequate theme-rheme correlation, typical combinability of words in the TL.

# The problem of translatability

This problem has been the subject of heated discussions ever since translation practice appeared as a special kind of human activity. In the philosophy of language two radically opposed points of view have been asserted reflecting “relativist” and “universalist” orientations:

· “**relativist” orientation** towards translatability

Adherents to this approach claim that translation is impossible. Such a skeptical opinion was expressed both by outstanding men-of-letters, and prominent linguists. It is sufficient to quote S.M.de Cervantes who compared translation to the wrong side of the carpet.

V.von Humboldt, one of the greatest figures in ethnography and linguistics, wrote in 1796 that any translation was doomed to be a waste of time, since it is an attempt to try to solve a task that cannot be solved. He argued that a translator either stays too close to the original, at the cost of taste and the language of his nation, or he adheres too closely to the characteristics peculiar to his nation, at the cost of the original. Such an approach was connected with his theoretical views on language, thought and reality. He looked upon language as an expression of the spirit of the nation hence each language embodies the world-view (*Weltansicht*) and shapes the reality for the people speaking a particular language as well as their mentality.

Similar ideas were later supported and developed by other German linguists, Humboldt’s followers, for example, L. Weisgerber who proposed the theory that our understanding is under the spell of the language which it utilizes.

In American linguistics the postulate of untranslatability is founded on the conviction that there can be no true symmetry, no adequate mirroring, between two different semantic systems. The tendency to identify language and thinking was started in the works of E. Sapir and B. Whorf, who developed the theory of linguistic relativity. Since thinking was practically equated with language the conclusion was that it is impossible to translate adequately from one language into another. In their opinion, different perception and mental organization of reality account for the existence of gaps between languages including terms specific to each language community. Concepts that are common to two or more linguistic communities nevertheless have different connotations in each of them. Besides, the difference in structuring reality by each linguistic community is done according to their own linguistic codes. This point of view is known as ‘monadist’ (G. Steiner) which implies that universal deep structures are either fathomless to logical investigation or too abstract and generalized. So it is argued that any universalist models are at best irrelevant and at worst misleading and concerning the problem of translatability it means that translation “is a convention of approximate analogies, a rough-cast similitude, just tolerable when the two relevant languages or cultures are cognate, but altogether spurious when remote tongues and far-removed sensibilities are in question” [Steiner 1977:74]. In Russia A.A. Potebnya shared similar ideas on restrictions of translatability.

· **“universalist” orientation** in translation studies

The supporters of the second approach to the solution of the problem of translatability stick to the opposite principle of absolute translatability which was proclaimed in the Age of Enlightenment. Prominent philosophers R. Descartes, G.W. Leibnitz and others proceeded from the assumption that different languages should be regarded as variants of a single language *lingua universalis*which express the same logical notions that are easy to translate from language to language. The emergence of such views goes back to antique grammars. The term *grammatica universalis*appeared in the Middle Ages (13th century) after the publication of “Grammaire generale et raisonnee de Port-Royal” when the notion ‘universals’ acquired a linguistic basis. It was argued that all languages have a ‘universal’(‘rational’, ‘philosophic’) basis which enables to achieve absolute translatability.

Similar views were held in American linguistics by adherents to the generative approach (started in the work by N. Chomsky, 1976) who claimed that even the most complicated sentences can be described in terms of simple nuclear patterns which are easy to translate from language to language. From this it follows that the main task is to apply transformation rules which enable to turn nuclear structures into full sentences in TLT.

Both the ‘relativist’ and ‘universalist’ approaches to this key issue of translation studies should be qualified as extreme points of view that can hardly be accepted today. Their ideas run counter to the real practice of translation and are given up now as being one-sided and rigorous. And besides, the development of linguistics, the emergence of national languages outside the European continent have shown the futility of ideas connected with lingua universalis.

· **modern views** on translatability

As is usual in debates on controversial issues, the truth lies in the middle, and the solution to the problem of translatability has to be made on a different ground.

In polemics with adherents to the idea of absolute untranslatability it is argued that the long history of the practice of translation testifies to the opposite. The assumptions used by the authors are as follows:

a) thinking of any people is based on common laws of logic;

b) the basic units of logic are notions that are universal for all human beings;

c) all national languages possess not only culturally specific characteristics, but also a lot of universal features;

d) reality surrounding man exists by itself and is only reflected in the course of human activity by human mind and the results of human cognition are embodied in a language;

e) whatever is expressed in one language can always be translated into another language as all languages are rich in their resources.

At the same time the ‘universalist’ approach to the problem which proclaims absolute translatability cannot be accepted either although for different reasons. In contrast to the principle of absolute translatability which is practically unattainable, both Russian and foreign scholars advocate the solution of translatability in relative terms. Besides, they offer a more strict understanding and treatment of the term *translatability*.

In order to clarify the notion of translatability Prof. A.D. Shveitzer suggests distinguishing between two interpretations of the term: on the one hand, it is possible to understand translatability as the general basic underlying principle of translation activity. To such an understanding of translatability he gives a positive answer. At the same time it is possible to refer the notion of translatability to concrete language points and discover a lot of things that are hard or even impossible to translate. There are well-known books that collect language units that defy translation [Влахов, Флорин 1978]. As an example we can refer to the Russian word *пошлость,* which is impossible to translate adequately into English. The dictionary correspondences are *cheap, sham, common, vulgar, commonplace, trivial, in bad taste, banal*and some others (ORED). In the opinion of V. Nabokov, none of these correspondences can convey the idea of moral, spiritual and social criticism like the Russian pitiless word (cit [Вежбицкая 2001]).

Prof. L.S. Barkhudarov suggested a rather convincing solution to this problem as he believes that it is necessary to view this category on the level of a whole text, but not its parts and segments. He claims that though there may be units which are difficult to translate they should not undermine the principle of translatability established on the level of a text. As for textual elements that may be difficult or even impossible to translate they do not undermine the fact of translatability of a whole text.

Thus, to conclude it is necessary to stress that it is necessary to keep apart two aspects of this phenomenon: first of all, translatability as such which is established on the level of a text as a whole and secondly translatability of textual elements. Since from the above it follows that translatability as the basic theoretical assumption which is used in regard to a text is quite plausible and its validity cannot be questioned it is necessary to see some other aspects of translatability which arise on the level of textual elements.

The history of translation studies bears out that both Russian and foreign pioneers of LLT were concerned with textual elements and considered both linguistic and cultural differences between the respective codes conveying a certain message. In view of such discrepancies E. Nida discussed a variety of formal modifications which are especially needed in order to overcome cultural differences. Some authors (A. Martinet, H. Friedrich, etc) do not support the theory of translatability and viewing it in regard to textual elements they claim that the art of translation will always have to cope with the reality of untranslatable from one language into another.

In view of the cultural approach to language American linguist R. Lado, the author of the book “Linguistics across Cultures”, developed the notion of ‘cultural untranslatability’ [Ладо 1989]. He uses this term to refer to culturally unique terms such as cultural concepts, barbarisms, some terms, etc. It is clear from this that the author shifts the problem of translatability onto the level of textual elements rather than the level of a text.

It is with reference to problem areas of a SLT that J. Catford proposed a basic division between *linguistic* and *cultural* untranslatability:

· *linguistic untranslatability* is defined as a failure to find a TL equivalent which is due entirely to differences between the SL and the TL;

· *cultural untranslatability* occurs when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely absent from the culture of which the TL is a part (e.g. the names of some institutions, clothes, food, abstract concepts, etc) [Катфорд 2004].

To illustrate linguistic untranslatability he refers to the category of gender which is relevant in Russian, but not in English, cf. *Я пришла – I’ve arrived.* – There are no special markers in English to render the Russian feminine gender as the latter is not an obligatory category in it.

Cultural untranslatability defined above offers great difficulties and the failure of a translator to deal with them properly can result in a cultural shock. The author proves this by the following example, cf. *Они лежали на горячих верхних полках бани, вдыхая ароматный запах березовых веток. – They lay on the hot upper benches of the bathroom inhaling the aromatic scent of the birch twigs.*

In connection with both types of translatability J. Catford speaks about limits and degree of translatability, both linguistic and cultural, so he refrains from using the terms absolute translatability and absolute untranslatability.

The attitude of modern foreign theoreticians of translation to the problem of translatability shows a more flexible and many-sided approach to its solution than that of their predecessors. As an example we can refer to P. Torop, the creator of the total approach to translation, who argues that it is necessary to establish various *types and levels* of translatability instead of trying to offer its more or less universal definition [Тороп 1995]. His theoretical assumption is that measuring the quality of translation should not be done only on the basis of language facts as a target text functioning as a secondary text in a receiving culture may prove to be quite valuable to that culture despite some linguo-stylistic faults. The problem of translatability has a number of aspects which should be considered as partially compatible dominants of translation activity.

The author distinguishes between **three types** of translatability depending on whether the dominant as the basis of conceptuality of translation activity refers to:

· a SLT,

· a translator or

· a receiving culture.

In the first case the source text dictates its own optimal translatability, in the second case the translator as a creative person realizes himself through the choice of the translation method which itself determines the degree of translatability and in the third case the translator takes into account a would-be reader or cultural norms, i.e. determines the degree of translatability by conditions of acceptance of a translation text.

Besides these types of translatability the scholar describes **levels**of translatability by considering sets of parameters that refer to translatability of culture. Translatability of culture is understood as a complex whole including:

· the parameter of *language* (grammatical categories, cultural terms, speech etiquette, world-view, associations),

· the parameter of *time* (historical and cultural time, the author’s and eventive time),

· the parameter of *space* (geographic space, psychological space),

· the parameter of a text (genre, the author’s lexis, expressive means used),

· the parameter of *the work of art* (additional metatexts which may be presuppositional, interpretative, the reader’s reaction),

· the parameter of *social-political determinatedness* (norms, prohibitions, evaluation of translation).

It is clear from the above that the problem of translatability in modern translatology is solved on a different theoretical basis as compared to the traditional approaches, therefore such a treatment of this notion exceeds the boundaries of language facts and brings to light a number of important factors including cultural signs and categories that are active when assessing different aspects of translatability:

o it not only proclaims the importance of culture, but actually investigates translation as part of culture viewing the entire phenomenon of translation as culture-bound;

o it takes into account functioning of a translation text in the receiving culture so the problem of translatability is closely linked with the acceptance of a translation version of a SL text in a receiving culture;

o it overcomes simplification of the problem studied and views translatability as a typology of complementary parameters which taken together can provide a solid ground for a comprehensive analysis of the total translation activity.

To sum up, modern approaches to languages and cultures adopted in cultural studies of a language develop views on language as determining medium of thought which structures experience according to its own particular lines and habits of cognition (see the works by A. Vezhbitzka, В.А. Маслова, С.Г. Тер-Минасова), so to a great extent we think and feel as our particular language impels and allows us to do. This may account for translation difficulties and non-translatable elements in languages. At the same time, there are some universal features of the semantic and formal systems that cannot be ignored. Common linguistic properties facilitate passage from one language into another ensuring success of a translator’s enterprise. Thus, the problem of translatability is realized as a complex phenomenon which should be studied accordingly.The practice of translation confirms that various translation strategies are constantly applied in order to bridge the gaps between languages and cultures and thus avoid losses which may result in the target text.

# Adequate translation and the role of context

The importance of the context and the situation in which a speech event is taking place was stressed in studies revealing the difference between texts produced as speaking and those produced in writing [Biber 1988]. The author introduced the terms *highly explicit context*-*independent reference* and *nonspecific, situation-dependent reference*. It is reasonable to apply these terms to segments of a text where a translator / interpreter deals with them as matters of reference and so he can also rely on the varying degree of dependence of a unit of translation upon a context. According to the dependence on the context translation practice points at the two classes of units the translation of which differs a lot: the so-called context-free and context-bound units. The translation of the former group is more or less independent of a context and the consituation as they possess a more or less constant meaning which is easy to translate outside a context. Context-free units of translation are mainly found among proper names of various types usually comprising common nouns, precision lexis including some technical terms used in particular fields of human activity, units of weights and measures, etc (*e.g. the Cape of Good Hope – Мыс доброй надежды, keystroke – нажатие клавиши)*as well as some monosemantic words and phrases from neutral word stock (*milliner – шляпник, to lisp - шепелявить* ).

