

Guennadi E. Miram, Valentina V. Daineko,
Lyubov A. Taranukha, Marina V. Gryschenko
Aleksandr M. Gon

BASIC TRANSLATION

(a course of lectures on translation theory and
practice for institutes and departments of
international relations)

PART I

Edited by Nina Breshko

Kyiv-2001

PREFACE

When a language is taught to students of non-linguistic specialties - so-called Language for Special Purpose (LSP) - this fact is usually taken into account by the authors of language manuals and results in special manuals either intended for a particular profession (for example, English for Law Students) or covering a range of similar occupations (e. g., Technical English, Financial English, etc.). As a rule, LSP Manuals focus students attention on peculiar professional vocabulary and phrasing, comprise training text materials pertaining to particular profession and explain grammar rules and stylistic patterns conspicuous for certain professional speech variety. Also, LSP Manuals include numerous translation exercises involving texts of specific professional orientation.

Although translation is part and parcel of any LSP Manual, however, with several rare exceptions (e. g., Military Translation Manual by L. Nelyubin et al.) there are no translation manuals specifically intended for students of non-linguistic specialties and this Manual is an attempt to fill the gap. We think that there are several reasons that might justify our venture. First and most of all, translation is an effective tool that assists in matching language communication patterns of the speakers of different languages in a specific professional field, especially such communication-dependent one as international relations. This aspect of translation teaching becomes even more important under the language development situation typical of New Independent States such as Ukraine. Besides, general linguistic subjects related to translation are not in the curriculum of the international relations students and we included in our Manual several lectures that would improve general linguistic awareness of the students, moreover that we consider this information a necessary prerequisite for proper understanding of translation. Last, but not the least the Manual comprises in its training part (exercises after each lecture and the Appendix) English vocabulary and speech patterns with their Ukrainian equivalents which are in standard circulation in diplomatic practice, international law and international finance areas.

The theoretical approaches to translation that we use in our Manual are based on the most widely accepted modern translation theories, both Western and of

the former Soviet Union. An attempt was made, however, to present them to the readers in a concise and simplified form, which in our opinion is justified by the purpose and target audience of the Manual. Special accent is made, however, on communicational theory since it highlights those aspects of translation process which are of vital significance for practical translation. The Manual discusses both translation and interpretation since both skills are desired from international relation specialists.

The Manual is targeted to the audience of translation teachers and students of non-linguistic higher educational establishments and international relation institutes and faculties, in particular.

* * *

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the **Foreign Languages Chair of the Institute of International Relations** (Kyiv Taras Shevchenko National University) for discussions and valuable comments on the Manual.

We would like to thank **Prof. V. Karaban** and **Ass. Prof. K. Serazhim** for reading and suggesting valuable comments on the Manual.

We highly appreciate and gratefully acknowledge the support of the **Administration of the Institute of International Relations**.

Authors

LECTURE 1. LANGUAGE AND EXTRALINGUISTIC WORLD

This Lecture :

- introduces the notions of a linguistic sign, a concept and a denotatum;
- establishes relations between the above sets of elements;
- shows the difference between the denotative and connotative meanings of a linguistic sign;
- describes the mental concept of a linguistic sign;
- describes the relations of polysemy and synonymy, and
- explains some causes of ambiguity of translation equivalents

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

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

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

It should be noted that sequences smaller than a word (i.e. morphemes) and those bigger than a word (i.e. word combinations) are also language signs rather than only words. Word combinations are regarded as individual language signs if they are related to a single mental concept which is different from the concepts of its individual components (e. g. *best man*).¹

¹In this as well as in many other instances we make use of definitions which seem the most suitable for the explanation of translation but might be

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

One may say that language signs are a kind of construction elements (bricks) of which a language is built. To prove the necessity of knowing the language sign system in order to understand a language it is sufficient to run the following test: read with a dictionary a text in a completely unknown language with complex declination system and rich inflexions (say, Hungarian or Turkish). Most probably your venture will end in failure because not knowing the word-changing morphemes (language signs) of this language you won't find many of the words in a dictionary.

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

The relationship between a language sign and a concept is ambiguous: it is often different even in the minds of different people, speaking the same language, though it has much in common and, hence, is recognizable by all the members of the language speakers community. As an example of such ambiguity consider possible variations of the concepts (mental images and associations) corresponding to the English word *engineer* in the minds of English-speaking people when this word is used, say, in a simple introductory phrase *Meet Mr. X. He is an engineer.*

The relationship between similar concepts and their relevant language signs may be different also in different languages. For example, among the words of different languages corresponding to the concept of *a woman* mentioned

considered oversimplified should they be kept to in a comprehensive semantic analysis.

above: *vrouw*, *Frau*, *femei*, and *kobieta*, the first two will include in the concept of *a woman* that of *a wife* whereas the last two will not.

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

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

For example, the German word *haben* possesses the lexical meaning of *to have* with similar connotations and associations and in its grammatical meaning it belongs as an element to the German grammatical system of the Perfect Tense. One may note similar division of the meanings in the English verb *to have* or in the French verb *avoir*.

Thus, a **lexical meaning** is the general mental concept corresponding to a word or a combination of words.² To get a better idea of lexical meanings let's take a look at some definitions in a dictionary³. For practical purposes they may be regarded as descriptions of the lexical meanings of the words shown below:

mercy - 1. (capacity for) holding oneself back from punishing, or from causing suffering to, somebody whom one has the right or power to punish; 2.

² It is, of course, a simplified definition but we think it serves the purpose of this manual. In order to read more on this complex subject you may refer to: L. B. Salomon. *Semantics and Common Sense*. - N.-Y. 1966; W. L. Chafe. *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. - Chicago-London. 1971

³A. S. Hornby. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*. - Oxford, 1982

piece of good fortune, something to be thankful for, relief; 3. exclamation of surprise or (often pretended) terror.

noodle - 1. type of paste of flour and water or flour and eggs prepared in long, narrow strips and used in soups, with a sauce, etc.; 2. fool.

blinkers (US = *blinders*) - leather squares to prevent a horse from seeing sideways.

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

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

Naturally, the number of regular, well-established associations accepted by the entire language speakers' community is rather limited - the majority of them are rather individual, but what is more *important for translation is that the relatively regular set of associations is sometimes different in different languages. The latter fact might affect the choice of translation equivalents.*

The most important fact, however, to be always born in mind in translation is that the relation between words (language signs) and parts of the extralinguistic world (denotata) is only indirect and going through the mental concepts⁴.

⁴ For more information see, for example, a classical work of C. K. Ogden, Ivor A. Richards "The Meaning of Meaning" - London, 1949

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

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

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

The peculiarities of conceptual fragmentation of the world by the language speakers are manifested by the **range of application of the lexical meanings** (reflected in limitations in the combination of words and stylistic peculiarities). This is yet another problem having direct relation to translation - *a translator is to observe the compatibility rules of the language signs* (e. g. *make mistakes*, but *do business*).

The relationship of language signs with the well-organized material world and mostly logically arranged mental images suggests that a language is an orderly system rather than a disarray of random objects. The language system and its basic rules are the subject of the next lecture.

QUESTIONS

1. What are the basic elements of the relationship between a language and extralinguistic world?
2. What is a language sign, a concept and a denotatum? Give definitions. Show the relation between them?
3. What is a lexical meaning, a connotation and an association? Give definitions and examples.
4. What is the range of application of a word? Give examples.
5. What are the main sources of translation ambiguity stemming from the sign-concept relationship?

