студентам 5 курсу перекладацького відділення, простежується, які саме перешкоди створює вертикальний контекст для адекватного сприйняття авторського тексту, а відтак і перекладу.

Ключові слова: вертикальний контекст, інтерпретація, експеримент, значення і смисл, розуміння, фонові знання, історико-філологічний мінімум.

UDC 413.13(43)

T. Oliynyk, cand. of philol., associate prof., doc.
Institute of Philology KNU named after Taras Shevchenko, Kyiv (Ukraine)

THE ROLE OF FORMAL EQUIVALENCE IN PROSE TRANSLATION

The article deals with the problem of formal equivalence in prose translation. Different theories of the concept of equivalence are discussed. The problems arising from the juxtaposition of the source and target contexts are summarized. The issue of a comparative norm by which the correctness or accuracy of a translation can be assessed in a valid manner is studied. The importance of the concept of equivalence is proved within the theoretical inquisition on translation.

Key words: equivalence, translation, source text, target text, comparative norm.

The presentation of the problem. The theory of equivalence is difficult to ignore while comparing texts in different languages. Equivalence can be considered to be one of the central notions in translation theory. But it should be mentioned that it causes tempestuous discussions which lead to elaboration of many different theories of this concept in past years.

The aim of this article is to evaluate the role formal equivalence plays in literary translation. To accomplish this, the concept of formal translation of a text from the source language into the target language must first be placed into context.

The evaluation of recent researches. A great deal of controversy has surrounded the issue of literary translation, both historically and today. Debate in this controversy typically focuses upon the strategy by which the translator seeks to replicate the text from the source language into the target language. A translation is generally regarded as "correct" or "accurate" when it sufficiently replicates the original, with respect to both form and transfer of intended meaning.

Considered within these two parameters, translation is understood as decoding a message from the forms used to encode that message in one language and re-encoding it into the forms that are used to express the same message in another language [Kühlwein 1983, 18]. However, translation considered as a simple process of decoding and re-encoding, although theoretically sound prima facie, becomes problematic in application because no two languages exhibit identical systems of organizing symbols into meaningful expressions [Nida 1964, 27]. Consequently, the term "sufficiently replicates" begs the issue of a comparative norm by which the correctness or accuracy of a translation can be assessed in a valid manner, because accuracy must be considered with respect to the language forms of both the source and target languages, which are presumably typologically distinct.

The burden of the article. Establishing a comparative norm calls into consideration two primary questions which must first be answered before conclusions concerning the accuracy of a translation can be drawn. The first question concerns the criteria for distinguishing a translation vs a non-translation, i. e., how does one define a "translation." Possible criteria to be considered for this definition align themselves along a spectrum comprising the extremes of text-oriented translation and reception-oriented translation, both of which constitute the respective positions in the debate concerning translational strategy. As will be seen, each strategy seeks to justify its approach by positing itself as the solution to the inadequacies inherent in the other. Text-oriented translation predicates the definition of translation upon the replication of form and content of the original text. However, opponents of this strategy for translation maintain that it ignores reception of the text in the target language. Consequently, transfer of meaning between texts can become distorted if certain information, presupposed on the part of the reader of the source text, is not shared by the reader in the target language and culture.

The relation between a body of discourse and the meanings expressed by its sentences is not exclusively a formal semantic relation. It obtains only relative to other facts or theories about the world, particularly about the language users' environment and about

the language users' relations to that environment and to each other. Meanings, as it were, are relative to the speakers and their environments [Tymoczko 1978, 31]. Accordingly, information conveyed by the source text may have meaning only in certain metalinguistic contexts, such as the culture in which the text was produced. A translation must account not only for text-internal factors such as syntax and lexical items, but also for text-external factors such as the cultural context. Otherwise, the language of the source text, if not adjusted to account for its transfer into a different context, can convey a wholly different meaning, or no meaning at all.