The majority of units of translation, however, prove to be difficult or even impossible to translate outside a context as they are polysemantic or semantically non-differentiated, so their correct translation can be achieved only in a certain context. It is hard to overestimate the truism that “no grammar or dictionary is of very much use to the translator as only a context in the fullest linguistic-cultural sense, certifies meaning” [Steiner 1977: 357].

Depending on the character of a context it is possible to distinguish between linguistic and extralinguistic contexts, horizontal and vertical contexts.

Linguistic contexts can further be subdivided into two kinds when their size is taken into account: macrolinguistic and microlinguistic. A microlinguistic context is a minicontext the boundaries of which are usually confined to the immediate environment of a unit of translation which is typically a word-group. This can best be illustrated by polysemantic words used in a concrete context (cf*. ash* has at least 4 dictionary correspondences [NERD]), but when it is ised in the microcontext *to turn to ashes* the choice of the proper correspondence offers no difficulty: *разлететься в прах*). The importance of a microcontext is hard to overestimate when translating a word which acquires a particular contextual (usual or occasional) meaning in a certain (fixed or variable) context, e.g.. *consumer*may be translated as 1) *истребитель, 2) потребитель, 3) клиент; заказчик; покупатель; абонент; подписчик; 3) биол. консумент*, but within the fixed microcontext *consumer electronics* it is translated as *бытовая электроника.*

A macrolinguistic context by definition exceeds the limits of the immediate environment and stretches into a sentence, a group of sentences, a paragraph, a chapter or even the whole book. For example, it is insufficient to know the immediate environment of the word *state*when it is used in the word combination *in several states* in order to properly make out its meaning and translate it correctly, but the boundaries of the sentence will be quite enough to cope with this task, “*The Democratic party candidate won the election in several southern states”.*The importance of the whole book in the process of correct understanding and adequate translation of its segments is easy to prove in regard to titles, e.g. the title of the novel “*Five Go Adventuring Again*” by Enid Blyton can be clearly understood and translated only in a macrolinguistic context made up by several books of the world-famous series of books for teenagers; the given title refers to the 2-nd book of this set and can be translated in the following way: *«Новые приключения великолепной пятёрки*». The title of one and the same book can be translated in a variety of ways depending on proper understanding of its textual implications, cf. «*Недоросль»*by D. Fonvizin was translated by English translators in various ways: “The Minor”, “The Infant”, “The Young Hopeful”.

Extralinguistic context can also vary in its size and volume stretching from the actual context of situation to the knowledge of background information. To understand this complex phenomenon it is helpful to take into account in translation various divisions of it suggested by prominent Russian and foreign linguists: *practical context* (E. Nida) which includes various circumstances of communication (participants, their relations, attitude to circumstances, etc), *life situation* (N.N. Amosova) or *‘предметная обстановка’* (Ya.I. Retsker) which implies not only objects of reality and relations between them, but also a broader context (the country, the historical time), *context of situation* (B.K. Malinovski) which embraces not only the actual situation in which an utterance occurs, but the entire cultural background against which a speech event has to be set, *speech situation* (Ya.I. Retsker) which reflects the author’s identity, a source which publishes a TL text, takes into account the addressee and the readers for whom it is meant, the desirable effect it is supposed to make, *vertical context* (O.S. Akhmanova, I.V. Gubbenet) which includes the knowledge of culture, history, geography. These approaches to the conception of context have one important feature in common despite differences in terminology and accent on its various aspects: they “burst the bonds of mere linguistics” in the wording of B. Malinovski and carry over into the analysis of the general conditions under which a language is spoken. The demand to study any language spoken by a people living under conditions different from ours “in conjunction with the study of their culture and of their environment” is hard to overestimate in translation studies and practice of translation viewed from an ethno-cultural angle in an ethno-cultural context. Very often the knowledge of the context of situation is no less important than linguistic contexts of both types in the process of translation. The actual context of situation is rather a complicated structure since it includes the place, time, conditions of communication, participants in intercourse, the character of a message, e,g. a very familiar expression “Hear! Hear!” can adequately be translated as «Поддерживаем! Правильно!» when it is used in BrE in Parliament or in a meeting to say that you agree with a person who is speaking [LDCE].

Background knowledge is a broad category which embraces any kind of knowledge related to the world in which nations exist. So it can include universal information which is possessed by speakers of any language, and nationally-specific and culturally relevant information which is a property only of some nation or nations. In translation which is viewed as an act of intercultural communication of utmost importance is a nationally specific aspect of a SL unit or utterance which is not known to TL readers and has to be added in order to prevent loss of implied information.

Prof. Mednikova E.M. claims that extralinguistic implicit information, both universal and nationally specific, cannot be easily perceived as it presupposes the reader’s intellect, erudition, knowledge. If the reader is not prepared most of the implicit textual information is wasted on him. So the volume of extralinguistic information including the so-called universal depends on a person’s cognitive abilities.

For purposes of translation it is possible to follow the division of extralinguistic information into two kinds: information of the 1-st level that relates to the knowledge of the situation and its characteristics mentioned above and information of the 2-nd level that refers to the background knowledge. Background knowledge may stand for varied extralinguistic information related to the knowledge of the history, geography, literature, customs and traditions, politics, etc.

This classification should be supplemented by R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev’s approach to the so-called i*nformation store* («*информационный запас*») that he refers to the volume of information associated by a recipient of a message with a linguistic sign or an object denoted by it [Миньяр-Белоручев 1999]. The author distinguishes between five degrees of information store moving from minimum information sufficient to refer a linguistic sign to a certain sphere of life to a maximum amount of information which presupposes the broadest possible knowledge about an object in question.

In view of the differences in the volume of knowledge possessed by the average readers an experienced translator finds it necessary to resort to various means of compensation for insufficient knowledge. It is obvious that the information store of the average reader cannot be measured precisely so some of the translator’s comment may appear quite unnecessary while others too superfluous. The character and volume of the translator’s comment may in the final analysis influence the levels of understanding in intercultural communication.

Depending on their position such means can be classified into **intextual** and **extratextual**.

Intextual devices are introduced into a TLT in the form of explanations, comment, insertions, etc. E.g. *For desert, you got Brown Betty which nobody ate. - На сладкое подали «рыжую Бетти», пудинг с патокой, только его никто не ел.*

Extratextual means of compensation are supplied outside the text proper in the form of a translator’s notes and commentary, e.g*. “The first dog I ever had was called Prince. I called him after the Black Prince”. «Мою первую собаку звали Принц. Я назвал её в честь Чёрного принца».*This sentence might be not quite meaningful to an unprepared reader, especially a Russian one who may not know particulars of the British royals; so the following extratextual comment made by the translators (Е. Голышева и Б. Изаков) and a comment writer (Ю.Г. Кларк) seems absolutely necessary: *прозвище принца Уэлльского, старшего сына английского короля Эдуарда III, прозванного так из-за цвета своих доспехов. Известен тем, что учинил зверскую расправу над жителями французского города Лимож (Limoges*).

Thus, for the obvious reasons a translator has to make an extensive use of various sources dealing with special branches of knowledge, countrystudy books, linguacultural dictionaries, encyclopedia and other reference materials that help him to identify extralinguistic information and look for adequate means of rendering it properly in order to prevent loss of vital information.

The role of context in translation depends on several linguistic and extralinguistic factors. To linguistic factors refer the following:

1) the character of a unit of translation (whether it is polysemantic or monosemantic, its semantic volume, connotational components, etc);

2) the type of semantic correlation of English and Russian words;

3) the number and types of TL correspondences for a given unit of translation.

In keeping with these factors a context may play a very insignificant role in translating proper and geographic names, some terms, and other varieties of precision lexis which refer to cases of full semantic coincidence and have constant regular correspondences in TL (e.g. *Gulf Stream – Гольфстрим; double spacing – двойной интервал; To whom it may concern – По месту требования*).

The role of context is important when dealing with polysemantic words when both linguistic, including the type of text, and extralinguistic contexts have to be taken into account, e.g. *Her case is quite different – С ней дело обстоит совсем по-другому.*

Finally, the role of a context is hard to overestimate when translating a word which undergoes great contextual semantic changes when it is impossible to use a dictionary correspondence, e.g*. In an atomic war women and children will be the first hostages. Женщины и дети будут первыми жертвами в атомной войне.*

In view of these factors a translator has to resort to occasional contextual substitutions when in a certain context it is impossible to use ready dictionary correspondences of a unit of translation. It may be due to the following reasons:

1) to retain the necessary pragmatic effect, i.e. make a sentence meaningful to a TL reader, e.g. .. *he said, glancing at a gentleman just entering, arrayed in a high hat and Prince Albert coat…(Th. Dreiser)*

*…произнёс, взглянув на джентльмена в цилиндре и длинном двубортном сюртуке… (пер. М. Волосов).*

2) to take into account combinability of words in TL, e.g. *When she came to her own rooms, Carrie saw their comparative insignificance (*Th. Dreiser*). Когда Керри вернулась домой, ей сразу бросилась в глаза относительная убогость её квартирки* (пер. М. Волосов).

3) to create a proper stylistic effect, especially when it is connected with nationally specific images, associations, etc. e.g*. You’ll like him yourself, he is such a foolish old Polly*(in English old Polly stands for a tame parrot (Chamber*s*)*. Тебе он понравится, он – такая забавная мартышка.*

Various types of contextual substitutions will be discussed in detail alongside other kinds of translation transformations.

# Transformations in Translation

**Translation transformations: definition, causes, classification**

In the process of translation a SLT as a whole or its segments may undergo varied modifications that are known in the theory and practice of translation as translation transformations. The term ‘transformation’ is polysemantic and there are at least 6 meanings that are associated with this word in translation studies including intralinguistic translation [Нелюбин 2003]. The discussion of translation transformations below includes the following: definition, causes (determinants), levels and techniques of translation.

Translation transformations are defined by L.S. Barkhudarov as numerous and varied in their quality inter-lingual changes which are made to achieve adequacy in translation in spite of discrepancies in the formal and semantic systems of a SL and a TL [Бархударов 1975: 190].

A.D.Shveitser stresses that the term ‘transformation’ is used in translation theory metaphorically as in fact we mean special inter-lingual operations of transpresentation («перевыражение») of SL sense by means of TL [Швейцер 1988: 118]. In keeping with this understanding he connects the character of transformations with his model of the levels of equivalence which is based on three aspects of a linguistic sign: syntactic, semantic and pragmatic.

The **syntactic**level favours substitutions which retain the syntactic invariant despite various other replacements, e.g*. The sun disappeared behind a cloud. – Солнце скрылось за тучей.*

The **semantic** level admits of a variety of transformations including passivization, nominalization, replacement of a word by a word group, etc. E.g. *Ваша жена прекрасно готовит – Your wife is a superb cook*. In such cases the invariant is retained on two sublevels: (a) componential – retains the componential structure of an utterance (as in the example above) and (b) referential – retains the invariant of the referential sense of a SL utterance and a TL utterance (*У меня стоят часы – My watch has stopped*).

The **pragmatic** level regarded as a top level in the hierarchy of levels exists irrespective of the other two levels and allows a wide range of transformations which cannot be described in terms of a single type (e.g. *Many happy returns of the day* – *С днём рождения*).

An understanding of translation transformations offered by V.S.Vinogradov connects it with two stages in a translator’s work:

· the first phase includes two types of perception of a message: *pre-translational* (a translator perceives a SL text after first (second, if necessary) reading, analyses its sense) and *translational*perception (immediate perception of concrete words, phrases, utterances at the moment of their translation);

· the second phase connected with re-creation by means of TL of what has been perceived in a SL text is also divided into two phases: *transpresentation* and *artistic identification of translation*[Виноградов 2004].

The author discusses various transformations in both phases of the second stage and points out that changes are indispensable in translation as the translator does not look for a ready correspondence in a TL utterance for this or that unit of translation, but he transpresents («перевыражает») the sense of the phrase.