Exercises

Ex. 1. *Using a dictionary define the lexical meanings of the following words and word combinations. Find Ukrainian or English equivalents. Compare the lexical meanings of the English words and their Ukrainian equivalents and vice versa.*

a) anticlimax; arms; bottom; bout; concert; to concoct; date; detail; end; engineer; fulcrum; fun; the gist; give and take; world; worldly; peer pressure; peer-bonded; rapport; task force; track record; power broker; odds; home; war.

б) аматор – любитель – дилетант; аналізувати – розглядати - розбирати; банкір – фінансист; засновник – основоположник – фундатор – батько; малий – невеликий – нечисленний – обмежений – мізерний – нікчемний; неймовірний – неправдоподібний – дикий – парадоксальний – анекдотичний; простий – щирий – простодушний – грубий – звичайний.

Ex. 2. *Describe connotations of the following words and word combinations. Suggest Ukrainian translations with similar connotations.*

malady - disease - illness; unusual - off-beat; efforts - travails; work - toil, gun - piece; corpse - stiff; rich - well-to-do; quit - buzz off; liquidate - iron out.

Ex. 3. Consider regular associations between English words (concepts) in the word combinations given below, suggest Ukrainian equivalents of the latter. Observe similarity or difference of the associations in the Ukrainian equivalents.

white knight; white heat; yellow press; common sense; die hard; soft (hard) figures; pipe dream; red tape

Ex.4. Suggest the missing parts of the expressions below; say where the associations are similar in English and Ukrainian

.... Tom, ... Tom; ... Rouges, ... Rouge; ... sky, sky; apple; ... Apple, apple ... , apple, Apple ..., Apple, apple ..., apple ...

Ex. 5. Take three homonyms and synonyms in Ukrainian, translate them into English, point to the cases of similar and different use

LECTURE 2. LANGUAGE SYSTEM: PARADIGMS AND SYNTAGMAS

This Lecture:

- introduces the concepts of a system;
- introduces the notion of language as a system existing in formal and semantic planes;
- attributes linguistic signs to morphological, lexical or syntactic levels;
- depending on meaning or function, defines what paradigm a unit belongs;
- analyzes syntactic and semantic valence;
- shows how different syntagmas are activated in English and Ukrainian in the course of translation;
- gives a definition of translation as a specific coding-encoding process

So, there is a system underlying seemingly random signs of a language. One may note, for instance, that not all the words are compatible with each other, their range of application has certain limitations, and through their lexical meanings and associations they may be united into individual groups.

For example, to take an extreme case, in English speech one will never find two articles in a row or in an official obituary an English speaker will never say that *the minister pegged out*. An evident example of grouping by meaning and association gives the group of *colors* in which even a little child will easily include *black, red, blue*, etc.

Thus, one may conclude that there is some order organizing hundreds of thousands of words making it easier to memorize and properly use them in speech. This order is called the *system of a language*. Any system is an organized set of objects and relations between them, but before discussing objects and relations in the system of a language it is worthwhile to describe the traditional approach to language system descriptions.

In any language system two general planes are usually distinguished: the **formal** plane, comprising spoken or written language signs (words and word combinations as well as minor elements, morphemes) and the **semantic**, comprising mental concepts (meanings) the language signs stand for.

As a simplified example one may again take words from a dictionary (*formal plane*) and their definitions (*semantic plane*):

corps - 1. one of the technical branches of an army; 2. - military force made up of two or more divisions

correct - 1. true, right; 2. - proper, in accord with good taste and conventions.

This example is, of course, simplified since the real semantic content corresponding to a word is much more complex and not that easy to define. The general relationship between these planes has been described in the previous lecture.

A language system is traditionally divided into three basic levels: **morphological** (including morphs and morphemes as objects), **lexical** (including words as objects) and **syntactic** (comprising such objects as elements of the sentence syntax such as Subject, Predicate, etc.)

For example, *-tion*, *-sion* are the English word-building morphemes and belong to objects of the morphological level, *book*, *student*, *desk* as well as any other word belong to objects of the lexical level, and the same words (nouns) *book*, *student*, *desk* in a sentence may become Subjects or Objects and thus belong to the set of syntactic level objects of the language.

At each language level its objects may be grouped according to their meaning or function. Such groups are called **paradigms**.

For example, the English morphemes *s* and *es* enter the paradigm of Number (Plural). Words *spring*, *summer*, *autumn*, and *winter* enter the lexico-semantic paradigm of *seasons*. All verbs may be grouped into the syntactic (functional) paradigm of Predicates.

One may note that one and the same word may belong to different levels and different paradigms, i.e. *the language paradigms are fuzzy sets with common elements*. As an example, consider the lexico-semantic paradigm of *colors* the elements of which (*black*, *white*, etc.) also belong to the syntactic paradigms of Attributes and Nouns.

It is important to note that *the elements of language paradigms are united and organized according to their potential roles in speech (text) formation*. These roles are called **valences**. Thus, words *black*, *white*, *red*, etc. have a potential to define colors of the objects (**semantic valence**) and a potential capacity to serve as Attributes in a sentence (**syntactic valence**).

The paradigms of the language brought together form the **system of the language** which may be regarded as a kind of construction material to build sentences and texts. **Language paradigms** are *virtual* elements of the language which are activated in syntactically interdependent groups of sentence elements called **syntagmas**.

In simple language a syntagma is a pair of words connected by the master-servant relationship⁵

As an example, consider sentences in English and in Ukrainian: *He used to come to Italy each spring* and *Звичайно кожної весни він приїздив до Італії*.

The following paradigms were used to form these sentences and the following paradigm elements were activated in syntagmas during their formation (viz. Table 1 below)

Table 1

⁵This is an approach typical for Immediate Constituents (IC) Grammar.

Names of Paradigms Used to Form the Sentences	Elements Activated in the Sentence	English	Ukrainian
Personal Pronouns Paradigm		<i>he</i>	<i>він</i>
Verbs Paradigm		<i>used, come</i>	<i>приїздив</i>
Verb Tense Paradigm		<i>Past Indef.</i>	<i>минулий час</i>
Particles Paradigm		<i>to</i>	<i>попе</i>
Prepositions Paradigm		<i>to</i>	<i>до</i>
Noun Paradigm		<i>Italy, spring</i>	<i>Італія, весна</i>
Adjectives Paradigm		<i>each</i>	<i>кожний</i>
Adverbs Paradigm		<i>none</i>	<i>звичайно</i>
Noun Cases Paradigm		<i>Common</i>	<i>род. відм.</i>
		<i>Case</i>	
Adjective Cases Paradigm		<i>none</i>	<i>род. відм.</i>

Comparing the paradigm sets used to form the above English and Ukrainian sentences and paradigm elements activated in the syntagmas of these sentences one may easily note that both the sets used and the set elements activated are often different.

They are different because English and Ukrainian possess different language systems. It goes without saying, that this fact is very important for translation and explains many translation problems.

Any language has a particular multi-level organization: its elements are organized in sets (paradigms) at various levels and a language speaker is using the elements of these sets to generate a message intended for communication with other speakers of this language and entirely incomprehensible for those who have no command of this language.

The latter fact is easy to illustrate by a sentence in a language presumably unfamiliar to the readers of this Manual. Consider Dutch sentence: *Dat vat ik niet*. One will understand it if he knows that: *ik* is a Personal Pronoun, first person singular (English *I*);

vat is the first person singular of the verb *vatten* (English *catch, get*);
niet is the negation (English *not, no*);
dat is a Pronoun (English *it, this*).

