

англоязычных научно-технических текстов авиационной тематики на украинский язык. Определено, что главный комплекс грамматических проблем перевода связан с пониманием синтаксической структуры сравниваемых языков и морфологического состава предложений как языковых элементов. Особое внимание уделено исследованию таких типов грамматических трансформаций как перестановка, замена, добавление и опущение, сущность которых заключается в изменении структуры предложения. Поскольку грамматика тесно связана с лексикой, то значительное количество переводческих трансформаций имеет смешанный характер, то есть при переводе необходимо одновременно осуществлять как лексические, так и грамматические изменения.

Доказано, что перевод научно-технической литературы авиационной тематики целесообразно рассматривать с позиций языкознания и технических дисциплин, поскольку качество перевода определяется его лингвистической, терминологической и профессиональной правильностью.

Ключевые слова: научно-технический текст, адекватный перевод, грамматические трансформации, авиационная терминология, грамматические структуры.

Glushanytsia N. Peculiarities of Grammatical Translation of English-Scientific and Technical Aviation Literature (on the example of technical texts from aircraft maintenance manual).

The paper presents comparative analysis of English and Ukrainian grammatical systems on the material of English aviation scientific and technical documentation. The groups of grammatical difficulties of translation of English scientific and technical texts have been distinguished. The features of grammar structures translation from English into Ukrainian have been defined. It has been determined that the most complex grammatical translation problem is proper understanding of syntactic structure of compared languages and morphological structure of sentences as language elements. Particular attention is paid to research of the following types of grammatical transformations such as transposition, substitution, addition and omission, the essence of which is to change the structure of the sentence. Since grammar is closely related to vocabulary, a considerable amount of translation transformations is mixed, that is, both lexical and grammatical changes should simultaneously be performed in the process of the translation.

It has been proved that translation of scientific and technical aviation literature should be considered from the standpoint of linguistics and technical subjects because translation quality is determined by its linguistic, terminological and professional accuracy.

Key words: scientific and technical texts, adequate translation, grammar transformation, aviation terminology, grammatical structures.

Natalia Ivanytska
(Vinnytsia)

УДК 81'255.2:629.73

**CORRELATION BETWEEN TRANSLATION AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES:
CURRENT APPROACHES**

One major goal of this paper is to analyse the interrelationships between linguistics and translation, and clarify how they benefit from each other. One reason for the relative separation between the two fields is, perhaps, the domination of formal approaches to language study for a considerable period of time. But, with the spread of functional linguistics in the last three decades, there have been growing hopes for establishing links between linguistics and translation studies. Accordingly, the discussion, in the present study, proceeds primarily from the importance and necessity of correlation between Translation Studies and Linguistics. The paper also focuses on the current tendencies of narrowing the gap between theory and practice in Translation Studies thanks to work being done in several different but related areas of discourse studies, pragmatics and semantics, cognitive and comparative linguistics. It is emphasised that in the course of its development, the focus of Translation Studies has, thus, shifted markedly from linguistic towards contextual and cultural factors which affect translation.

Key words: Translation Study, Linguistics, communication across languages, equivalence.

Introduction. One of the goals of the present study is to consider the impact of linguistics on the work of the translator and vice versa, and to look for areas where the theoretical study of language

can continue to bring insights to the translator's task. This paper has emerged out of the conviction that linguistic theory has more to offer to translation theory than is so far recognized, and vice versa.

Perhaps one reason for the relative separation between the two fields is the domination of formal approaches to language study over modern linguistic thinking and research for a considerable period of time. Formal approaches to language, with their focus on structure and confinement to the sentence boundaries, are of limited benefit to translation theory and practice, for which a textually-oriented approach is more appropriate. With the spread of functional linguistics in the last three decades, there have been growing hopes for establishing links between linguistics and translation studies. Although there have been a number of contributions in this direction [1; 3; 5], much work is still possible, and still required, to help establish such links.

The translation theorists, almost without exception, have made little systematic use of the techniques and insights of contemporary linguistics (the linguistics of the last twenty years or so) and the linguists, for their part, have been at best neutral and at worst actually hostile to the notation of a theory of translation [4]. This state of affairs seems particularly paradoxical when one recognizes the stated goal of translation: the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as is possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text. It does seem strange that such a process should, apparently, be of no interest to linguistics, since the explanation of the phenomenon would present an enormous challenge to linguistic theories and provide an ideal testing ground for them. Equally, it is difficult to see how translation theorists can move beyond the subjective and normative evaluation of texts without drawing heavily on linguistics. The need for access to and familiarity with the accumulated knowledge about the nature and function of language and the methodology of linguistic enquiry must become more and more pressing. This paradox has arisen as a result of a fundamental misunderstanding, by both translation theorists and linguists, of what is involved in translation; which has led, inevitably, to the failure to build a theory of translation which is at all satisfactory in a theoretical or an applied sense.