One more very important aspect is revealed in translation transformations by L.K. Latyshev who defines them as conscious deviations from objectively possible language parallelism in order to achieve communicative and functional equivalence of a SLT and a TLT [Латышев 2003]. This approach to translation transformations requires satisfying a strict principle of their motivatedness, that is the use of transformations in translation should always be due to some causes. In the author’s opinion, causes of translation transformations include two major factors:

(a) a SL text as a determinant of translation modifications and

(b) a lingua-ethnical barrier as another important determinant.

Both these factors are so complex and comprise important facets that they deserve a careful consideration.

A SL text as a determinant of its transformations contains the following features:

1) textual *content* comprising denotative, significative connotations, the interpreter’s level of content, intra-lingual content, structural content;

2) *functions* of a text including intellectual informative, emotive, aesthetic, nominative, voluntative, phatic.

A lingua-ethnical barrier includes linguistic (proper) and ethno-cultural factors:

1) *linguistic* factors comprise discrepancies between two language systems on various language levels, language norms, speech norm;

2*) ethno-cultural b*arrier refers to pre-textual information stock of SL and TL speakers.

It is obvious that textual parameters of a SLT should be reproduced in translation as fully as possible which impels the translator to make varied modifications on the levels indicated above. As investigations show there are differences in the lingua-ethnical competence of a SL and a TL reader which may become too serious a barrier to ignore. The importance of the two factors is hard to overestimate especially now that modern views on translation activity regard it as a bi-lingual, bi-ethno-cultural process, as a dialogue of two mental worlds and two world-views.

In further discussion of translation transformations it is useful to keep apart related aspects of transformations: transformations as *modifications*/changes of a SL text made on various levels, transformations as certain *operations*made in particular conditions of activity and transformations as *translator’s techniques* caused by certain translation difficulties and problems.

**Levels of translation transformations, operations
and techniques of translation**

These aspects of translation refer to the ‘nuts and bolts’ of the translation craft and business, yet in translation studies scholars often use respective terms indiscriminately, especially often mixing levels of transformations and techniques of translation. Suffice it to mention that even well known classifications of textual modifications confuse *transformations* proper and *techniques* of translation. The term *operations*of translation is reserved by us to those cases when a translator makes use of ready dictionary correspondences to translate a given unit by merely replacing it.

Besides, there is one more aspect of translation transformations which is connected with the understanding of the mechanism of transformations. This problem initially linked with lexical transformations gave rise to a heated discussion that revealed its principal significance in understanding the nature of any transformations. In 1980 Ya.I. Retsker published in the journal “Tetradi perevodchika” his famous article «Что же такое лексические трансформации?» [Рецкер 1980] which brought to light this burning issue of translation practice. The author contrasted two diametrically opposite views on the understanding of lexical transformations expressed, on the one hand, by L.S.Barkhudarov [Бархударов 1975] and, on the other hand, by T.R.Levitskaya and A.M. Fiterman [Левицкая, Фитерман 1976]. L.S.Barkhudarov argues that lexical transformations should be understood as substitutions of some lexical units (words and stable word combinations) in a SLT by lexical units in TL which are not their dictionary equivalents , that is such units which taken outside the given context possess a different referential meaning. E.g. She had *said*that she was in bed and ill (W. Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*) – Она *писала*, что она больна и лежит в постели (пер. М. Дьяконова).

The supporters of the other approach to lexical transformations believe that there are no absolute equivalents in any two languages and since translation itself is regarded as a kind of transformationwhich presupposes the retention of semantic invariant of a source text or textual elements content rather than its/their surface structure, i.e. the form of expressing this content, it is liable to change, cf. *school leavers – выпускники, instant coffee – растворимый кофе.*

In this debate Ya.I. Retsker backs up the first approach for which he gives several reasons:

firstly, such TL correspondences as given above are qualified as dictionary correspondences that do not result from any contextual modifications;

secondly, what the authors mean by a surface structure of a lexical unit is its inner form pointing at a particular feature of an object chosen to name it which very seldom coincides in different languages accounting for the differences in nomination techniques, and

finally, the use of translation transformations is a creative artistic process which lets a translator exceed the limitations of dictionary equivalents and offer something proper and adequate for a given situation.

In connection with the discussion of the nature and mechanism of lexical transformations it seems reasonable to apply the above given understanding to any other transformations including grammatical and stylistic. For example, when rendering English sentences with an active voice predicate it is not always best to retain it in translation, but use instead a passive voice construction as there may be other factors active in a given speech situation. The same goes for stylistic devices as there may be shifts in the choice of proper devices in place of ready formal correspondences to produce in a TLT a desirable stylistic effect. Such examples are discussed later in connection with respective types of transformations.

The first important problem arises in connection with classification of transformations made on different levels which is due to the difference of opinion on the notion of ‘levels’. In many books on translation the authors single out transformations that correlate with language levels. One of the most popular classifications of transformations offered by prof. V.N. Komissarov takes into account the character of modifications and singles out lexical, grammatical and lexico-grammatical transformations [Комиссаров 1999a]. L.K. Latyshev and A.L. Semenov differentiate between two classes of transformations: structure-layer and content [Латышев, Семёнов 2003]. The former include categorial morphological, syntactical, stylistic and lexical changes, while the latter involving a change in the content representation of a situation include redistribution of semantic components, situational semantic transformations (instrument – instrumental use, event – perception of an event, measure – result, etc), explication of implicit content.

In the section devoted to methods of translation J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet consider them on three levels: lexis, structural organization and message [Вине, Дарбельне 1978].

In their approach to this problem T.R.Levitskaya and A.M. Fiterman also use a language-level classification of transformations (lexical, grammatical and stylistic), though, as is obvious from the previous discussion, they treat transformations in a very broad sense embracing both lexical and grammatical equivalents [Левицкая, Фитерман 1976].

In a systematic way translation transformations were considered and classified by prof. Ya.I. Retsker in close connection with the theory of regular correspondences which distinguished between adequate substitutions (later named ‘lexical transformations’) and equivalent, variant and contextual correspondences [Рецкер 2004]. Transformations are classified by the author into lexical (comprising *differentiation, concretizing, generalization of meaning, sense development, antonymic translation, entire phrase modification*, *compensation for losses*), grammatical (*full* – with complete sentence restructuring and *partial*with partial restructuring) and stylistic (*expressive-emotional concretizing* due to the necessity to follow the principle of expressive-stylistic compatibility (in the terminology of V.G. Gak) and *expressive-pragmatic concretizing)*.

In our classification of translation transformations from the point of view of the level on which they are made we proceed from the understanding of the object of translation which has been defined above as speech units, i.e. texts. Accordingly, a translator resorts to various modifications either of fragments (segments) of a text or a whole text. Transformations involving segments of a text may refer to the elements of the semantic, lexical, morphological, syntactical (with two sublevels – that of a phrase and that of a sentence) levels, whereas textual transformations are active on the level of a text as an entity. All the above mentioned levels of transformations with the exception of the semantic level may involve changes on two planes: content and form. Correspondingly, in real practice of translation various transformations overlap affecting various aspects of a speech unit: semantic, syntactic and pragmatic.

\* \* \*

Below are given examples of *different-level transformations*, but for the sake of illustrations we point out only those which apply to a particular type:

a) ***lexico-semantic***, А я вот сиди и *работай на него как каторжный*!… (Чехов. Юбилей) – So I have to sit here and *slave away for him* (пер. К. Кук).

Instead of using dictionary correspondences of the word *каторжный (convict, prisoner, felon, culprit, criminal)*the translator resorted to a number of transformations including lexico-semantic, replacing the word within the comparative word-group by the phrasal verb on the basis of several common semantic components: cf. (*работать как) каторжный – человек, сосланный на каторгу*[*каторга – содержание заключённых в тюрьмах с особо суровым режимом и с привлечением к тяжёлому физическому труду*]*(БТСРР) – slave away – work continuously like a slave*[*a slave – someone who is legally owned by another person and works for them for no money*].

b) ***Morphological***, …а заглянешь в душу – *обыкновеннейший* крокодил (Чехов. Медведь) - …yet gaze into her soul and what do you find – a *regular* hyena (C. Cook)

Since the English word *regular*is used as an intensifier there is no need to use it in the superlative degree.

c) ***Syntactic I (***phrase level), *Сестра опять всю ночь не спала (*Чехов. Чайка*) – My sister had another sleepless night (*C. Cook*).*

**Syntactic II** (sentence level), *И бедняк может быть счастлив (*Чехов. Чайка*) – People can be poor and still be happy (*C.Cook*).*

d) ***Textual level*** (text as an entity), the title of the book by V. Grossman “Все течет…” and its translation transform “Forever Flowing” (Tr.Thomas P. Whitney) make sense only in the context of the entire book.

*Techniques* of translation relate to a translator’s concrete actions and particular ways of translation which bring about a certain modification or transformation of a SLT. L.S. Barkhudarov described his transformations in terms of four basic techniques: (a) restructuring (or transpositions), (b) substitutions, (c) additions and (d) omissions (or deletions) [Бархударов 1975]. In his opinion, all the major classifications of translator’s techniques boil down to those four.

A much broader classification of techniques of translation was advanced by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet [Вине, Дарбельне 1978] who singled out seven types:

a) borrowing

b) loan translation

c) word-for-word translation

d) transposition

e) modulation

f) equivalence

g) adaptation.

The authors point out that the technical ways and means of translation are limited and can be exhaustively described in terms of those seven given above which are enumerated according to the degree of difficulties of translation. In the classification they refer the first three techniques of translation to direct (or literal) translation thanks to structural or/and metalinguistic (notional) parallelism in the two languages. The remaining four techniques are associated by the authors with non-direct translation and are due to either structural or metalinguistic discrepancies or ‘empty cells’.

It seems that such a broad approach to techniques of translation can hardly be justified as, for one thing, the first three types are in fact connected with the choice of the unit of translation rather than techniques, and, for another thing, the four phenomena ‘modulation’, ‘adaptation’, ‘equivalence’ and ‘transposition’ may be qualified as varieties of substitutions which are caused by different factors: modulation is due to the necessity of expressing a certain message in a usual way which is acceptable in TL (cf. *No vacancies – Номеров нет* (объявление в гостинице и т.п.), adaptation is used to render a SL situation which does not exist in a TL community (cf. *greet one another with a holy kiss* (from the New Testament) is not translated into English word-for-word, but is adapted into *give one another a hearty handshake all around*, equivalence is used to render the same situation in a way that is typical of a TL, so it is always syntagmatic in its character, involves a message as a whole and refers to stable units and clichés including proverbs, sayings, phraseological units (cf. *Too many cooks spoil the broth* – *У семи нянек дитя без глазу*), while transposition is just another term to use alongside ‘substitution’. Thus, the given classification confuses techniques of translation and their causes, techniques of translation and units /ways of translation, but at the same time it neglects some other important techniques which are active in the process of translation.

Thus, we can take for a basis L.S. Barkhudarov’s classification and supplement it with one more type, namely entire message modification=integral modification (‘целостное преобразование’). This system of techniques of translation comprising five types underlies various translation transformations on all the levels discussed above, used alone or in various combinations.

**Classification of translation transformations according
to techniques of translation**

6.3.1**. Transpositions** covers all cases of restructuring, so naturally here refer transformations made on the syntactic level which result in changes in word order. They can be divided into two kinds depending on the nature of a unit undergoing restructuring, its size and syntactic functions:

· re-patterning on the level of a word-group,

· re-patterning on the level of a sentence.

*Re-patterning I* (on the level of a word-group or a phrase) is caused by differences in the structural patterns of correlated SL and TL word-groups and phrases. Quite often such changes are accompanied by morphological (part-of-speech) or syntactical substitutions, e.g.

Алёшка, *стуча зубами*, стал сказывать про Тыртова (А. Толстой)

*His teeth chattering,* Alyosha began explaining about Tyrtov (tr. by A. Miller)

The Russian verbal adverbial phrase is replaced by the English absolute construction (syntactical substitution) which makes a respective re-patterning obligatory.

*Re-patterning II* (on the level of a sentence) can be further subdivided into three sub-types:

a) changes in the word order within a sentence or a clause, e.g.