Then being aware of the relevant English words (paradigm elements) one may render this sentence in English as *I do not get it*.

From the above one may conclude that a language is a *code* understood only by its users (speakers).⁶ Then, may be, translation is a process of decoding a message in one code and encoding it in another which is understood by another group of users using a different code. However, this is the subject of the next lecture.

QUESTIONS

1. What are the two main planes of a language? What is the relationship between them?
2. What levels are traditionally distinguished in a language? Give examples of the objects of each level.
3. What is a language paradigm? Give examples of lexico-semantic and grammatical paradigms.
4. What is a syntagma? Give a definition.
5. What is the language system? Give a definition.

EXERCISES

⁶This viewpoint is widely accepted by computational linguistics (viz., e. g.: Grishman R. *Computational Linguistics: An Introduction* - Cambridge, 1987).

Ex. 1. *Give the elements of the following lexico-semantic paradigms.*

- a) furniture, colors, time, times of the day, seasons
- b) вибори; судовий устрій; переговори; фінанси

Ex. 2. *Compare the grammatical paradigms which enter the following English words and their Ukrainian equivalents.*

house, man, easy, do-little, easy-going, white

Ex.3. In the text below, name as many lexico-semantic and grammatical paradigms as you can find.

BOTH SIDES WILL MAKE SURE AMERICAS CULTURE WARS CONTINUE

The Internaitonal Herald Tribune. April 12, 2001. By Neal Gabler.

The culture wars that so enlivened the 1980s and 1990s in America are said to be over. The savage fights that raged full-scale as recently as two years ago over gay rights, abortion, gun control, environmental protection and general permissiveness, and that culminated in the Antietam of culture battles, Bill Clinton's impeachment and trial, seem to have just petered out.

Pundits say the combatants, exhausted from all the verbal shelling, have accepted compromise rather than press on for total victory, and this has led to a new spirit of accommodation. One observer writes that the "crackle of cultural gunfire is now increasingly distant."

It makes you wonder what country they're living in.

Ex. 3. *Compare the paradigm sets used to form the following English and Ukrainian sentences and paradigm elements activated in the syntagmas of these sentences.*

Jack is an early riser. Джек рано встає.

LECTURE 3. LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

This Lecture

- introduces the concepts of:
- (a) communication;
- (b) components communication consists of (message, message sender, message recipient);
- (c) ways of communicating;
- shows the difference between bilingual communication and translation;
- shows which tools are helpful in coping with ambiguity of messages and gives their definitions.

Thus, a language may be regarded as a specific code intended for information exchange between its users (language speakers). Indeed, *any language resembles a code being a system of interrelated material signs (sounds or letters), various combinations of which stand for various messages*. Language grammars and dictionaries may be considered as a kind of Code Books, indicating both the meaningful combinations of signs for a particular language and their meanings.

For example, if one looks up the words (sign combinations) *elect* and *college* in a dictionary he will find that they are meaningful for English (as opposed, say, to combinations *ele* or *oll*), moreover, in an English grammar he will find that, at least, one combination of these words: *elect college* is also meaningful and forms a message.

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

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

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

Bilingual communication is a rather typical occurrence in countries with two languages in use (e. g. in Ukraine or Canada). In Ukraine one may rather often observe a conversation where one speaker speaks Ukrainian and another one speaks Russian. The peculiarity of this communication type lies in the fact that decoding and encoding of mental messages is performed simultaneously in two different codes. For example, in a Ukrainian-Russian pair one speaker encodes his message in Ukrainian and decodes the message he received in Russian.

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

Translation as a specific communication process is treated by the communicational theory of translation discussed in more detail elsewhere in this Manual⁷.

Thus, a language is a code used by language speakers for communication. However, a language is a specific code unlike any other and its peculiarity as a code lies in its ambiguity - *as opposed to a code proper a language produces originally ambiguous messages which are specified against **context, situation and background information***.

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

⁷See also: Kade O. Kommunikationswissenschaftliche Probleme der Translation. In: Grundfragen der Uebersetzungswissenschaft. - Leipzig, 1968

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

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

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

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

In simple words *a context may be defined as a length of speech (text) necessary to clarify the meaning of a given word.*

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

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

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

Apart from being a code strongly dependent on the context, situation and background information a language is also a code of codes. There are codes within codes in specific areas of communication (scientific, technical, military, etc.) and so called sub-languages (of professional, age groups, etc.). This

applies mostly to specific vocabulary used by these groups though there are differences in grammar rules as well.

As an example of the elements of such in-house languages⁸ one may take words and word combinations from financial sphere (*chart of accounts, value added, listing*), diplomatic practice (*credentials, charge d affairs, framework agreement*) or legal language (*bail, disbar, plaintiff*).

All said above is undoubtedly important for translation and will be discussed in more detail elsewhere during this lecture course, however, it is high time to answer the seemingly simple question "What is translation?". And this is the subject of the next lecture.

⁸The term used by some scholars for sub-languages.

QUESTIONS

1. What is language communication? What actors does it involve?
2. What is monolingual communication? What is bilingual communication? Give examples.
3. Describe translation as a special kind of bilingual communication. Why is it called special?
4. What is peculiar about a language as a code? Which factors specify the meaning of a message?
5. What is context, situation and background information? Give definition of context. Give examples of extralinguistic situations and items of background information that would clarify a message.

EXERCISES

Ex. 1. *Suggest the elements of the context that clarify the meanings of the italicized words in the following phrases (messages). Translate into Ukrainian and English, accordingly.*

a) You are doing *well!* Water is deep down the *well*. *Top-to-bottom* structure. The submarine lies on the sea *bottom*. *College* vote. University *college*. *Drugs* plague modern society. The *drug* is to be taken with meals.

б) Він пишався своєю рідною землею, що дала світу так багато видатних людей. У цій частині країни всі землі придатні для вирощування пшениці. На чорній землі біла пшениця родить. На чийй землі живеш, того й воду п'єш. Колос плідний до землі гнеться, а пустий – вгору дереться. Земля багата – народ багатий.

Ex. 2. *Describe situations and/or items of background information that clarify the meanings of the italicized words in the following phrases (messages). Translate into Ukrainian.*

Bottoms up! Her Majesty *man-o'-war* 'Invincible'. *Bugs* in the room. *Global net*.

Ex. 3. *Describe situations and/or items of background information that clarify the meanings of the following Ukrainian words. Suggest English equivalents.*

презентація, КВН, бомж, зачистка, прем'єріада, ЖЕК.

Ex. 4. *Translate the text into Ukrainian. Suggest items of background information necessary for its proper translation.*

HAS THIS BEEN A TERM OF ENDEARMENT?

The Observer, Sunday April 29, 2001. Andrew Rawnsley, columnist of the year.

Tony Blair's government has made history. What it has yet to demonstrate is the capacity to change the country's destiny.

A week is a long time in politics; 48 months is an eternity. Four years ago this Wednesday, Tony Blair stood before the black door on his sun-dappled first day in office. 'Enough of talking,' said the man of action. 'It is time now to do'. 'Strip off the hype which has gushed from Number 10 ever since; blow away the froth of the daily headlines. How has his government actually done? Let us try, as clinically as is possible, to assess the performance of New Labour.