The problems arising from the juxtaposition of the source and target contexts, without consideration for equivalence of explicit and implicit categories of information, can be summarized in the following five points:

1. Instances in which Message1 lacks information which is obligatory in Message2.

2. Instances in which information which is obligatory in Message1 is ambiguous in Message2.

3. Instances in which information obligatory in Message1 is obscure in Message2.

4. Instances in which information which must be made explicit in Message1 is only implicit in Message2.

5. Instances in which information which is explicit in Message1 must be differently treated in Message2 [Nida 1975, 36–39].

Critics of text-oriented translation maintain that for reasons of potential distortion of meaning inherent in this strategy, the translator is obliged to adjust the verbal form of the translation to the requirements of the communicative process [Nida 1975, 26].

This adjustment of the verbal form to meet the requirements of the communicative process is precisely the strategy employed by reception-oriented translation which, in its most extreme expression, circumvents the issue of transfer of meaning by considering translation as a fact of one system only, i.e., the target system, because it is the target system or recipient culture which initiates the translation [Toury 1985, 18–19]. Elements of the original text, whether stylistic or determined by metalinguistic factors such as cultural context, play a secondary, almost coincidental role.

Consequently, it is irrelevant if a translated text is not received in the way the original was received because translators operate foremost in the interests of the target culture, not the source text or source culture [Hermans 1986, 18–19]. Within this broad consideration, there is no foolproof criterion which presents itself a priori for determining a translation. In fact, the presumption to distinguish a translation from a non-translation implies that a textual linguistic fact of one culture has chronological and logical priority over a textual linguistic fact of another culture. By rejecting this presumption, this approach provides no theoretical possibility for distinguishing between translation and pseudo- translation. In fact, it maintains that the theoretical branch of translation must account for pseudo- translation.

Within this context, translations should be considered as functions which map target-language utterances, along with their position in the relevant target system, on source-language utterances and their analogous position [Toury 1980, 20]. For this reason, any target language utterance regarded as such by the target culture must be considered a translation [Toury1995, 20], regardless of the degree to which the target language text replicates the original text with respect to both form and meaning. Opponents to this reception-oriented strategy maintain, however, that without any replication to the source text in either form or meaning the target text cannot be considered a translation, but at most an adaptation.

Each of these translational strategies, proceeding from two widely varying assumptions about translation, emphasizes a critical aspect of translation necessary for transfer of meaning. A text-oriented translation seeks to replicate the original text in its form and content, but is charged with ignoring the dynamics involved in reception. Consequently, equivalence between source and target texts would fail because transfer of meaning breaks down as it becomes distorted, lost, or rejected. A reception-oriented translation considers only reception in the context of the target text but not reception of the original in its context. Consequently, the transfer of meaning from the original in terms of reception is purely coincidental, if it occurs at all. However, when transfer of meaning is considered both from the angle of replication of the original and its reception in a new context, these approaches are not mutually exclusive, but rather can be

understood as complementing each other. Such an approach is considered by W. Wilss who also investigated the science of translation [Wilss 1977, 137].

His definition clearly articulates and emphasizes the role equivalence between the source text and the target text plays in translation. Opponents of text-oriented translation maintain that equivalence breaks down at the reception end and opponents of reception-oriented translation maintain that equivalence breaks down on the source end. Breakdown of equivalence with respect to either extreme is avoided by this definition because a source text must be analyzed to determine the relevant dimensions of equivalence which are to be transferred from source text to target text, and the target text must then consider their reconstruction in another language and culture. Accordingly, the key concept in this definition of translation is "equivalence."