*It was very tiring to stoop all the time (*E. Blyton*).*

*Идти всё время согнувшись было очень утомительно* (пер. В. Исакович).

The restructuring of the English sentence is caused by the change in the sentence-type, the difference in their theme-rheme structure and is accompanied by other transformations (addition, morphological substitution).

There is no re-patterning of Russian sentences which are characterized by two features: 1) a verb-predicate is intransitive so there is no direct object in them and 2) a sentence begins with some adverbials (of manner, place), e.g. *Там, в этом краю, очень много озёр. – Up in that lake country were many, many lakes.*

b) changes in the order of clauses within a complex or a compound sentence, e.g.

*Disposed as she then was to calculate upon that vague basis which allows the subtraction of one sum from another without any perceptible diminution, she was happy* (Th. Dreiser).

*Девушка была счастлива; она находилась в том настроении, которое позволяет вычитать одну сумму из другой без заметного ущерба для последней (*пер. М.Волосова*).*

Re-patterning II is caused by the difference in the theme-rheme organization of the English and Russian sentences and is accompanied by a number of other transformations (syntactical, lexical and morhological substitutions, omission).

c) changes in the order of sentences, e.g.

*Photographers came. The tragedy had interested the local press.
– Трагедия заинтересовала местную прессу. Пришли фотографы*.

The main cause of the re-patterning here is the grammatical meaning of the Past Perfect form which expresses priority of the action denoted by it to an action in the Past Simple which in Russian has to be signaled by the order of respective sentences.

In our classification of translation transformations from the point of view of the level on which they are made we proceed from the understanding of the object of translation which has been defined above as speech units, i.e. texts. Accordingly, a translator resorts to various modifications either of fragments (segments) of a text or a whole text. Transformations involving segments of a text may refer to the elements of the semantic, lexical, morphological, syntactical (with two sublevels – that of a phrase and that of a sentence) levels, whereas textual transformations are active on the level of a text as an entity. All the above mentioned levels of transformations with the exception of the semantic level may involve changes on two planes: content and form. Correspondingly, in real practice of translation various transformations overlap affecting various aspects of a speech unit: semantic, syntactic and pragmatic.

Below are given examples of *different-level transformations*, but for the sake of illustrations we point out only those which apply to a particular type:

a) ***lexico-semantic***, А я вот сиди и *работай на него как каторжный*!… (Чехов. Юбилей) – So I have to sit here and *slave away for him* (пер. К. Кук).

Instead of using dictionary correspondences of the word *каторжный (convict, prisoner, felon, culprit, criminal)*the translator resorted to a number of transformations including lexico-semantic, replacing the word within the comparative word-group by the phrasal verb on the basis of several common semantic components: cf. (*работать как) каторжный – человек, сосланный на каторгу*[*каторга – содержание заключённых в тюрьмах с особо суровым режимом и с привлечением к тяжёлому физическому труду*]*(БТСРР) – slave away – work continuously like a slave*[*a slave – someone who is legally owned by another person and works for them for no money*].

b) ***Morphological***, …а заглянешь в душу – *обыкновеннейший* крокодил (Чехов. Медведь) - …yet gaze into her soul and what do you find – a *regular* hyena (C. Cook)

Since the English word *regular*is used as an intensifier there is no need to use it in the superlative degree.

c) ***Syntactic I (***phrase level), *Сестра опять всю ночь не спала (*Чехов. Чайка*) – My sister had another sleepless night (*C. Cook*).*

**Syntactic II** (sentence level), *И бедняк может быть счастлив (*Чехов. Чайка*) – People can be poor and still be happy (*C.Cook*).*

d) ***Textual level*** (text as an entity), the title of the book by V. Grossman “Все течет…” and its translation transform “Forever Flowing” (Tr.Thomas P. Whitney) make sense only in the context of the entire book

*Techniques* of translation relate to a translator’s concrete actions and particular ways of translation which bring about a certain modification or transformation of a SLT. L.S. Barkhudarov described his transformations in terms of four basic techniques: (a) restructuring (or transpositions), (b) substitutions, (c) additions and (d) omissions (or deletions) [Бархударов 1975]. In his opinion, all the major classifications of translator’s techniques boil down to those four.

A much broader classification of techniques of translation was advanced by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet [Вине, Дарбельне 1978] who singled out seven types:

a) borrowing

b) loan translation

c) word-for-word translation

d) transposition

e) modulation

f) equivalence

g) adaptation.

The authors point out that the technical ways and means of translation are limited and can be exhaustively described in terms of those seven given above which are enumerated according to the degree of difficulties of translation. In the classification they refer the first three techniques of translation to direct (or literal) translation thanks to structural or/and metalinguistic (notional) parallelism in the two languages. The remaining four techniques are associated by the authors with non-direct translation and are due to either structural or metalinguistic discrepancies or ‘empty cells’.

It seems that such a broad approach to techniques of translation can hardly be justified as, for one thing, the first three types are in fact connected with the choice of the unit of translation rather than techniques, and, for another thing, the four phenomena ‘modulation’, ‘adaptation’, ‘equivalence’ and ‘transposition’ may be qualified as varieties of substitutions which are caused by different factors: modulation is due to the necessity of expressing a certain message in a usual way which is acceptable in TL (cf. *No vacancies – Номеров нет* (объявление в гостинице и т.п.), adaptation is used to render a SL situation which does not exist in a TL community (cf. *greet one another with a holy kiss* (from the New Testament) is not translated into English word-for-word, but is adapted into *give one another a hearty handshake all around*, equivalence is used to render the same situation in a way that is typical of a TL, so it is always syntagmatic in its character, involves a message as a whole and refers to stable units and clichés including proverbs, sayings, phraseological units (cf. *Too many cooks spoil the broth* – *У семи нянек дитя без глазу*), while transposition is just another term to use alongside ‘substitution’. Thus, the given classification confuses techniques of translation and their causes, techniques of translation and units /ways of translation, but at the same time it neglects some other important techniques which are active in the process of translation.

6.3.2. **Substitutions**unlike the previous technique underlie transformations made on various levels: lexical, stylistic, grammatical (morphological and syntactic).

· *Lexical* substitutions include several subtypes depending on the character of changes in the lexical meaning of a SL unit:

1) **concretizing**– a SL word with an abstract, broad and general meaning is replaced by a TL word with a concrete, narrow and specific meaning, e.g.

*After dinner I sat and waited for Pyle in my room over the rue Catinat*(Gr. Greene).

*После ужина я сидел у себя в комнате на улице Катина и дожидался Пайла (Е.*Голышева, Б. Изаков). The English word *dinner* has a broad meaning (*dinner – the main meal of the day, taken in the middle of the day or in the evening –* LDCE) which has to be concretized in translation into Russian where there are two words with more specific meanings (*обед – основной приём пищи, еда (обычно в середине дня)*и*ужин – вечерняя еда, последний приём пищи перед ночным сном* – БТСРЯ).

2) **generalization** – a SL word with a concrete, narrow, specific meaning changed for a TL word which has an abstract, broad, general meaning, e.g.

*Отец умер ровно год назад, как раз в этот день, пятого мая, в твои именины (А.*Чехов*).*

*It’s exactly a year ago today that Father died, the fifth of May – your birthday (K.*Cook).

The Russian word is more specific in meaning since it reflects Christian habits and is different from the word group *день рождения* (*именины – у православных и католиков личный праздник кого-либо, приходящийся на день, в который церковь отмечает память одноимённого святого* – БТСРЯ), while the English word *birthday*is *day that is an exact number of years after the day when you were born* (LDCE).

3) **sense development** – a SL word is replaced by a TL word the meanings of which denote notions connected with each other through cause-result links. Since such links are usually connected with an action there may be basically 6 varieties of such transformations:

result – cause

result – action

action – result

action – cause

cause – result

cause – action

e.g. *When I opened my eyes she had lit the lamp*(Gr. Greene) (action*).*

*Когда я открыл глаза, лампа была зажжена* (K. Cook) (resultant state)

4**) antonymic translation** – a SL word is translated by its TL antonym which as a rule brings about changes in the grammatical structure of a sentence, namely an affirmative sentence often becomes negative and vice versa a negative sentence may turn into an affirmative one,

e.g. *“He will not be long”, she said as though I needed comfort for his absence (Gr.*Greene*)*

*Теперь он скоро придёт, -- сказала она, будто я нуждался в утешении (K.*Cook).

· *Compensation* – the replacement of a SL word which has no ready correspondence by a TL unit with an approximate / close meaning or an acceptable way of referring to an object named. Compensation can be of two types:

1) ***semantic*** compensation which is used as a means to compensate for sense losses especially while translating culture-bound and nationally specific units and thus render the intended meaning in an acceptable form for the target reader, e.g*. five-and-ten-cent store trade (*Warren*) – дешёвые магазины (*В.А. Кухаренко*); from soup to nuts and a Corona Corona (*Warren)*– полный обед – от супа до десерта и дорогой сигары*(В.А.Кухаренко).

2) ***stylistic*** compensation which can be local and non-local and is employed to compensate for stylistic losses that may be due to differences in stylistic reference of correlated units. Compare English correspondences used to translate Russian young people’s slang, *буча (драка) – a scrap, a brawl; пятихатник – 500 roubles, каша (вещевой рынок) – flea market*.

In cases of non-local compensation a translator fails to find a proper correspondence for a certain stylistically marked unit in a SL text, so he tries to restore the intended effect elsewhere. As a result, the overall impression of a text is believed to be balanced.

· *Grammatical substitutions*refer to various changes of grammatical (morphological) forms and syntactic structures that include several kinds of modifications:

1) part-of-speech characteristics, e.g.

*Когда дочь переехала к родителям, ей вначале было очень одиноко. – When she moved to stay with her parents, their daughter felt very lonely at first (*pronominal substitution);

…*в российского министра образования чуть не попало яйцо – Russia’s Minister of education was nearly hit by an egg (*passivization);

*Он не очень хорошо сходится с людьми – He is not a terribly good mixer* (the Russian verb-adverb phrase is translated by the English adjective-noun combination;

*Он копит деньги на покупку дома – He is saving money to buy a car* (the Russian deverbal noun is translated by the English infinitive);

*Рабочие требовали повышения зарплаты и сокращения рабочего дня – The workers demanded higher pay and shorter working hours* (the Russian deverbal noun denoting increase or decrease in size, volume, range is replaced by the English adjective in the comparative degree);

*Я ему обрадовался – I was glad to see him* (the Russian verb denoting emotional behaviour is often replaced by the English stative phrase: to be (turn, get, grow, become) + adjective);

*Проект бюджета представлен на рассмотрение правительства России – The draft budget was submitted for consideration by the Russian government* (the Russian noun+noun pattern is often replaced by the English adjective-noun phrase).

2) parts-of-a-sentence substitutions:

*Visitors are requested to leave their coats in the cloakroom – Посетителей просят оставлять верхнюю одежду в гардеробе* (the subject of the English passive form is replaced by the Russian direct object of the active form);

*Last week witnessed an intensification of the diplomatic activity – На прошлой неделе наблюдалось оживление дипломатической деятельности* (the English subject denoting the time of the action is replaced by the Russian adverbial modifier of time).

3) syntactic substitutions:

*I never even once saw him brush his teeth – Я не видел, чтобы он чистил зубы (*the English simple sentence is replaced by the complex sentence in Russian);

*It was so dark that I couldn’t see her*– *Я её в темноте не мог видеть* (the English complex sentence is translated by the simple Russian sentence);

*John kept whistling “Song of India” while he shaved – Джон брился и насвистывал «Индийскую песню*» (subordination in the English sentence is replaced by coordination in the Russian sentence);

*It was hot as hell and the windows were steamy – Жара была адская, все окна запотели* (English syndetic linking is replaced by asyndetic linking in Russian).

6.3.3. **Additions**are complex lexico-grammatical transformations which bring about changes in the lexical elements of a SLT that are accompanied by grammatical changes. As a result of additions one or more words are added when translating an original utterance which are a sort of extension to it. Additions are caused by a number of factors:

a) the difference in the word-building, combinatorial, grammatical and other features of SL and TL, e.g*. I’ll have him call you – Я скажу ему, чтобы он позвонил тебе*.

b) the absence of a ready-to-use lexical correspondence in TL for a certain unit of translation which makes it necessary to resort to periphrastic explanations or cultural comment, e.g.