The starter test of any government, I would suggest, is that it is reasonably accomplished at governing. This sounds an undemanding hurdle, but it is a first fence many previous governments have failed to surmount. The Blair government has made serious, self-inflicted mistakes - the Millennium Dome blasts them still. The unexpected has come close to blowing them over. Foot and mouth has not been - I am being charitable - a textbook example of how to handle an emergency. The Government teetered on the lip of the abyss during last autumn's fuel protests. It is natural that we should curse their blunders more than we offer credit for the mistakes they have avoided. But the Blair government has eschewed perpetrating any spectacular errors.

The novices to red boxes who took office four years ago have broadly run a competent government. Its life has been punctuated by crises, which have been invariably generated not by dissident backbenchers or off-message Ministers, but erupted from the inner core of the regime. There have been gripping soap operas, none more so than the double resignations of Peter Mandelson. But the damage done has been to the actors, not to the country at large. There has

not been the economic calamity or civil crisis which destroys governments and wrecks countries.

The Blair government has not inflicted upon us a Suez, a Three Day week or a Winter of Discontent. There has not been the vicious social conflict of the inner-city riots and the miners' strike in the Eighties. There has not been anything approaching the ruinousness of Thatcher's poll tax or Major's Black Wednesday. Just by being reasonably adept at ruling, the Blair administration is lifted above the average run of postwar governments.

The next test of any government is whether it has been true to its promises. Generally, the so-distant People's Prime Minister has fulfilled the rather low expectations the people had of him. Blair was elected on a paradoxical prospectus. The subtext of his campaign was: everything is appalling; we will change it very slowly. The Conservatives may have left office in May 1997, but their term of power did not properly end until just two years ago, when Gordon Brown finally released the Government from the Tory spending corset. Transformed schools and hospitals await realisation. If not delivered in the second term, the punishment of the electorate may be terrible.

Blair's most reckless pledge was to restore faith in public life. Back on May Day 1997, even the most cynical observer did not anticipate they would have quite so much sleaze in them. In other respects, this government has delivered more than it promised. The last manifesto pledged nothing about child benefit - it has actually risen by 25 per cent. They did not claim to be able to create full employment, yet they have achieved that historic goal of Labour.

Any set of rulers with an eye on claiming a large place in posterity must aspire to be more than competent deliverers. The superior rank of government is occupied by those which make changes lasting beyond their lifetime. It is not conceivable that the Conservatives could unravel devolution to Scotland and Wales, an aspiration of progressive governments dating back to Gladstone.

One of the ironies of Blair is that, for all his relentless emphasis on the modern, his bigger achievements have been based on ambitions set by long-dead predecessors. A settlement in Ireland has eluded every premier since the nineteenth century. The minimum wage was a Labour goal when Keir Hardie founded the party. The Tories have been compelled to accept it, just as they have been forced to support independence for the Bank of England. This government could come to a full stop today - and would leave enduring legacies.

There are other elements of the Blair record which the Right accepts because they are as amazed as many on the Left are disgusted that they have been enacted by a Labour government.

Which takes us to my next test of a government: has it permanently altered the framework of political choice? The verdict here is mixed. With a little help from the grisly pantomime that is William Hague's Conservative Party, New Labour commands the centre ground and swathes of territory on both flanks. Harold Wilson's unrequited dream of making Labour 'the natural party of government' is closer to realisation by Tony Blair than under any previous Labour Prime Minister.

But he has achieved it more by following the consensus than by challenging the status quo. His government has pandered to illiberality more often than it has confronted prejudice. It has become a little less bashful about making the case for the active state and a fairer society, but remains coy of full candour.

Since the Third Way was giggled to death, it has become ever clearer that this is a government which moves by inches rather than leaps. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with that: small steps, provided there are enough of them, can take you on a long journey.

Baby bonds are an eye-catching device to give the poor an asset stake in society. But this is the safest sort of radicalism. The first beneficiaries of the scheme will not come into possession of their modest endowments until Mr Blair is eligible for his pension. He, Gordon Brown, David Blunkett and Alistair Darling, along with the Institute for Public Policy Research and the Fabian Society, all claim paternity over baby bonds. When one good notion has to be spread around four Cabinet Ministers and two think tanks, it tells us that New Labour is not bursting with bold and innovative ideas.

This brings me to the last and most demanding test. The outstanding governments are those which alter the country's destiny. The project to secure the exclusion of the Conservatives from power for a generation has withered as Blair's enthusiasm for changing the Westminster voting system has shrivelled. In terms of the private goals he set for his premiership, the most evident failure has been Europe. Towards Europe as a whole, and towards the single currency especially, public opinion is more aggressively hostile than ever.

The greatest wrangling between the Prime Minister and the Chancellor about the next manifesto is not over what it says about tax, but about the warmth of the phraseology towards the single currency. The fiercest struggle about that is within Mr Blair himself. Will he hedge his self-perceived destiny with

deadening qualifications or will he articulate the belief that his epochal role is to make Britain a fully engaged partner in Europe?
The Blair government has demonstrated that it can make history. Only in its second term will we discover whether it has the capacity to change the future.

LECTURE 4. TRANSLATION DEFINITION

In this Lecture the reader will:

- find the definition of translation as an object of linguistic study in terms of process and outcome;
- find the definitions of languages translated from and into.

The lecture also describes:

- stages of the translation process;
- the role of verification process.

Usually when people speak about translation or even write about it in special literature they are seldom specific about the meaning. The presumption is quite natural - everybody understands the meaning of the word. However, to describe translation intuitive understanding is not sufficient - what one needs is a definition.

Translation means both a process and a result, and when defining translation we are interested in both its aspects. First of all, we are interested in the process because it is the process we are going to define.

But at the same time we need the result of translation since alongside with the source the translated text is one of the two sets of observed events we have at our disposal if we intend to describe the process. In order to explain translation we need to compare the original (*source*) text and the resulting (*target*) one.

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

Moreover, when describing a language one should never forget that *language itself is a formal model of thinking, i.e. of mental concepts we use when thinking*.

In translation we deal with two languages (two codes) and to verify the information they give us about the extralinguistic objects (and concepts) we should consider *extralinguistic situation*, and *background information*.

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

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

In short, **translation is functional interaction of languages**⁹ and to study this process we should study both the interacting elements and the rules of interaction.

Among interacting elements we must distinguish between the observable and those deducible from the observables. *The **observable elements** in translation are parts of words, words, and word combinations of the source text.*

However, translation process involves parts of words, words, and word combinations of the target language (not of the target text, because when we start translating or, to be more exact, when we begin to build a model of future translation, the target text is yet to be generated). *These translation components are **deducible** from observable elements of the source text.*

In other words, one may draw the following conclusion:

⁹The definition suggested by V. Komissarov. See: Комиссаров В. Н. Лингвистика перевода. М.,1981

During translation one *intuitively* fulfills the following operations:

- a. deduces the target language elements and rules of equivalent selection and substitution on the basis of observed source text elements;
- b. builds a model consisting of the target language elements selected for substitution;
- c. verifies the model of the target text against context, situation and background information;
- d. generates the target text on the basis of the verified model.

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

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

Let us illustrate this process using a simple assumption that you receive for translation one sentence at a time (by the way this assumption is a reality of consecutive translation).

For example, if you received :

"At the first stage the chips are put on the conveyor"

as the source sentence. Unless you observe or know the situation your model of the target text will be:

"На першому етапі стружку (щєбінку) (смажену картоплю) (нарізану сиру картоплю) (чіпи) кладуть на конвеєр".