Translation is concerned with capturing all the meaningful components of the text as a whole, a step which is necessary in order to be able to then re-create a fully meaningful text in the target language [Vasconcellos 1985, 1]. However, the concept of equivalence with respect to the "relevant dimensions" is rather ambiguous and raises the second question which must be answered before assessment of accuracy in translation can be addressed, namely, what levels of equivalence should be transferred from the source text to the target text and how can these be measured? Early attempts to establish the basis of translational equivalence developed what is known as "functional" or "dynamic" equivalence. In this case, the translator communicates with the intention that Reader2 will respond to Message2 in ways that Reader1 responded to Message1. Translation consists in producing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent to the message of the source language, first in meaning and secondly in style [Nida 1975, 33]. However, Nord identifies several levels of equivalence between texts which can be broadly distinguished with respect to both text-internal and text-external factors. Dynamic equivalence belongs to the latter grouping by virtue of its strong emphasis upon reception. On the other hand, text-internal factors include content, form, and style: [Nord 1997, 25]. But neither text-internal nor text-external factors

provide the sole basis for defining a translation; rather a translation must be constructed such that it accounts for both.

Consequently, there is great range of possible equivalent relationships which may obtain between the source and target texts, depending upon which combination of text-internal and text-external factors are taken into account.

The relation of equivalence holds between a sentence in one language and a sentence in another language if and only if each of them is an optimal translation of the other in a given context. The judgment as to the optimal translation and its correctness is left ultimately to the authority of a competent bilingual speaker [Marton as cited in Wilss 1977, 157].

Here, equivalence obtains when the target text is an "optimal translation" of the source text; however, an appeal to a competent native speaker is necessary to verify this condition. The model of the previously mentioned dynamic equivalence offers another perspective on the issue of equivalence. With this model, a translation is accurate when it functions for a reader in the target language and culture the same way the original functions for a reader in the source language and culture. Although these two perspectives are in some ways similar, they are not necessarily identical. What is considered by one individual as a functional translation may not be considered by another individual as optimal. Moreover, neither of these provides a theoretical model for measuring accuracy with respect to either functional translation or optimal translation; rather, an appeal to the judgment of an external agency is required to assess both "optimal" as well as "functional equivalence".

On a less subjective level, Catford maintains that in total translation, source language and target language texts or items are translation equivalents when they are *interchangeable in* a given situation [Catford 1978, 60]. Interchangeability is the diagnostic test for assessing accuracy and this model then resembles that of dynamic equivalence. However, as in dynamic equivalence, the question as to how the text functions is left unaddressed. Moreover, it is unlikely that this interchangeability is possible with literary texts vs non-literary texts. W. Wilss argues that the reason for this is that a literary text contains both connotative as well as denotative elements

whereas a non-literary text contains only denotative elements [Wilss 1977, 151]. Although it may be possible to translate denotative elements without an appeal to context.

These differing definitions of equivalence in translation show that no one relationship of equivalence has been determined to be more essential than any other.

Two primary options result from this apparent lack of theoretical foundation for identifying one particular relationship of equivalence between source and target texts as essential to translation. The first option is to proceed from the assumption that it is not possible to develop that kind of equivalence and to construct a theory which can account for a plurality of relationships of equivalence. One such approach is called the "Skopos Theory", summarized by Nord [Nord 2005, 25].

Skopos theory provides an insight into the nature of translation as a purposeful activity, which is directly applicable to every translation project. It was established by the German linguist Hans Vermeer and comprises the idea that translating and interpreting should primarily take into account the function of both the source and target text [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Skopos_theory].

Skopos theory focuses on translation as an activity with an aim or purpose, and on the intended addressee or audience of the translation. To translate means to produce a target text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances. In skopos theory, the status of the source text is lower than it is in equivalence-based theories of translation. The source is an "offer of information", which the translator turns into an "offer of information" for the target audience [Nord 1997].

Paul Kussmaul writes about this theory: "the functional approach has a great affinity with *Skopos theory*. The function of a translation is dependent on the knowledge, expectations, values and norms of the target readers, who are again influenced by the situation they are in and by the culture. These factors determine whether the function of the source text or passages in the source text can be preserved or have to be modified or even changed [Kussmaul, 1995].