*Его встретили с хлебом-солью – He was met with the bread and salt of hospitality*.

c) ellipsis of some elements in a SLT where they are considered redundant, but which have to be restored in a TLT since they are compulsory in it, e.g.

*The current design will only have a single process train, as the volumes will be small. – По существующему проекту предусматривается только одна технологическая линия, так как объемы добычи невелики.*

d) stylistic demands in keepingwith the norms of TL, e.g.

*A few minutes later nurse Davis, starched and curious, arrived – Через несколько минут вошла сестра Дэвис, вся накрахмаленная, едва сдерживая своё любопытство.*

6.3.4. **Omissions** represent changes in a SLT which are opposite in nature to additions, though they are also qualified as complex lexico-grammatical transformations. Omissions result in dropping some elements from a SLT which may be caused by a number of factors:

a) the difference in combinability of SL and TL, e.g. English favours pair synonyms the origin of which has historical and cultural roots that have to be translated by single word correspondences in Russian. They are known as redundant synonymic cliches and are eliminated in a Russian translation, e.g. *in respect thereof or in relation thereto – связанные с этим, all matters and things – все вопросы.*

b) well-established traditions of expressing some information, e.g. English unlike Russian prefers to use detailed descriptions of size, volume, weight and other measurements [Хайруллин 1997] which are looked upon as redundant in Russian and are usually replaced by their functional analogues, e.g. *Every inch of his face expressed amazement – На его лице было написано изумление.*

c) the desire to create compression in an English sentence which is often achieved thanks to frequent uses of participial, infinitival, gerundial phrases, complex object, complex subject and other complexes, e.g. *Как сообщается, целый день более 30 автомашин простояло без движения из-за снежных заносов на дороге. – More than 30 cars are said to have stuck twelve hours in snow drifts.*

Translation practice shows that omissions are more frequently made while translating from Russian into English in contrast to additions that are usual when translating from English into Russian.

 **Integral modifications** are such changes which involve the whole semantic and formal structure resulting in radical modifications of the speech utterance.

According to S.P. Romanova and A.L. Koralova, integral modifications may take place on two levels: the level of a word-group and the level of a sentence [Романова, Коралова 2004].

On the level of *word groups* they usually occur when translating phraseological units which may correlate in SL and TL in sense, but differ in their form, e.g. *to be born with a silver spoon in one’s mouth – родиться в сорочке; to set the fire to – пустить красного петуха.*

But more often than not we resort to integral modifications when rendering *the whole utterances*, e.g. *The others can go right along the road. – Остальные пусть проваливают.*

The comparison of integral modifications with other translation transformations shows that integral changes are of a higher order as they are usually accompanied by some other transformations, such as concretizing or generalization of meaning, antonymic translation and some others that refer specifically to constituent parts of an utterance which are rendered in some modified form, e.g. *Have you ever in all your born days seen the like?—Ты когда-нибудь за всю свою жизнь видел что-нибудь подобное?* (generalization).

*I had the right of way – Вы должны были уступить мне дорогу (*sense development*).*

It stands to reason that a translator may resort to integral modifications in two ways:

(1) when there is a ready correspondence in TL to render a given SL speech unit which presupposes a complete transformation. This is a case when dealing with various well-established notices, warnings, etc that have a fixed form, cf. *Video controlled – Ведется видеонаблюдение; Fragile – Осторожно, стекло; Mind your head – Осторожно, низкий потолок.*

(2) when a translator refrains from using a dictionary correspondence and thinks of a different way of translating a certain unit in a given context that he finds more appropriate for a given occasion, cf. *Except for those two things, life is nau-se-at-ing – Без удовольствий и власти жизнь – ко-ш-шмар.*

Thus in the former case integral modifications are regular and constant, while in the latter case they are individual, optional and contextual.

# Main types of semantic correlation of English and Russian words

The semantic structure of any language including its vocabulary system is a complicated whole which according to F.de Saussure is determined by two factors: extralinguistic and intralinguistic [Соссюр 1977]. The first factor shows how the language segments the outside world and embodies the results of its reflection by human mind in the meanings of lexical units. The second factor takes into account semantic links within the vocabulary system and thus determines semantic value of particular units. English and Russian differ from each other in both of these dimensions, and norms of speech make these differences greater. Cf. *He tiptoed into the room. Он вошёл в комнату на цыпочках.*The English adverbial verb both names the action and characterizes it, while in Russian this information is distributed between several words.

The semantic structure of individual lexical units is also a complicated structure, because it is made up of two aspects of lexical meaning (denotational and connotational) which are described in their turn as sets of semantic components or semes. So any correlated units in Sl and TL should be compared both in their denotational and connotational components, the latter comprising emotive charge, evaluative component, expressive component and stylistic reference.

The problem of relationship between word-senses in translation is regarded as a fundamental issue which is a constant challenge to a translator. According to A.L. Bourak, there are three key types of relationship between word-senses in the SL and TL: (1) inclusion (hyponymy), (2) partial inclusion (cross-language synonyms) and (3) exclusion (antonymy) [Бурак 2002].

Thus, taking into account various aspects of lexical meaning and semantic structures of correlated English and Russian words, scholars establish 3 types of semantic correlation:

1) full semantic coincidence,

2) partial semantic coincidence,

3) absence of semantic coincidence.

**The 1-st type** of semantic correlation is established between correlated words in two languages the semantic structures of which coincide fully. Such cases are quite rare and this type of semantic correlation is usually confined to various classes of proper and geographic names, monosemantic terms, numerals and other varieties of precision lexis that form closed sets of units, e.g. *per mille – промилле, hi-fi – высококачественный (о звукозаписи), Greenwich mean time – среднее время по Гринвичу.*

**The 2-nd type** of semantic correlation characterizes the vast majority of correlated words in English and Russian which are not always interchangeable in translation because their semantic structures do not coincide fully so they correlate only in some of their meanings. According to prof. L.S. Barkhudarov, in regard to denotational component of lexical meaning partial semantic coincidence of correlated words can be of two kinds:

· ***intersection*** – a type of relationship established between related polysemantic words in English and Russian refers to cases of interlingual relative synonymy, e.g.

*coat – 1) пиджак; жакет; куртка; китель*

*2) мех; шерсть; шкура*

*3) покров; слой; обшивка*

The English dictionary correspondences for various meanings of the Russian word (see underlined meanings above) have their own correspondences in TL that wll be different from those given in the above example, cf.

*шерсть – 1) hair слой – 1) layer*

*2) wool; card 2) stratum*

3) *worsted 3) skin; covering*

*4) woolen stuff 4)cover; cloak*

· ***inclusion*** – a type of relationship established between English and Russian related words refers to cases of interlingual hyponymy / hyperonymy, i.e. words differ in their semantic volume in SL and TL, cf. *часы – watch, clock* (the Russian word does not specify the component of place, locality).

The English word *vocal*is broader than its Russian counterpart *вокальный*and can be translated by the following Russian correspondences:

*1) голосовой, речевой;*

2) *звучащий, наполненный звуком;*

3) *обладающий голосом;*

4) красноречивый, выразительный;

5) звонкий [NERD].

These varieties of semantic relationships underlie different types of linguistic relations of correlated English and Russian words:

· *relative interlingual synonymy: e.g.палата – 1.palace, 2. chamber, hall; 3. ward; 4.chamber, house.*

· *interlingual hyponymy/hyperonymy: авантюра ( 2 meanings) – adventure (4 meanings)*

· *interlingual antonymy: rich*has the following antonyms for its various meanings: 1*) wealthy – бедный,* 2) *fertile – бесплодный*, 3) *valuable – дешевый*, 4) *delicious, spicy – безвкусный, пресный.*

· *Interlingual paronymy*(partial similarity in form with no coincidence in meaning): *affair*(дело, бизнес; эпизод, событие, история; любовная связь)*– афера* (shady transaction, fraud, speculation, swindle).

Partial semantic coincidence may concern correlation of English and Russian words on the basis of their connotational component of meaning, cf.

*bobby (Br informal, old-fashioned)*

*полицейский (neutral) policeman (neutral)*

*cop (informal), ranger (Am, sl)*

This type of partial semantic coincidence is connected with great differences in the stylistic stratification of vocabulary systems in English and Russian. Quite often neutral words in one language correlate with stylistically marked units in another, cf. *поймать тачку (*youth slang) – *to hitch a ride (*neutral); *to chat (*neutral)*– чатиться (общаться по Интернету)(*slang).

**The 3-rd type** of semantic correlation refers to numerous cases of empty cells (lacunae) in the vocabulary system of one of the two languages compared to that of the other language which may be due to various causes:

1) the difference in the systems of nominative means in English and Russian (cf. *a fortnight – две недели, четырнадцать дней; by-line – строка в начале статьи (на которой помещается фамилия автора, художника или фотографа);*

2) appearance of new coinages (*self-cover – обложка из тиражной бумаги; hoops – баскетбол*);

3) cultural words (*Civil List – цивильный лист, самофинансирование – self-financing performance, декретница – woman on maternity leave).*

The third type of relationship can be qualified as semantic mismatch of two language systems which requires search for various solutions:

1) the use of functional – semantic analogues: *авось – divine providence, blind trust in sheer luck;*

2) descriptive definitions, *Голубой огонёк – a popular New-Year’s Eve TV show;*

3) loan translation; *бизнес по-русски – business Russian-style;*

4) transplants from SL: *PIN-code – PIN – код, карта VISA.*

The comparison of the three types of semantic correlation of English and Russian words shows that translation problems involved in them are different and their discussion should be linked with the main types of lexical correspondences.

# The theory of regular correspondences by Ya.I.Retsker

The notion of lexical correspondences can be treated in a narrow and a broad sense: in a narrow sense it refers to correspondences registered as ready dictionary correspondences in bi-lingual dictionaries, while in a broad sense it is used in regard to any means of textual translation of a given unit that doesn’t coincide with a dictionary correspondence, cf. on the one hand*, in one’s teens – в подростковом возрасте* and on the other hand*, events of the country in its teens – события в стране в начале нынешнего столетия*.

The theory of regular correspondences elaborated by Ya.I. Retsker (the first version was described in the article that came out in 1950 signaling the emergence of the linguistic theory of translation in this country) is based on the narrow interpretation of the term *correspondence*though in actual practice it often exceeds its limits and relies greatly upon a broad approach to correspondences. This inconsistency was explicitly stressed in prof. V.N. Komissarov’s theory of the levels of equivalence. In 1974 Ya.I. Retsker published his monograph “*Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktica*” in which he modified his initial version changing the classes and the terminology used. The final version of the theory of regular correspondences establishes three types:

· equivalent correspondences

· variant and contextual correspondences

· correspondences resulting from translation transformations [Рецкер 2004].

According to the author, equivalent correspondences belong to the sphere of language, while the 2-nd and the 3-rd groups refer to speech. Such a conclusion is not supported by other scholars, for example, by prof. V.N.Komissarov who claims that there are several mute points here:

firstly, it is not quite clear what is actually meant in such cases, that is whether we take into account ways of establishing correspondences (when we view them as elements of a SL and a TL systems or establish as a result of comparing a SLT and a TLT) or the fact of their being registered in a bilingual dictionary;

secondly, variant correspondences cannot be contrasted to equivalents on this ground because they are also registered in parallel dictionaries and thus should be qualified as language elements, but not speech units;

thirdly, many correspondences which result from textual transformations later become established as dictionary correspondences [Комиссаров 2004].

 **Equivalent correspondences: definition,
classification, types of equivalents**

**Equivalent correspondences** are defined as constant regular dictionary correspondences which are used in translation irrespective of a context and are interchangeable with each other in all their uses. It is argued that equivalents are usually found among compound words and word-combinations and are very rare among simple words, e.g. *dog-collar – ошейник, to take the floor – взять слово*. To equivalents the author refers proper and geographic names, terms and some common nouns.