Having verified this model against the context provided in the next sentence (verification against semantic context):

"Then they are transferred to the frying oven"

you will obtain: *"На першому етапі нарізану сиру картоплю кладуть на конвеєр".*

It looks easy and self-evident, but it is important, indeed, for understanding the way translation is done. In the case we have just discussed the translation model is verified against the relevance of the concepts corresponding to the word *chips* in all its meanings to the concept of the word *frying* (*Is it usually fried? or Is it worth frying?*).

Verification against semantic and grammatical contexts is performed either simultaneously (if the grammatical and semantic references are available within a syntagma) or the verification against semantic context is delayed until the availability of a relevant semantic reference which may be available in one of the following rather than in one and the same sentence. *Cases when the grammatical, semantic or situational references are delayed or missing present serious problems for translation.*

The examples of specifying contexts are given in Table 2 below.

Table 2

<i>long stick - long run</i>	grammatical and semantic context in one syntagma
<i>The results are shown in the table - Put this book on the table</i>	grammatical and semantic context in one sentence
<i>The tanks were positioned in specially built shelters and the tank operation proved successful. The enemy could not detect them from the air.</i>	semantic context in different sentences

With these simple examples we want to stress a very important fact for translation: *the co-occurring words or the words situated close to each other in a source text have invisible pointers indicating various kinds of grammatical, semantic, and stylistic information. This information is stored in human memory, and the principal task of a translator is to visualize **all** of this information.*

In the examples with *chips* that were just discussed we used so called deduction modeling, that is we built our translation on the basis of our knowledge about the languages involved in translation and the knowledge of "the way things are in life" (e.g. that it is hardly reasonable to fry fried potatoes or fragmented stones). We intuitively formulated hypotheses about translation of certain words and phrases and then verified them.

So, speaking very generally, *when we translate the first thing we do is analyze the source text trying to extract from it all available information necessary for generating the target text (build the intermediate model of the target text), then verify this information against situation and background knowledge and generate the target text.*

For example, let the source text be:

Europe's leaders trust that these criticisms will pale into insignificance when the full import of expansion begins to grip the public mind

Then, omitting the grammatical context which seems evident (though, of course, we have already analyzed it intuitively) we may suggest the following intermediate model of the target text that takes into account only semantic ambiguities:

Європейські лідери/лідери європейської інтеграції/ вважають/вірять/, що ця критика вибухне/поступово зійде нанівець/, коли важливість поширення (Євросоюзу) почне завойовувати громадську думку/, коли суспільство почне краще усвідомлювати важливість поширення Євросоюзу/.

On the basis of this model we may already suggest a final target text alternative¹⁰:

Лідери європейської інтеграції вважають, що ця критика поступово зійде нанівець, коли суспільство почне краще усвідомлювати важливість розширення Євросоюзу.

It is important to bear in mind that in human translation (unlike automatic) the intermediate representation of the target text will comprise on the conscious level only the most problematic variations of translation which one cannot resolve immediately.

We seldom notice this mental work of ours but always do it when translating. However, the way we do it is very much dependent on general approach, i.e. on translation theories which are our next subject.

¹⁰It goes without saying that this target text alternative is not the only one - many other alternatives are possible.

QUESTIONS

1. What interrelated components does translation include as an object of linguistic study?
2. Give short definition of translation (after Komissarov).
3. What are the interacting elements in translation? What elements are observable? What elements are deducible?
4. What interrelated operations does one fulfill in the process of translation?
5. What three stages does one distinguish in translation?

EXERCISES

Ex. 1. *Suggest situation and/or background information necessary to clarify the meanings of the italicized words in the following sentences. Suggest Ukrainian equivalents for the italicized words and explain your choice. Translate the texts into Ukrainian and English, respectively.*

1. He stopped for *gas* at an all-night *Texaco* with a *clerk* who seemed uncommonly friendly.

2. Here was the most powerful country on earth *in suspended animation*: in the age of Internet, the age of instant information, the race between Al Gore and George W. Bush was frozen by a laborious manual recount.

3. All that the unsuspecting Bilbo saw that morning was an old man with a staff.

“*Good morning!*” said Bilbo, and he meant it. The sun is shining, and the grass was very green. But Gandall looked at him from under his long bushy eyebrows that stuck out further than the brim of his shady hat.

“What do you mean?” he said. “Do you wish me a good morning, or mean that it is a good morning whether I want it or not; or that you feel good this morning; or that it is a morning to be good on?”

“All of them at once,” said Bilbo. And a very fine morning for a pipe of tobacco out of doors, *into the bargain*. (Tolkien)

4) Як поет, він вперше серйозно заявив про себе під час *відлиги*. Час минає, *гласність* стала асоціюватися з конкретним історичним періодом *перебудови*, на зміну їй прийшов термін *прозорість*. Спілкуючись з

іноземцями, дізнаєшся, що для багатьох із них Україна – це Чорнобиль і Шевченко, зробимо паузу ... футболіст.

Ex. 2. *Build an intermediate model of translation and suggest final target text for the source text below.*

He could almost feel the campfire glow of the screen, an international sameness of news that must accompany businessmen everywhere.

Ex. 3. *Translate into Ukrainian. Suggest elements of the context that helped you choose the Ukrainian equivalents.*

WASHINGTONS NEW SALUTE TO COMPROMISE

New York Times September 6, 1998, by Herbert Muschamp

Bad things happen to good architects. James Ingo Freed is the man who designed the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, one of the most powerful buildings of our time. It gives me no pleasure to report that Freed's most recent project, the Ronald Reagan Building, is a disappointing piece of work. The building has intermittent merit. It is an impressive feat of urban planning. It also offers some fine interiors and an excellent outdoor space. Its flaws are mostly the result of the design constraints under which Freed was compelled to operate. He was expected to design a neo-classical edifice of stone, as if in 1998 that concept were still able to fill anything larger than a Bart Simpson frame of values. As someone once said, the scariest sentence in the language is, "Everyone has their reasons." This building is such an overwhelming monument to compromise that one comes away resenting the talent, intelligence, materials, time and space absorbed by its creation.

Officially called the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, this edifice is second in size only to the Pentagon among federal buildings. It fills in the last empty plot of ground in the Federal Triangle, the 70-acre urban slice that fans out between the Mall and Pennsylvania Avenue. Physically and symbolically, the Triangle both joins and separates the executive and legislative branches of government.

The area is slightly larger than Vatican City, though its turn-of-the-century image did not occupy high moral ground. A century ago, the Triangle was called the Hooker District for the many brothels there. Now it houses the National Archives, the Departments of State and Commerce, and the Internal Revenue Service. The grand neo-classical faces of these huge, foursquare

buildings hark back to a time before federal bureaucracy became a term of contempt.

The project began with an idealistic vision. The concept was to pull together beneath one roof a cultural center and agencies for international trade. What a wonderful idea: a government building dedicated to the historical and continuing interaction between global trade and cultural exchange. Sadly, the cultural components, mainly performance spaces, were largely eliminated from the project in 1992. As realized, the Reagan Building houses some small government agencies, private business offices, shops, restaurants and the Woodrow Wilson Center. Essentially, it is a speculative real estate venture built on public land. The major disappointment is that the building itself makes no cultural contribution.