In this case, equivalence between source text and target text is defined as coherence according to a particular "skopos," or intention,

presumably on the part of the agency which initiates the translation. Accuracy in translation depends on its fidelity to the skopos rule [Nord 1997, 27] to which both text-internal and text-external factors are subordinated. Consequently, this theory of translation ascribes a certain amount of relativism to the translational process. As the skopos rule changes, so do the requirements under which an equivalent translation will be produced. For this reason, there can never be one comparative norm, i.e., skopos rule, by which to assess the accuracy of a translation.

The other option is to reject this relativism by seeking a theoretical foundation for establishing a comparative norm which obtains for relationships of translational equivalence. The order and regularity by which language is structured become the foundation for the linguistic approach to translation, which seeks to formalize relationships of translational equivalence.

The linguistic approach to translation proceeds primarily from an examination of the structural relationships inherent in the language of the source text and considers their reconstruction in the language of the target text. By focusing on these as the basis for equivalence in translation, the linguistic approach endeavors to establish and maintain the objectivity of the translation process, during which the translator's role or input is minimized in formal-equivalence thus precluding the instance of interpretation on the part of the translator [Tymoczko 1985, 63].

That is, the translator's own view of the text will be severely circumscribed by the method of translation and the translator will intervene less between translation and text [Tymoczko 1985, 63]. However, by focusing on language structure as the basis for translation, this approach considers essentially text-internal factors and goes to the extreme of the text-oriented translation. For this reason, equivalence with the source text is presumed to obtain, but equivalence in reception must still be addressed because equivalence in both respects is necessary for translational equivalence to obtain.

Opponents to text-oriented translation argue that this is not possible because certain categories of implicit, explicit, and obligatory information can become lost in the translation. This objection rests on the unstated definition of formal equivalence as a

literal translation, by which transfer of information becomes distorted because it is duplicated in the target language without theoretical analysis governing its reconstruction. However, in the linguistic approach to translation formal equivalence refers to translation by means of equivalent categories [Kühlwein 1983, 6].

We see **the perspectives on this issue** in analyzing the source text in terms of its stylistic categories and these same categories then serve as the foundation of equivalence on which the target text is constructed. The objection previously raised against formal equivalence can be sustained only if it can be shown that a translation constructed according equivalent stylistic categories results in a target text in which equivalence fails, either with respect to the source text or to reception.

The object of further investigation is to determine if the objection raised against literal translation is sustained or refuted vis a vis formal equivalence, defined as translation by means of equivalent syntactic categories. In order to make this determination, the following condition will be established: similar stylistic structures must convey similar semantic content across languages.

In order to test the adequacy of stylistic categories to fulfill this condition, a number of sentences will be found in English into Ukrainian literary texts. Each translation pair will be examined to determine if the stylistic categories convey similar semantic content. Fulfillment of this condition would suggest that translation by means of equivalent stylistic categories is plausible, in which case there exists an objective, i.e., translator-independent comparative norm by which to evaluate accuracy in translational equivalence. Failure to fulfill this condition would indicate: 1) either another translator-independent comparative norm must be established; or 2) subjectivity must be conceded to the translational process.

Conclusion. The concept of equivalence is one of the central and controversial issues in translation theory. The term causes polemics within translation studies. It has been intensively discussed from different viewpoints and has been come nigh unto many different perspectives. The first mentioning of this notion in translation theory leaded the further elaboration of the problem in modern linguistics. Even the concise analysis of the concept given above testifies its

importance within the theoretical inquisition on translation. The complications in designation the equivalence results in the unpredictability of approaching to this notion.

LITERATURE

1. *Catford J.G.* Linguistic Theory of Translation: an essay in Applied Linguistics / John Cunnison Catford. – London: Oxford University Press, 1978.

2. *Hermans Theo.* Toury's Empiricism Version One: Review of Gideon Toury's In Search of a Theory of Translation // The Translator. – 1995. – 1(2).

3. *Hermans Theo* (ed.) The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation. – London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986.