Equivalents can be further divided into groups if we take into account denotational and connotational components of lexical meaning: when only denotational component of correspondences is compared it is possible to speak about *full* and *partial* equivalents. Full equivalents are such equivalents which coincide fully in their denotational meaning, cf*. mass media – средства массовой информации, gossip column – светская хроника.*Partial equivalents are such equivalents which coincide in some of their meanings, and differ in others and so they are interchangeable only in some of their contexts. Usually partial equivalents are found among polysemantic words, cf. the word – group *silver plate* can be translated as 1) *серебряная пластинка, 2) серебряное блюдо, 3) столовое серебро.* All these three correspondences should be treated as partial equivalents as they are used to translate different meanings of this polysemantic word.

When not only denotational, but also connotational component of lexical meaning is taken into account equivalents are classified into *absolute* and *relative*. Absolute equivalents coincide fully both in their denotational and connotational meanings, e.g. *hydrocarbons – углеводороды, nitrogen dioxide – двуокись азота*(terms in English and in Russian); *to kick the bucket (sl)* – *окочуриться (сл., вульг.).* Relative equivalents coincide in English and Russian in their denotational meaning, but differ in connotational component, e.g. *гэбист (разг.) – KGBer (neutral); клубничка (сл.) – erotic entertainment (neutral).*

There are several points connected with equivalent correspondences that have been criticized by some scholars. The first restriction concerns the use of the term *equivalent*which should not be understood as complete identity of content (H. Bellock, E. Nida, В. С. Виноградов, В.Н. Манакин). Even proper names and terms are liable to have some nuances of meaning which are often culturally relevant. These nuances of meaning are often revealed in derivatives and combinatorial capacity [Чанышева 2004], cf. the English name *Canterbury* enters the phrase *to tell Canterbury tales* which acquires a metaphorical sense associated with the knowledge of the respective narrative. The Russian correspondence *рассказывать нескончаемые скучные истории* retains only part of the connotations, while very important connotation implied in the English phrase ‘*these stories are especially famous for bawdy humour, i.e. about sex told in a rude and funny way’* (LDELC) is not conveyed. Besides, the contention that equivalents do not depend on a context gives rise to doubts since it may be true only of full equivalents the number of which is obviously very insignificant, but it does not hold good in regard to partial equivalents used by definition when translating polysemantic words which are contextually dependent [Швейцер 1988].

**Variant correspondences: definition and the difference between variant correspondences and partial equivalents**

**Variant correspondences** are a set of dictionary correspondences in TL used to translate, depending on a context, one and the same meaning of a SL unit of translation.

e.g. *writing paper – писчая бумага*

*writing desk - письменный стол*

*the writing profession – пишущая братия*

The analysis shows that meanings that are translated by variant correspondences prove to be general and broad in SL and have to be specified or concretized in TL. These correspondences in TL are usually related in meaning and often form synonymic sets. The translator is confronted with a task of the proper choice of the synonym which can be done only depending on the context, cf. *общий – general/staff meeting; common aims/objective; joint efforts; our mutual friend.*

As the definition of variant correspondences implies, the main cause of using this type of lexical correspondences lies in the difference in the semantic volume of related words. For example, *министерство – ministry; board; the Treasury (*responsible for a country’s financial matters); *department; office (Home office)*. This may be due to linguistic and extralinguistic reasons. Ya.I Retsker gives examples of semantically non-differentiated meanings of English words which have to be differentiated in translation into Russian, cf. *justice* may be translated by Russian *справедливость* or *правосудие* which are thought of as inseparable in the English word, while in Russian, according to the author, one of them does not necessarily presuppose the other.

Variant correspondences can be used to translate a SL word with one broad meaning or one of the meanings of a polysemantic word. In the latter case variant correspondences should not be confused with partial equivalents. As was shown above, partial equivalents are used to translate different meanings of a polysemantic word, i.e. they refer to a vertical dimension, thus forming a paradigmatic set, when they are viewed together as partial equivalents in relation to a word as a whole unit. Variant correspondences refer to a horizontal dimension, i.e. forming a syntagmatic, linear string, as they are used to translate one and the same meaning depending on its right and left environment. Thus, partial equivalents and variant correspondences apply to a word on its different levels coexisting with each other: partial equivalents are considered in relation to the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, while variant correspondences are established as correlates in regard to individual meanings, e.g.

*carrier – 1) носильщик, подносчик (variants)*

*2) посыльный, рассыльный, курьер (variants)*

*3) возчик, перевозчик (variants)*

*4) авианосец*

**Contextual correspondences: definition and types
of contextual correspondences**

Contextual correspondences are such correspondences in TL which are used to translate a SL unit in a particular linguistic and extralinguistic context. Depending on the character of a context they can be subdivided into **usual**and **occasional contextual**. Usual contextual correspondences are used to translate a given unit in a fixed context, e.g.

*academic – 1) университетский; академический*

*2) академический, чисто теоретический, отвлечённый,*

*оторванный от практики;*

*3) канонический, традиционный*

but*: an academic discussion of a matter (already settled) – бесполезное (бесцельное) обсуждение уже решённого дела.*

The influence of a fixed context on the use of a usual contextual correspondence is best of all felt when translating phrases which possess stability of context, i. e. phraseomatic and phraseological units, cf*. light* which is translated by equivalent and variant correspondences and its usual contextual correspondence in the phrase *to bring to light – вывести на чистую воду*.

Occasional contextual correspondences occur in a free context when they replace existing (ready) correspondences registered in dictionaries. They are used as translation solutions only for a given occasion, and thus their occasional contextual corespondences do not get registered in dictionaries. Since their use is not governed by ready dictionary correspondences, occasional contextual correspondences are very individual in character and depend on a translator’s creative abilities. E.g. *He is a hot sketch for a fighter, anyway – Он такой «прекрасный» боксер, что дальше ехать некуда.*

The 3-rd group of correspondences in Ya.I. Retsker’s classification includes various kinds of correspondences which result from using translation transformations. They have been discussed in detail above in connection with translation transformations (see Ch. 6), here it suffices to illustrate it with one more example, *At last he found his voice. Он наконец-то обрёл дар речи.* The difference between occasional contextual and transformational correspondences lies in the fact that the latter are generally governed by certain regularities connected with changes and modifications of the original text. In the above given example the Russian dictionary correspondence for *voice – голос* can be easily replaced by *дар речи* thanks to the lexical transformation of sense development which is necessitated by combinability rules.

**Analogues as a special type of lexical correspondences.
Drawbacks of translation analogues**

The first version of the theory of regular correspondences established analogues as a variety of correspondences alongside equivalents and adequate substitutions. In the later versions this class is not included because the theory has been greatly changed by the author both in the types of correspondences established, their number and naturally the terms used.

In the modern LTT the term *analogue* is used in a different sense. Ya.I. Retsker used it in connection with several TL correspondences for a given unit of translation when a translator has to make a proper choice on analogy with the choice of synonyms for a given context. Other scholars understand the term differently. A.V.Fyodorov defines analogues as means of rendering nationally specific concepts of SL which have no ready correspondences in TL and are thus translated approximately by words and phrases which denote in TL something similar [Фёдоров 1968:181].

Prof. L.S.Barkhudarov qualifies analogues as approximate equivalents which means that he considers them alongside other correspondences [Бархударов 1975:101]. To illustrate analogues he gives the following examples: *техникум – junior college, горсовет – municipal council, путёвка (в санаторий, дом отдыха) – a voucher*. Though according to L.S.Barkhudarov, such analogues are quite useful in dealing with nationally specific notions a translator must be aware of their approximate character, cf. the comment from an American film “*Food is awful in drugstores*” might not make sense in Russian translation *«В аптеках ужасно кормят»* because the words *drugstore* and *аптека* are only analogues, but not true equivalents, so in this case it is reasonable to translate it by the word *закусочная*. From L.S. Barkhudarov’s definition it is clear that he regards analogues in a broader sense than A.V. Fyodorov, as he refers to them names of such notions that are similar in the two languages in some features and differ in others.

A.V.Fyodorov who treats analogues in a more narrow sense confines them only to nationally specific concepts and phraseological units. At the same time he points out drawbacks of unrestricted use of analogues:

1) they may *weaken* in translation the *national specificity*, cultural relevance and local colouring that is created by such words in the original text. In Russian a lot of perestroika terms were first translated by approximate English words, which proved that they failed to render properly all implications, so that the analogues had to be replaced by borrowed translation, *cf. гласность – openness, publicity, frankness / glasnost*which was supplied by a comment: *a system introduced in the mid-1980s in Russia which allowed people and the media to express views in opposition to the official position, diametrically opposed to the closed-society concept; государственные краткосрочные облигации (ГКО) – treasury bills /government short-term bonds (obligations).*Examplesof this kind are discussed in more detail in [Чанышева 2006; Чанышева, Дьяконова 2007].

2) they may result in the *unintended effect* of bringing in certain connotations connected with a given concept in a TL linguacultural community. Such connotations which are aroused by TLT may seem to be strange, out-of-place and improper for a situation described. For example, the English word *peddler (торговец-разносчик*) could hardly be translated by the Russian word *коробейник* which is proper to use only against the background of the Russia of the Nekrasov times.

It should be borne in mind that some bilingual dictionary compilers choose wrong analogues in translation which may bring to intercultural misunderstanding, e.g. *career woman – работающая женщина, особ. имеющая специальность.*

The study of translation activity as an act of intercultural communication stresses the importance of taking into account differences in cultural connotations of correlated words in any two languages on various content levels.

# Lexical problems of translation at word level

In translation studies it has been stressed that most lexical problems of translation arise at word level. According to V.S. Vinogradov [Виноградов 2004], a word occupies the central place on the level of lexis for several reasons:

· a word is the basic unit of information which is expressed, conveyed, stored in the language as a result of human cognition of the outside world;

· a word serves as the basic unit of thought and a means of transferring a message in the form of an utterance;

· a word possesses a broad scope of informative value which is made up of extralinguistic and linguistic information: extralinguistic information includes denotational, connotational, sociological, chronological, background, differential; linguistic information includes functional information (grammatical and formal);

· a word acquires different kinds of textual occasional information which are very important to understand in a SLT and retain them in translation.

The range of lexical translation problems which are important to solve at word level is very broad as here refer both general questions of translation studies and concrete practical matters involved in the process of word choice.

As has been shown above, different types of lexical correspondences are usually described in regard to words [Рецкер 2004; Виноградов 2004], various kinds of information are usually associated with words that embody them.

Concrete translation strategies connected with the problem of word choice in TL are usually established on word level. St. Campbell [Campbell 1998] in his monograph “Translation into a Second Language” describes in detail word-choice strategies that are open to translators who may choose to preserve or shift the sense of a word used in a SL text. It is important to stress that some of the word choices reflect the ability of a translator to operate beyond the sentence in order to understand the word properly and translate it appropriately.

Cf. *В богатых странах Запада огромны запасы зерна в закромах*. The word *богатые* could be translated by one of the following words: *affluent, wealthy, rich*. The difference between these English correspondences is largely due to a cultural connotation and context, in addition to the linguistic difference: *affluent* may connote the style of life resulting from wealth rather than wealth itself; the use of *wealthy* could reflect a neutral attitude; the word *rich* would be the best as it carries a negative judgement by the speaker and would fit best in the text that takes an accusatory line against the West. In view of this the given sentence could be translated in the following way*:*

*The rich countries’ stores have a surplus of a huge reserved quantity of grains*.

The discussion of translation problems at word level is often connected with establishing several large groups of words related in a certain way that offer similar difficulties for a translator. Such groups may be singled out on the basis of various criteria and so they do not coincide in different classifications. V.S. Vinogradov differentiates between the following groups:

1) lexis comprising background information,

2) lexis containing chronological information,

3) proper names.

The *first* group is represented by words denoting nationally specific concepts, i.e. designations of unique objects. This category of words is heterogeneous and there are many classifications of this lexis which were made in countrystudy papers. For the purposes of translation S. Vlakhov and S. Florin established over 10 classes of words that denote nationally specific notions [Влахов, Флорин 1980]. This approach did not take into account such words that denote objects partially similar in different communities, that’s why it was supplemented by V.S. Vinogradov who described several new classes including units of measurement, monetary units, musical instruments, folk dances and songs, forms of address, etc [Виноградов 2001].