The site is a vast irregular space, just south of the Post Office Building, left vacant when work on the Triangle was halted in the late 1930s. For decades, the lot was used for parking. In plan, it looks something like a guitar after a mad rock star has smashed off part of the handle. Like the Holocaust Museum, this building has a dual personality. Its neo-classical limestone exterior belies the modern spaces within. At the Holocaust Museum, however, Freed subverted the classical vocabulary to create a gaunt, hauntingly sinister facade, an image that evokes the official face of a totalitarian regime.

Here, he gives us neo-classicism straight, without even a whiff of postmodern irony. There are rusticated stone bases, ionic columns, arches both round and square, two little round tempietti, windows with triple-layered stone reveals. This overwrought classicism is the kind that Louis Sullivan, in 1893, predicted would set American architecture back by 50 years. Do I hear 100? Inside the building, Freed has attempted to realize the modernist ideals of structure and clarity that have guided most of his work. Beyond the main entrance, on 14th Street, is the building's main public space, a vast atrium with an exposed metal framework that rises toward a glass roof in the form of a half-cone.

The arrangement is similar to Cesar Pelli's Winter Garden at Battery Park City: glazed atrium; palatial staircase; a ring of shops and restaurants; art gallery. But instead of looking out toward the Hudson River, this atrium faces an imposing mezzanine adorned with a brilliant neon sculpture by Keith Sonnier.

Freed's other major departure from beaux arts precedent is the interior circulation. Instead of axial symmetry, the organization of halls and corridors reflects the site's irregular shape. Imagine the diagonal criss-cross of an airports runways and you gain some impression of the effect. The plan is

mildly disorienting but never boring. This is not a bureaucratic Kafkaland. What remains of the buildings initial program of performing arts is a small but exquisite auditorium, its walls festooned with swags of copper-colored fabric, acoustically functional and visually ravishing. A large illuminated grid of white opaque glass -- an Adolf Loos marquee -- rises two stories in the hall outside the theater.

Behind the building is a large plaza, the most successful element of the design. Fronting upon the grand hemicycle of the Post Office Building, the design counters this curve with a long diagonal wall to create a dynamic public space. The Reagan Building reaches out toward the hemicycle with a pavilion that will house the Woodrow Wilson Center. The pavilion's attenuated curve is balanced in the center of the plaza by a two-story tempietto designed for an upscale restaurant. The space offers a grand procession toward a Metro stop and is adorned by a perfectly scaled sculpture by Martin Puryear.

The work resembles at once an exclamation point and a punching bag: a fine symbol of the emotions evoked by a government of, by, for and against the people. Best of all is a long arcade facing out on the courtyard, and stretching its full length. It is divided into shallow bays, each outfitted with a lamp of exaggerated length. The spatial proportions may remind visitors of a first childhood trip to Washington. Recently, I listened to the recording of Maria Callas Juilliard master class in which she says good-bye to her students. Callas tells them that it makes no difference whether she keeps on singing or not. They are the younger generation, they must keep on going in the proper way, with courage, phrasing and diction: not with fireworks, or for easy applause, but with the expression of the words, and with feeling.

If I hear her correctly, what she is saying works to take the measure of this building. External authority -- a musical score, an urban context, the classical tradition -- can be properly grasped only by an artists courageous acceptance of her internal authority. This building lacks that acceptance. The city has been denied the knowledge Freed has gained in a lifetime of distinguished work, integrity and intellect. As a former dean of the Illinois Institute of Technology, once headed by Mies van der Rohe, Freed needs no architecture critic to remind him that Mies was the heir to neo-classicism in this century, and that the Reagan Building was an opportunity to rethink neo-classicism in the light of that history. All those pilasters and cornices are just so much fireworks, easy applause.

This should have been a glass building, a literal and metaphoric reflection on Classicism and the City Beautiful movement. It would have taken courage to

insist on a modern building -- or maybe just a serious phone call to Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, whose influence on public works is potent. What is most deplorable about this building is that it pitches Classicism back into exhausted debates over Traditional vs. Modern, Conservative vs. Progressive, debates that debased esthetic currency in the 19th century and have certainly not created architectural value in the comic post-modern mimicry of historical styles.

As Freed must know, his design for the Javits Center in New York is more authentically classical, in the principles it conveys of structure, clarity, detail and proportions, in its relationship to context and urban history, in its expression of personal conviction. Or if Moynihan was otherwise indisposed and a masonry building had to be the order of the day, Freed might have modeled this structure on the radical Classicism of Boullée and Ledoux, and thus enriched the Federal Triangle with an architectural reminder of our country's roots in the Enlightenment. Those abstracted, 18th-century designs are also among the historical sources of Freed's architecture.

In the Holocaust Museum, Freed, who was born in Nazi Germany, rose to the great creative challenge of drawing upon his intense personal experience of history's greatest evil. With greater fidelity to his own sense of architectural diction, phrasing and feeling, Freed might have created a building that assured modern democracy's capital city of its own place in time.

LECTURE 5. BASIC TRANSLATION THEORIES

The lecture discusses:

- **transformational approach;**
 - **denotative approach;**
 - **communicational approach;**
- and shows both the strength and limitations of each.**

In this lecture we shall discuss the most common theoretical approaches to human translation paying special attention to their limitations and ability to explain the translation process.

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

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

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

Within the group of theories which we include in the transformational approach a dividing line is sometimes drawn between transformations and *equivalencies*¹¹.

According to this interpretation a transformation starts at the syntactic level when there is a change, i.e. when we alter, say, the word order during translation. Substitutions at other levels are regarded as equivalencies, for

¹¹See, e. g.: Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод. М., 1975; Латышев Л. К. Курс перевода. М., 1981; Латышев Л. К. Текст и перевод. М., 1989; Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. М., 1974; Ширяев А. Ф. Синхронный перевод. М., 1979; Марчук Ю. Н. Методы моделирования перевода. М., 1985; Марчук Ю. Н. Проблемы машинного перевода. М., 1983

instance, when we substitute words of the target language for those of the source, this is considered as an equivalence.

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

In the process of translation:

at the morphological level morphemes (both word-building and word-changing) of the target language are substituted for those of the source;

at the lexical level words and word combinations of the target language are substituted for those of the source;

at the syntactic level syntactic structures of the target language are substituted for those of the source.

For example, in the process of translation, the English word *room* is transformed into Ukrainian words *кімната* or *простір* or French words *chambre* or *espace* or German words *Zimmer* or *Raum*.

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

The most common example of structural equivalencies at the syntactic level is that of some Verb Tense patterns, e.g. English to German: (*shall (will) go* ==> *werde/werden/wird gehen*).

The above examples of transformations and equivalencies at various levels are the simplest and, in a way, artificial because real translation transformations are more complex and often at different levels of languages involved in translation.

This kind of transformation is especially frequent when translation involves an analytical and a synthetic language, e. g. English and Ukrainian.

From the above you may conclude that *according to the transformational approach translation is a set of multi-level replacements of a text in one language by a text in another governed by specific transformation rules.*

However, *the transformational approach is insufficient when the original text corresponds to one indivisible concept which is rendered by the translator as a text in another language also corresponding to the relevant indivisible concept.*

For instance, the translation of almost any piece of poetry cannot be explained by simple substitution of target language words and word combinations for those of source language.

This type of translation is characteristic of any text, written or spoken, rather than only for poetry or high-style prose and the *denotative approach* is an attempt to explain such translation cases.

Though denotative approach to translation is based on the idea of denotatum (see above the relationship of signs, concepts and denotata), it has more relevance to that of a concept.