4. *Kühlwein W.* Sociosemiotics Across Cultures // Mathuna, Liam Mac and David Singelton (eds.) Language Across Cultures. Proceedings of a Symposium held at St. Patrick's College 8–9 July 1983 / W. Kühlwein. – Drumcondra, Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics. Lambert, Josh and Hendrik van Corp., 1983.

5. *Kussmaul P.* Training The Translator, John Benjamins Publishing Co, 1995. – Режим доступу: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Skopos_theory.

6. *Nida E.* Toward a Science of Translating / Eugene Nida. – Brill, 1964.

7. *Nida E.* Language Structure and Translation: Essays / Eugene Nida. – Stanford University Press, 1975.

8. *Nord K.* Translating as a Purposeful Activity. – St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. – Режим доступу: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Skopos_theory.

9. *Nord K.* Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis, 2nd revised edition / Kristine Nord. – Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2005.

10. *Toury G.* In search of a theory of translation / Gideon Toury. – Tel Aviv University: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1980.

11. *Toury G.* A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies // Hermans, Theo (ed.) The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation, London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.

12. *Toury G.* Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond / Gideon Toury. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995.

13. *Tymoczko M.* How Distinct are Formal and Dynamic Equivalents // Theo Hermans (ed.) The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation / Maria Tymoczko. – London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.

14. *Tymoczko T.* Translation and Meaning // Guenther, F. and M. Guenther-Reutter (eds.) Meaning and Translation: Philosophical and Linguistic Approaches / Thomas Tymoczko. – New York: New York University Press, 1978.

15. *Vasconcellos M.H. de.* Theme and Focus: Cross-Language Comparison via Translations from Extended Discourse / M. H. de. Vasconcellos. – Diss. Georgetown University, 1985.

16. *Wilss W.* Übersetzungswissenschaft: Probleme und Methoden / W. Wilss. – Klett; 1977.

Т. С. Олейник, канд. филол. наук, доц., докторант
Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко (Украина)

Роль формальной эквивалентности в переводе прозы

В статье обсуждается проблема эквивалентности в переводе прозы. Обсуждаются различные теории эквивалентности. Исследовано проблемы, возникающие в результате сравнения контекста языка-источника и целевого языка. Изучено понятие нормы перевода, по которой определяется правильность или точность перевода. Доказано важность концепта эквивалентности в теории перевода.

Ключевые слова: эквивалентность, перевод, исходный текст, целевой текст, норма перевода.

Т. С. Олійник, канд. філол. наук, доц., докторант
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна)

Роль формальної еквівалентності у прозовому перекладі

У статті розглядається проблема еквівалентності у прозовому перекладі. Обговорено різноманітні теорії еквівалентності. Досліджено проблеми, які виникають у результаті порівняння контексту мови-джерела і цільової мови. Вивчено поняття норми перекладу, за якою оцінюється правильність чи точність перекладу. Доведено важливість концепту еквівалентності у теорії перекладу.

Ключові слова: еквівалентність, переклад, вихідний текст, цільовий текст, норма перекладу.

I. Orlova, Doctora en Traducción e Interpretación,
Profesora titular de la
Universidad Nacional T. Shevchenko de Kiev (Ucrania)

LA AMBIGÜEDAD EN EL ORIGINAL Y LA TRADUCCIÓN
(basado en los cuentos de Borges)

El presente artículo estudia la ambigüedad en el lenguaje literario desde el punto de vista de la estilística cognitiva y sus propiedades como categoría estilística. En el centro de atención están las figuras retóricas y su papel en la formación de la ambigüedad. Basándose en la obra de Borges y sus traducciones se analizan las estrategias de la traducción de los elementos ambiguos.

Palabras clave: ambigüedad, estilo, lingüística cognitiva, traducción.

La categoría estilística de la ambigüedad (o ambivalencia) se analiza en los trabajos dedicados a la poética cognitiva [Leech, Short 1981; Stockwell 2002; Tsur 1997; Pilkington 2000]. En la traducción este fenómeno fue analizado por Boase-Beier [2006, 2011] y Popova