The *second* group of words containing chronological information includes archaic words and neologisms. These are opposed to each other in the character of information: archaisms are obsolete units that are employed in a book of fiction for special stylistic purposes which must be retained in translation while neologisms are created for other purposes and they must also be rendered properly in translation.

The *third*group comprises proper names which are also unique words in the vocabulary systems of languages, and though they have a peculiar semantic structure their use in a book of fiction can become a source of additional information to a TL reader. This informative value of proper names used in their primary function (that is in regard to their first bearers with the aim of singling them out) grows perceptibly when they are used in the secondary (transferred) function for the sake of characterizing a person in question [Ермолович 1999], so it is important to perceive all information introduced into a SLT by proper names.

All the groups of lexical units possess some common features when they are approached from a translator’s point of view, yet each offers some peculiarities in translation that should be considered separately.

# Translation of words having no equivalents in TL

*Such words are usually qualified as equivalent-lacking (V.N.Komissarov, A.L.Korallova, A.V.Fyodorov), the so-called “реалии” or words containing background information (V.S.Vinogradov, G.D.Tomakhin, V.V.Oshchepkova), “untranslatable” units in translation (S.Vlakhov, S.Florin), lacunar lexis (Yu.A.Sorokhin, G.V.Bykova), non-equivalent and partially-equivalent lexis (Ye.M.Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov), background lexis (V.V.Vorobyov, G.D.Tomakhin) which point at the varied nature of words that are referred to this category. In view of this it is possible to speak about two approaches to the definition of words having no correspondences in TL. In a broad sense, they comprise various units which do not have correspondences in TL for different reasons (neologisms at the time of their appearance, geographic names which are seldom used, etc). In a narrow sense, they are confined to words that denote cultural concepts which can be further subdivided into classes depending on their extralinguistic reference (ethnographic, mythological, administrative, political, etc).*

*In regard to cross-cultural studies words having no equivalents can be described as motivated and non-motivated. In the former case their absence is due to the absence of notions in the notional system of the people, while in the latter case there are empty cells in the vocabulary system for a certain familiar notion (e.g. первогодок – young of animal less than one year old).*

*From a translator’s point of view there is sufficient material to analyze ways of rendering such units in translation on the basis of two types of dictionaries: traditional translation or bi-lingual dictionaries and dictionaries of the new generation including lingua-countrystudy and lingua-cultural dictionaries that are culture-oriented. Traditional translation dictionaries (ORED 1999, NERD 2000) confine the information they give in TL only to conventional linguistic information (translating meaning with minimum explanatory notes to avoid ambiguity, e.g. каша – kasha (dish of cooked grain or groats). Minimal explanatory notes used alongside transliterations in stead of rather clumsy periphrastic correspondences prove to be more useful in translating words denoting specifically Russian or Soviet concepts, in addition to indications of style or usage, grammatical information, phraseology, etc. As for background information related to an object named (the uses of an object, associations with it, value attitude to it accepted in a certain community, etc) which determines cultural connotations of language units denoting a given object it is left outside such language oriented dictionaries.*

*A much greater amount of extralinguistic background information which is varied in its nature is provided in translation countrystudy dictionaries, including the latest editions of “Great Britain. Linguacountrystudy Dictionary” by A.R.Room, L.V.Kolesnikov, et al; “Linguacountrystudy Dictionary: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” by G.D.Tomakhin, L.K.Genina (see the references).*

*Lingua-cultural dictionaries appeared first as monolingual dictionaries among which the most well known are Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture published in 1992 and Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners which came out in 2002. In Russian lexicography the first translation dictionary of this type was created by V.V.Kabackchi [The Dictionary of Russia, 2002]. The lingua-cultural approach was adopted as a basic principle in compiling a Russian-English dictionary of cultural words in the social, economic and cultural spheres [Чанышева, Дьяконова 2007].*

*The analysis of ways of presenting words denoting cultural concepts in the mentioned dictionaries enables us to establish the following means:*

*1)****borrowed translation****which includes:*

*a) transcription, e.g. Wellcome Foundation – Уэллком фаундейшн (крупная фармацевтическая компания), candy-floss – кэнди-флос (сахарная вата), the Beeb (coll) – Биб / Би-би-си; speed – спид (наркотик из группы стимуляторов);*

*b) transliteration or /and + transcription, e.g. canter – кантер (легкий галоп); strip poker – стрип- покер (покер с раздеванием);*

*c) loan-translation, e.g. pusher – толкач (торговец наркотиками), Inter-City train – междугородный поезд; canned music – консервативная музыка; музыка в записи;*

*2)****analogues****, e.g. ‘Omnibus’ – «Кругозор» (еженедельная телепрограмма о мире искусства), old salt – морской волк, square – консерватор; cheesecake – «лакомый кусочек» (фотография полураздетой или обнажённой женщины), букв. сдобная ватрушка; Highway Code – правила дорожного движения (ПДД); cottage loaf – деревенский хлеб;*

*3)****descriptive / periphrastic translation****, e.g. fielder – полевой игрок в крикете; brunch – плотный поздний завтрак в выходной день; L-plates – таблички «за рулём ученик»; folk museum – музей народного творчества.*

*4)****combined translation****which may be based on combining several ways of translation simultaneously, e.g.*

*borrowed translation + explanatory translation, e.g. old – maid – «старая дева» (карточная игра: игроки подбирают и сбрасывают парные карты); blue chip – синяя фишка (надёжная акция какой-либо компании); happy hour – весёлый час (время, когда алкогольные напитки в баре продают по сниженным ценам);*

*borrowed translation + analogue, e.g. I-spy – «Вижу, выходи!» (детская игра типа пряток); twos and threes – «двойки и тройки» (детская игра, напоминающая игру ‘третий лишний’).*

*The examples show that in the vast majority of cases the so-called background information which may not be known to a TL reader is supplied in the form of additional comment that contains various data related to the following:*

***origin****, e.g. college pudding – пудинг «колледж»; предполагают, что такие пудинги впервые подавали в Нью-Колледже;*

***quotations****, e.g. winter of discontent – «зима недовольства» (цитата из «Ричарда III» Шекспира); corridors of power – коридоры власти (first used by C.P. Snow in “Homecomings”with reference to ministries on Whitehall).*

***associations****, e.g. Downstairs – живущие внизу, слуги; в богатых особняках живущие в полуподвале, в отличие от хозяев, живущих наверху;*

***encyclopaedic****information about an object in question, e.g. D. Notice – меморандум: цензурный меморандум, направляемый английским правительством СМИ и запрещающий в интересах национальной безопасности предавать гласности определенную информацию; retrosexual – ретросексуал: человек, тратящий минимум денег на гардероб и не обращающий чрезмерное внимание на то, как он выглядит, в отличие от метросексуала (metrosexual).*

***value attitudes,****goodwill – the good reputation and dood relations that a company has with its customers, and how much these are worth if the company is sold – условная стоимость деловых связей.*

*It should be noted in conclusion that in conditions of globalization languages tend to influence one another greatly which is seen in the phenomenon of transplants requiring no translation of SL units, e.g. VIP – зал, трансакции по SWIFT.*

# Problems of translating neologisms

Neologisms at the time of their appearance in SL are treated as words having no ready correspondences in TL, although with time due to intense international contacts they are rendered in different ways which become established as translation correspondences.

Neologisms are defined as new lexical units used to name new objects or phenomena of reality, or new meanings of already existing words, or new names which are given to familiar notions and objects (I.V.Arnold, R.S.Ginzburgh, Ye.V. Rozen, etc)]. A translator is confronted most often with neologisms dealing with the following materials:

· publicistic and newspaper materials,

· scientific and technical texts,

· colloquial speech.

In publicistic and newspaper texts neologisms appear in a nominative function in respective materials which cover the latest news;

in scientific and technical texts they usually perform a terminological function and

in colloquial speech their use is connected with emotional, evaluative and other connotations.

The fate of new words is hard to predict because some of them are short-lived, as they are created for a special occasion while others thanks to repeated use come into general use and become registered first in special dictionaries of new words or addenda in dictionaries [The LRNW 1990; LDCE: New Words, 2002]; then they find their way into parallel (translation) dictionaries [Гальперин 1980; Новый русский лексикон 1999; Палажченко 2003; Трофимова 1993].

The greatest difficulties arise when a new word is not registered anywhere yet. A translator then has to solve two tasks:

1. to make out the meaning of a new coinage,

2. to make the correct choice of the appropriate way of translating it into TL.

The first task is solved differently in regard to different types of new units. Out of various classifications of new words the one suggested by Ye.Rozen is the most convenient to use for translation [Розен 1976]. She takes into account the criteria of form and content and on this basis the author establishes three groups of new words:

**neologisms proper**, i.e. words and word-combinations which are new both in form and content;

**semantic innovations**, i.e. new meanings of already existing words and word-groups;

**transnominations**, i.e. new names that are given to familiar notions.

In each case it is convenient to rely on a particular type of analysis to make out the meaning of a new coinage. There are three types of analysis which may be useful when dealing with different kinds of neologisms:

1) ***derivational*** analysis is best in regard to neologisms proper which have been created after active patterns of a SL. The knowledge of the meaning of a pattern and the meanings of its structural elements may help to guess the meaning of a neologism, e.g. *netizen (*blending*), gamer (*suffixal derivative*), L-driver* (compound shortening), *no-brainer* (derivational compound), *skategate* (compounding on analogy with the new meaning of ‘gate’ – a public scandal which is realized in similarly patterned words: Watergate, Irangate, Monicagate) which was coined to refer to a scandalous episode in figure skating competitions during the Olympic Games in Salt Lake City in the USA.

2) ***Semantic*** analysis works best in cases of semantic innovations as it reveals certain links that can be established between familiar meanings and new ones, e.g. *visitation*has three meanings registered in Longman Contemporary Dictionary which help to guess a new meaning it has acquired recently, cf. *visitation is used in a situation where parents are divorced, an occasion when one parent is allowed to spend time with their children who are living with the other parent or the right to do this, e.g visitation rights.*

3) ***Contextual*** analysis is helpful in regard to any neologism supplying an additional clue to understanding a new unit in an environment, e.g. *A****zombie bank****is a financial institution that has an economic net worth less than zero but continues to operate because its ability to repay its debts is shored up by implicit or explicit government credit support. The term was first used by Edward Kane in 1987 to explain the dangers of tolerating a large number of insolvent savings and loan associations and applied to the emerging Japanese crisis in 1993*.

Very often the meaning of a neologism becomes transparent when there is visual support.

The second problem is associated with the proper choice of translation means which are available in TL. The analysis of translation practice shows that there are various means used in parallel dictionaries of neologisms that can be used in translating new coinages in a TLT. They include the following:

**transcription or / and transliteration**, e.g. *futures – фьючерсные сделки , overdraft – овердрафт , spot prices – спотовые цены.*

**loan – translation**, e.g. *microbeam – микропучок, bedroom community / area – спальный район.*

**analogues,** e.g. *cosmetic – прикрасы, ~ лакировка действительности, marching orders – ~ от ворот поворот , lead-footed - ~ тугодум.*

**periphrastic or descriptive translation**, e.g*. jingle – рекламная передача с рекламным сопровождением, double dipping – двойной источник дохода .*

**combined translation**, e.g. *day of infamy – день бесчестья (*loan translation), *позорный день (*analogue); *time share – таймшер (*transcription+transliteration), *сезонная аренда какой-либо недвижимости за рубежом (*periphrastic translation).

**translation supplied with a comment,**e.g. *happening – хэппенинг (*transcription + transliteration*). Род авангардистского драматического представления, часто с привлечением зрителя*(translator’s comment).

The choice of the proper way of translating a neologism depends on several factors: the kind of text where a neologism is used, the addressee for whom the text is intended, the kind of a new coinage itself.

The choice of translation correspondences is problematic because each of them has their own merits and demerits.