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

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

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

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

(1) *The sea is warm tonight* - *Сьогодні ввечері море тепле.*

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

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

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

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

The communicational theory of translation was suggested by O. Kade and is based on the notions of communication and thesaurus. So, it is worthwhile to define the principal terms first.

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

It should go without saying that this definition is oversimplified and not all communication terms used here are standard terms of communication and information theories. Our purpose, however, is to describe the act of communication in the simplest possible terms and to show translation as a part of this act.¹²

Information, which is sent and received (communicated) may be of any kind (e.g. gestures, say, *thumbs up*), but we shall limit ourselves to verbal communication only, i.e. when we send and receive information in the form of a written or spoken text.

Naturally enough when communicating we inform others about something we know. That is *in order to formulate a message, we use our system of interrelated data, which is called a thesaurus*¹³.

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

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

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

¹² See more in: Естественный язык, искусственные языки и информационные процессы в современном обществе. М., 1988; Попов Э. В. Общение с ЭВМ на естественном языке. М., 1982

¹³ See more on thesauruses in: Нариньяни А. С. Лингвистические процессоры и представление знаний. Новосибирск. 1981; Никитина С. Е. Тезаурус по лингвистике. М., 1978.

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the communicational aspect in the success of translation.

To understand this better let us consider an example of message formulation (encoding), message translation (encoding/decoding), and message receipt (decoding).

Let the original message expressed by a native speaker of English (encoded using the English language as a code to convey the mental content of the message) be:

Several new schools appeared in the area.

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

У районі з'явилися нові косяки риби

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

У райони з'явилися нові школи,

which naturally lead to misunderstanding (miscommunication).

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

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

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

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

QUESTIONS

1. What are the basic theoretical approaches to translation?
2. What is translation according to the transformational approach?
3. What are the steps involved in translation according to the denotative approach?
4. What are the principal differences between transformational and denotative equivalencies?
5. What is translation according to the communicational approach? What is the key to successful translation according to this approach?

EXERCISES

Ex. 1. *Compare the Ukrainian text and its English translation, find mismatching text elements. Suggest the approach used by the translator.*

Слово може обманути. Очі, руки, ритм серця - ніколи... Задля цієї правди якась дитина сьогодні вперше одягне пуанти і стане до станка... І з тої миті, якщо вистачить їй волі і бажання, кожен день власним різцем на власному тілі буде годинами "відсікати все зайве" ...

Words deceive, while the eyes, hands and heart never do... Learning this simple truth, another youngster dons her toe shoes and approaches the bar for the first time... From this very moment, if she has enough will and desire, she will start shaping her body several hours a day...

Ex. 2. *Translate into Ukrainian using the transformational approach and observing syntactical transformations of the italicized text fragments.*

No bail for South African police.

Bail should be denied for six white police officers arrested after a *videotape showed them setting dogs on alleged illegal immigrants, beating them and shouting racial slurs*, Justice Minister said Wednesday

Ex. 3. *Translate into Ukrainian using both transformational and denotative approaches. Suggest reasons for your choice of a particular approach.*

SPRING-CLEAN The Times, March 16 2001

The Clinton foreign policy is in for an overhaul For a President who took office with the reputation of being almost exclusively interested in domestic policy, George W. Bush has moved with remarkable speed and concentration to distance his Administration's foreign and security policies from those of the Clinton era. Almost every major aspect of America's international profile is under intensive scrutiny. Even on missile defence, where there is no doubting President Bush's determination to press ahead, if possible with the assent and co-operation of America's allies and of Russia but if need be without, analysts have been sent back to the technical and diplomatic drawing boards. But it is already clear how different will be the priorities and style of this Administration.

It will be scrupulously polite, as Tony Blair found, but on substance it will be a good deal less emollient than the Clinton White House. It will have a preference for the bilateral over the multilateral; and it is deeply sceptical of the Clintonite mantra of "constructive engagement" with governments, such as China's, North Korea's or even Russia's, which in the words of the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, "do not follow international standards of behaviour". The new Administration may also, although the Bush team does not yet, and may not in future, speak with one voice, be more reliable to deal with than the Clinton White House, which was disconcertingly prone to abrupt policy shifts.

This is no "new look" team. Mr Bush has drawn his biggest hitters from his fathers generation, and in so doing has created a novel variation on the tensions, familiar from the days of Henry Kissinger, between the State Department, Defence and the National Security Adviser. Both General Powell at State and, to a lesser extent, Condoleezza Rice at National Security are finding themselves outpaced by the formidable duo of Donald Rumsfeld at Defence and Richard Cheney, who shows no sign of settling into the conventional near-anonymity of the vice-presidency. Both men view the present through the prism of the Cold War and its immediate aftermath and are more at home assessing "the true threats facing America" than they are with the rhetoric of opportunity. Those threats are, in the new conspectus, heavily concentrated in Asia, where China is seen not as a "partner" but a

potential strategic challenge and North Korea — with which Mr Bush has cancelled plans for talks and in effect told Pyongyang that the road to Washington lies through Seoul — as an unpredictable, unreformed menace. Chinas conciliatory reaction goes some way towards proving the wisdom of this more sceptical approach. Time was when Beijing would have taken loud offence at being told that its Foreign Minister must wait in the White House queue behind Japans lame duck Prime Minister; instead, yesterday, it hastened to issue its own invitation to Mr Bush. Its chief arms negotiator, Sha Zukang, has even announced that China will not contest US plans to deploy a missile defence system in Asia to protect US troops there — a with its hitherto shrill opposition to missile defence in any form. With Russia showing interest in missile defence and European Union resistance slackening, China fears being left out in the cold. Above all, it wants to dissuade the US from equipping Taiwan, as it is inclined to do, with anti-missile defence systems. There is some risk that Europeans will misinterpret Washington's intentions. On European defence, a muted tone should not be mistaken for assent to EU plans for a rival military structure to Nato; the US will accept no such thing. A second mistake would be to see "realism" towards Russia as any; there is more intense US scrutiny of Moscow in Washington than there has been for some time. US foreign policy is undergoing a thorough spring-cleaning. Foreign governments would do well to turn out their own attics.

LECTURE 6. TRANSLATION RANKING

The lecture deals with:

- various ranks of translation;
- means to ensure adequate translation which have been suggested by different scholars and translation ranks;
- fields of application and hierarchy of transformational, denotative and communicational approaches depending on type of translation;
- priorities in training translators;
- meaning, equivalence and extralinguistic information as three basic components of translation;
- the use of different approaches depending on translation variety.

Even in routine translation practice one can see that there are different *ranks of translation*, that one rank of translation consists of rather simple substitutions whereas another involves relatively sophisticated and not just purely linguistic analysis.

Several attempts have been made to develop a translation theory based on different translation ranks or levels as they are sometimes called. Among those one of the most popular in the former Soviet Union was the "theory of translation equivalence level (TEL)" developed by V. Komissarov¹⁴.

According to this theory the translation process fluctuates passing from formal inter-language transformations to the domain of conceptual interrelations.

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

Ideas similar to TEL are expressed by Y. Retsker¹⁵ who maintains that any two languages are related by "regular" correspondences (words, word-building patterns, syntactical structures) and "irregular" ones. The irregular correspondences cannot be formally represented and only the translators

¹⁴See: Комиссаров В. Н. Слово о переводе. М., 1973 ; Комиссаров В. Н. Лингвистика перевода. М., 1981

¹⁵Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. М., 1974

knowledge and intuition can help to find the matching formal expression in the target language for a concept expressed in the source language.