The comparison of translation dictionaries of neologisms compiled by different authors and those available in E-form reveals some differences in the choice of translation solutions. It is possible to point out a number of features of electronic E>R dictionaries and data available on the Internet : (a) they tend to give a great variety of TL correspondences that allow a translator to choose a proper one for a given context; (b) they offer relevant cultural information which gives a clue to adequate understanding of a given unit; (c) they show a chain of new coinages related to one another that makes it easy to understand them. E.g. *town-house – городской дом, дом городского типа; 2. городская квартира в отличие от загородного дома; 3. дом ленточной застройки, стоящий в ряду одинаковых домов с общими стенами.*

Of recent origin are a number of units containing the word *toxic: toxic mortgage > toxic assets > toxic debts.* The word develops a number of new meanings that are connected with one another and help to reveal their origin: *showing significant fall in value, at significantly reduced prices to the holder; have no functioning market.*

In view of this diversity, a translator has to make a solution that best suits a given context and a situation.

# Ways of rendering proper names

Proper names are defined in a very general way as nouns used to name a certain person, place or thing. Accordingly, they are varied in their nature depending on the referent and different groups they comprise are treated differently in translation. Until recently, though, proper nouns were not entered in translation dictionaries with the exception of short lists of geographic names, some personal names and their variants and derivatives that were attached to general translation dictionaries. D.I.Yermolovitch explains such an attitude of translators to proper nouns by the false assumption that proper names are not translated. The first translation dictionaries of proper names appeared in the late eighties: А.И.Рыбакин. Словарь английских личных имён, М., 1989; А.И.Рыбакин. Словарь английских фамилий, М., 1986; Д.И. Ермолович. Англо-русский словарь персоналий, М., 1999.

Translation of proper nouns is regarded as a special section of translation theory and practice and is characterized as a very complicated field of study in translation literature. This can be accounted for by several reasons:

1) proper nouns constitute a highly heterogeneous system of units which are handled differently in translation. Here belong proper nouns that refer to people (personal names, nicknames and pet names, diminutive and endearing forms and variants, tell-tale names in fiction), geographic names, microtoponyms (names of streets, squares, parks, buildings), names of ships, spaceships, weaponry, titles of newspapers, journals and magazines, names of organizations and institutions;

2) proper names can be translated following the well established tradition and the modern demands. Even when a translator sticks to the modern tendency he can’t disregard the existing forms of translating a certain name so as not to create doublets that may cause misunderstanding, cf. *Isadora Duncan – ‘Айседора Дункан’(*traditional)and*‘Изадора Данкан’ (*modern)*.*

3) proper names reflect nationally peculiar and culturally relevant features of respective language systems which are important to preserve in translation and accompany with appropriate explanation, cf. the structure of English personal names (first name – middle name – family name) and Russian personal names (first name – patronymic – family name).

Taking into account the above mentioned factors proper names are further discussed with reference to different groups.

· **Personal names** are divided into two groups depending on their translation: those translated according to tradition and those translated in keeping with the modern tendency. The modern tendency demands retaining in translation the way a proper name sounds in SL, cf*. Henry James – Генри Джеймс, Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde – доктор Джекилл и мистер Хайд*. The traditional approach did not follow any solid principles and the results of such a translation are often in conflict with the modern demand. The effect of the force of tradition is still felt today in translating two groups of units: 1) names of crowned kings, queens, emperors, monarchs which used to be translated in a special way contrasted to names of common people, cf. *Elizabeth – Елизавета и Элизабет, William – Вильгельм и Уильям, James – Яков и Джеймс*; 2) biblical and mythological names, e.g. *Icarus – Икар, Mary – Мария*. This accounts for doublets used to translate names that relate in origin. The name *Jesus*is translated in two ways: *Джизус (*a common name)*Иисус* (a biblical name). The same goes for *Joshua*that may be translated as *Джошуа* (common masc.) and *Иисус* (bibl).

Concerning names of living beings it should be noted that there may be different ways of translating them as, for example, the name of the American pianist Van Clybern was translated differently into Russian, cf. *Ван Клиберн и Ван Клайберн.* Those historical names the translation of which has become well-established in translation practice are not revised though it runs contrary to present-day demands as new versions of translation might result in doublets.

Translation of one and the same personal proper name may vary depending on the nationality of its bearer, cf. *Hugo – Хьюго (English) and Гюго (French), Richard – Ричард (English) and Рихард (German*). The choice of the way of translation can also depend on connotations that words arouse in two languages. The name *Шитиков*which sounds quite good and acceptable to a Russian will have to undergo some phonetic changes to suppress any negative associations with its transcription in English, *Shitikov >Chitikov.*

· **Pet names and nicknames** are used not only to single out a person in question, but also to give some additional information. They may perform various functions: 1) characterize a person in question, 2) reflect social, psychological and interpersonal distances, 3) show the attitudes, feelings, emotions expressed through interpersonal relations, etc. This additional information can be expressed either explicitly in the outer form of a word (affixes) or implicitly in the inner form of a word and its connotations.

In translation it is sometimes possible to find correlated affixal means in SL and in TL, e.g. *Shorty – Коротышка*, but in many cases a translator has to look for adequate means of compensation in order to retain the proper effect, cf. *Scout* – *Глазастик*. In this case there is a shift in translation from the implicit means of indicating connotations to the explicit means in Russian. Yet, the difference between the derivational systems of SL and TL does not always permit a translator to find a good solution, cf. *Матрёшенька – little (tiny) Matreshka*.

The choice of proper ways of translating pet and diminutive names is very often governed by translation norms reflecting tastes, rules and preferences in the receiving culture. When translation is made from English into Russian diminutive names in English newspaper texts used to refer to high-profile personalities tend to be replaced by neutral Russian counterparts, cf. *Gorbi – Горбачев, Maggy Thatcher – Маргарет Тэтчер*

· **Names of ships, titles of periodicals, names of weaponry and military equipment, firms, companies, associations**are transcribed though they may contain common nouns with transparent meanings, e.g. *Queen Elizabeth* (the name of a ship) – *Куинн Элизабет, General Electric – Дженерал Электрик, Trident – Трайдент, Stinger – Стингер, Sunday Telegraph – Санди Телеграф.* It should be noted, however, that newspapers today tend not to translate such names into Russian and leave them in their original SL form.

· **Names of organizations, societies, movements**are loan-translated, e.g. *Фонд обязательного медицинского страхования – Obligatory Medical Insurance Fund, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade – Генеральное Соглашение по тарифам и торговле.*

· **Geographic names and microtoponyms**are translated depending on several factors:

a) the type of nomination – one-word nominations and multi-word complexes,

b) the structure of multi-word complexes.

One-word nominations are transcribed and / transliterated, e.g*. Newfoundland -- Ньюфаундленд, Norfolk -- Норфолк.*True, even in translation of one-word geographic nominations there are many points which are difficult to explain from the modern point of view.

Multi-word complexes containing common nouns are translated differently depending on the way a common noun is handled. Thus, a common noun may be:

*1)*transcribed and / or transliterated, e.g. *Downing Street – Даунинг-Стрит, White Hall – Уайт Холл, Gordon Square – Гордон – Сквер;*

*2)*translated, e.g*. Cape of Good Hope – Мыс Доброй Надежды,*

*3)*both transcribed / transliterated and translated, e.g. *Bull Lake – озеро Булл Лейк, Black Hills – горы Блэк Хилз.*

The actual practice of translation shows that there may be examples of translating common nouns that are treated differently within various proper names. Compare, *White House – Белый дом, Trafalgar Square – Трафальгарская площадь, the English Channel – Пролив Ла- Манш.*Such differences are hard to explain and they can hardly be neutralized in translation since the force of tradition is too strong.

It must be noted that there may be certain peculiarities in dealing with some groups of proper names, for example, Russian microtoponyms (i.e. the names of streets, squares, avenues) which when used as post address should not be anglicized.

# International and pseudo-international words in translation

International words are defined as words of identical origin that occur in several languages as a result of simultaneous or successive borrowings from one ultimate source (I.V.Arnold, R.S.Ginzburgh, etc). Research into this category of words has revealed that it is not homogeneous and alongside true international words there are several groups of words which coincide only in their outer form, but not in meaning. They are qualified as pseudo-international words, false equivalents and misleading words of foreign origin. Disregard of this category of words may cause mistakes in translation so it is natural that not only special numerous papers are devoted to this problem, in recent years there have been published several dictionaries that collect related words in different languages. P. Palazhchenko, a well-known translator and interpreter, has collected in his dictionary *«Мой несистематический словарь» (*2003)cases of divergences in related English and Russian words that are often neglected and thus result in translation errors. As an example we can refer to the words *aggressive – агрессивный.* The English word has positive connotations: *very determined to win or be successful; assertive; forceful.*Its Russian counterpart was initially devoid of positive connotations, but now we are witnessing changes in it under the influence of English as combinations like *агрессивная кампания, агрессивная реклама*become loaded with positive evaluations.

The most well known dictionaries in this country which compare English and Russian related units are: V.V. Akulenko ‘English-Russian and Russian-English Dictionary of Misleading Words, M., 1969; L.I. Borisova ‘Misleading Words. General scientific lexis, M., 2002; A.I. Pakhotin “English-Russian and Russian-English Dictionary of Translators’ False Friends”, 2003. The dictionary by L.I. Borisova is restricted to terms, the approach adopted in the dictionary by A.I. Pakhotin is too broad as he compares words at random that are not related in origin, cf. *solid – солидный.*Of great theoretical interest and practical help is the dictionary compiled by V.V. Akulenko.

V.V.Akulenko singles out three groups of related words in English and in Russian which may be referred to misleading words:

1) inter-language relative synonyms,

2) inter-language homonyms,

3) inter-language paronyms [Акуленко 1969: 371-372].

Inter-language relative synonyms coincide partially in their meaning and usage, inter-language homonyms coincide in their sound or graphic form, but have different meanings, inter-language paronyms are partially alike in their form, but they arouse false associations in meaning though they are different in that respect. The author does not accept the term ‘deceptive cognates’ suggested by R. Lado instead of the word- combination ‘misleading words of foreign origin’ as it is clear from the above definitions that not all groups are related in their origin.

V.V.Akulenko collected in his dictionary 900 pairs of English and Russian misleading words of various types. On the basis of the analysis of related words the author establishes the following kinds of discrepancies between them:

a) **inter-language relative synonyms**that may have the following points of difference:

· the difference in the denotational component of meaning, e.g. *депо – depot.* The English word has four meanings: 1)*storehouse for goods, 2) a place where military stores are kept and new soldiers are trained, 3) a railway station, usu small, or a bus station, 4) a place where buses are kept and not repaired, a bus garage.*The Russian counterpart has a slightly different set of meanings that correspond to the English: *shed, roundhouse; fire-station (for* the word-combination *пожарное депо).*

· the difference in combinability: *absolutely – абсолютно*, cf*. to absolutely agree with – согласиться без возражений; to vanish absolutely – полностью исчезнуть.*

· the difference in the connotational component, cf. *consultation* (styl. neutral) and *консультация (bookish*); *compilation (neutral) – компиляция (negative*);

b) **inter-language homonyms** the meanings of which have nothing in common as they appear as a result of accidental coincidence, e.g. *actual – актуальный* (pressing, urgent, vital, of great contemporary interest, topical); *translate – транслировать* (to transmit, to broadcast, to relay);

c) **inter-language paronyms** have no common meanings despite their near identity in form, e.g. *intelligent – интеллигентский*. The Russian word has two meanings: 1) *characteristic of intellectuals, 2) weak-willed, hesitating*; while the English word means 1*) clever, understanding, thoughtful; 2) smart, witty.*

L.I.Borisova studied correlations of English and Russian pseudo-international words in scientific texts and established some regularities in their translation:

*specialization* of an English general scientific word, e.g. *companion*device – вспомогательное устройство; some *styles* – некоторые модели,

*de-internationalization* of an English word, e.g. compromise and its non-international translations into Russian, cf. *the best compromise* – *оптимальное соотношение, as a compromise – в качестве промежуточного варианта; optimistic – завышенный, pessimistic – заниженный.*

*stylistic neutralization* of an English general scientific word which is stylistically marked, e.g. *microprocessor’s talents – потенциальные возможности микропроцессора; provocative – интересный, представляющий интерес .*

Thus, the category of misleading words is of great theoretical and practical importance for translators and it should be given the utmost attention it deserves in order to avoid errors in the work of both experienced translators and beginners.