According to J. Firth¹⁶, in order to bridge languages in the process of translation, one must use the whole complex of linguistic and extralinguistic information rather than limit oneself to purely linguistic objects and structures.

J. Catford¹⁷, similar to V. Komissarov and J. Firth, interprets translation as a multi-level process. He distinguishes between "total" and "restricted" translation - in "total" translation all levels of the source text are replaced by those of the target text, whereas in "restricted" translation the substitution occurs at only one level.

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

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

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

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

As you will note later, the transformational approach forms the basis of machine translation design - almost any machine translation system uses the

¹⁶ J. R. Firth. Linguistic Analysis and Translation. In: For Roman Jakobson. The Hague. 1956.

¹⁷ J. Catford. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London. 1967

principle of matching forms of the languages involved in translation. The difference is only in the forms that are matched and the rules of matching¹⁸.

¹⁸See, e. g. Staples Ch. The LOGOS Intelligent Translation System - In: Proceedings of Joint Conference on AI. Karlsruhe, 1983; SYSTRAN Linguistische Beschreibung. Berlin.1990; Hiroaki Kitano. Speech-to-speech Translation: A massively parallel memory-based approach. Boston. 1994

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

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

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

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

Scientists and translators have been arguing and still do about the priorities in a translator's education. Some of them give priority to the linguistic knowledge of translators, others keep saying that a knowledgeable specialist in the given area with even a relatively poor command of the language will be able to provide a more adequate translation than a good scholar of the language with no special technical or natural science background.

In our opinion this argument is counter-productive - even if one or another viewpoint is proved, say, statistically, this will not add anything of value to the

understanding of translation. However, the very existence of this argument underscores the significance of extralinguistic information for translation¹⁹.

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

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

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

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

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

The hierarchy of these methods may be different depending on the type of translation²⁰. Approach priorities depending on the type of translation are given in Table 3 below.

Table 3

¹⁹ This viewpoint is also shared by, e. g.: I. Batori. Paradigmen der maschineller Sprachuebersetzung. In: Neue Ansätze in maschineller Sprachbearbeitung. Tuebingen. 1986; Новиков А. И., Слюсарева Н. А. Лингвистические и экстралингвистические аспекты семантики текста. М., 1982

²⁰See, e. g.: Ревзин И. И., Розенцвейг В. Ю. Основы общего и машинного перевода. М., 1964

Language for Special Purpose Series

Translation Type	Translation Method Priorities
Oral Consecutive	Denotative, Communicational
Oral Simultaneous	Transformational, Communicational
Written (general & technical)	Transformational
Written (fiction & poetry)	Denotative

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

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

As it is shown in Table 3, in written translation, when you seem to have time for everything, priority is also given to simple transformations (perhaps, with exception of poetic translation). This is no contradiction, just the path of least resistance in action - it is not worthwhile to resort to complex methods unless simple ones fail.

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

From the approaches discussed one should also learn that the matching language forms and concepts are regular and irregular, that seemingly the same concepts are interpreted differently by the speakers of different languages and different translation users.

Now, having discussed briefly the main theoretical treatments of human translation, we pass over to basic translation parameters being the subject of the following lectures.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the main idea of Komissarov's theory of 'translation equivalence level'?
2. What is translation according to Retsker, Catford and Firth?
3. What is translation ranking?
4. What translation ranks do you know?
5. What relationship is there between the approaches to translation and types of translation?

EXERCISES

Ex. 1. *Translate into Ukrainian. Divide translation equivalents into regular and occasional.*

Only those who have talent and willpower can make the most daring dreams come true. Many of us thought that we already knew all about the professional abilities of Bogdan Stupka, People's Artist of Ukraine and winner of numerous prizes. However, the news again held quite a surprise. The news of his tremendous success and the international recognition heaped on him this year reached us quickly and shattered all the long established clichés in one big bang. Bogdan Stupka won his latest victory in the movie *With Sword and Fire*. Jerzy Hofman's film shown in Poland, the United States and Australia raised the Ukrainian actor to the level of international film star. It was indeed his finest hour.

Ex.2. *Translate into Ukrainian using appropriate ranks (levels) of translation as required by the source text content and style. Comment on your decisions.*

1) "I am trustworthy, loyal, and helpful. But I struggle with *obedient*."

Tripp smiled faintly. "I am not looking for a boy scout," he said.

"Next best thing," I said.

"Well" Trip said, "Lieutenant Quirk said you could be annoying, but you were not undependable.

"He's always admired me," I said.

"Obviously you are independent," Tripp said. "I understand that. I've had my moments. 'He who would be a man must be a non-conformist.' "

(R.B.Parker).

2) ANIMALS HAVE TRADITIONALLY SHAPED HUMAN EVENTS.

Leading article *The Times*, April 27, 2001

There everyone is, caught between horror at the ghastly enormity that is foot-and-mouth and ennui that it has dragged on for so long, when suddenly from the ashes there rises the sacred calf, Bambi reincarnate. With her fluffy white fur, ox-eyed gaze and perfect pink pout Phoenix is the prettiest page 3 star Fleet Street has had in years. Suddenly amid the big, ugly world of slaughter trip the words “tiny”, “white” and “innocent”. Ministers quail and policy is made on the hoof.

People talk about causes needing a human face, but on the whole prefer an animal countenance. Mute bestial appeal is considered easier on the ear than, say, the guttural petition of asylum-seekers. We can be fairly indifferent to our own kind; it takes an animal to make us human. Phoenix’s life would have been pretty dreadful under normal circumstances, but no matter. She has assumed the symbolic status of *The Cow That Changed History*.

Animals have altered the course of events more often than might be imagined. Many’s the time when mankind has felt himself to be sturdily at the helm, when in fact matters have been bunted along by beak or snout. Europe itself began this way when Europa was carried off into the ocean by a bullish Zeus, kicking and flailing before submitting to become a continent. For Christians the instigating beast is the serpent, worming his way into Eve’s confidences with sinuous insinuations.

Ancient history is a positive bestiary of cloven goings on. The noblest incidence of animal magic came in the form of the sacred geese whose cackling alerted their masters to a stealthy advance upon the Capitoline Hill. Caligula’s bestowal of a consulship upon his horse was rather less successful, being one of all-too-many final straws that broke the populace’s back and led to his being dispatched at the Palatine Games. Cleopatra’s exit pursued by an asp showed far better judgment.

Animals also throw up historical “what-ifs”. What if Richard III had traded his kingdom for a horse, Dick Whittington not been so bounteous with his cat, or Catherine the Great been less pony crazy? In the multimedia age pets can win the ultimate prizes and emerge as global megastars. The orbit of Sputniks dog, Laika, made him the fantasy comrade of the worlds youth.

The Prime Minister’s personal intervention as Phoenix’s saviour is a bow to the electoral beasts of the apocalypse. It is a case of chicken, but the public will see only a happy ending to *The Calf’s Tale*.

Ex. 2. Translate into Ukrainian. Suggest the ranks (levels) of translation and explain your decision.

The first plant you will notice by the glass doors of the terminal will be a tangerine tree with tangerines "for real". The aroma, the color of their warm peel and even tiny dimples on the surface are so attractive that you, sick and tired of stony winter landscapes, will feel very much like putting some tangerines in your pocket. This country is fun already!