Results and Discussion. Structural linguistics sought to describe language as a system of interdependent elements and to characterize the behaviour of individual items and categories on the basis on their distribution. Morphology and syntax constituted the main areas of analysis, largely to the exclusion of the intractable problem of meaning, which was either ignored or else dealt with purely in terms of the distribution of lexical items:

The statement of meanings is therefore the weak point in language study, and will remain so until human knowledge advances very far beyond its present stale. In their evaluation of this issue, Hatim & Mason argue that "since meaning is at the very heart of the translator's work, it follows that the postponement of semantic investigation in American linguistics was bound to create a gap between linguistics and translation studies. Quite simply, linguists and translators were not talking about the same thing" [5, p. 25].

In addition, linguistic description was in general limited to single language systems. For the translator, every problem involved two language systems; a statement of the distribution of an item in one language is of no particular value. However, structuralism theories of language were, nevertheless, influential in translation theory and there were some serious attempts to apply structuralism notions to translation problems. This has led to an investigation of "equivalence probability": "an attempt to arrive at a statistical calculation of the degree of probability that a given SL category will, in any given text, be rendered by an equivalent TL category" [5, p. 26]. According to [8], the non-correspondence of grammatical and lexical categories is the main source of information loss and gain in translation. The influence of contrastive structural linguistics has made itself felt in translation teaching methodology. Many published manuals of translating devote separate sections to the translation of verbs, objectives, pronouns, prepositions.

Among the insights brought by Chomsky and others to language analysis was the distinction between 'surface structure' and 'deep structure'; that is "the notion that the arrangements of elements on the surface of discourse, 'the words on the page', so to speak, mask an underlying structural arrangement, reflecting the actual relations between the concepts and entities involved" [5, p. 31]. In this regard, E. Nida [8, p. 68] went as far as to suggest that the activity of translating involved (1) breaking down the SL text into its underlying representation or semantic 'kernels'; (2) transfer of meaning from

SL to TL ‘on a structurally simple level’, and (3) generation of ‘stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the TL.

In recent years, the scope of linguistics has widened beyond the confines of the individual sentence. Text linguistics attempts to account for the form of texts in terms of their users. If we accept that meaning is something that is negotiated between producers and receivers of texts, it follows that the translator, as a special kind of text user, intervenes in this process of negotiation, to relay it across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In doing so, the translator is necessarily handling such matters as intended meaning, implied meaning, presupposed meaning, all on the basis of the evidence which the text supplies. The various domains of sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse linguistics are all areas of study which are germane to this process.

On the other hand, the study of translation has been dominated, and to a degree still is, by the debate about its status as an art or a science. The linguist inevitable approaches translation from a ‘scientific’ point of view, seeking to create some kind of ‘objective’ description of the phenomenon. It could, however, be argued that translation is an ‘art’ or a ‘craft’ and therefore not amenable to objective, ‘scientific’ description and explanation. Translation can be defined as the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language. The scholars continue and make the problem of equivalence very plain. Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent), in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc.) and at different ranks (word – for – word, phrase –for – phrase, sentence – for- sentence).

Total equivalence is a chimera. Languages are different from each other; they are different in form having distinct codes and rules regulating the construction of grammatical stretches of language and these forms have different meanings. To shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally; there is no absolute synonymy between words in the same language. Something is always ‘lost’ in the process and translators can find themselves being accused of reproducing only part of the original and so ‘betraying’ the author’s intentions [2].

Equivalence is probably the most controversial notion in Translation Studies. Some translation scholars reject this notion outright, arguing that by retaining ‘equivalence’ in the vocabulary, translation scholars sidestep the issue that “it is difference, not sameness or transparency or equality, which is inscribed in the operations of translation” [10, p. 61]. This view is also expressed in current approaches that are inspired by postmodern theories and Cultural Studies, which argue that texts do not have any intrinsically stable meaning that could be repeated elsewhere.

The translator has the option, then, of focusing on finding formal equivalents which ‘preserve’ the context – free semantic sense of the text at the expense of its context – sensitive communicative value or finding functional equivalents which ‘preserve’ the context – sensitive communicative value of the text at the expense of its context – free semantic sense. The choice is between translating word-for-word (literal translation) and meaning for-meaning (free translation). As Bell [2, p.5] points out, pick the first and the translator is criticized for the ‘ugliness’ of a ‘faithful’ translation; pick the second and there is criticism of the ‘inaccuracy’ of a ‘beautiful’ translation. Either way it seems, the translator cannot win, even though we recognize that the crucial variable is the purpose for which the translation is being made, not some inherent characteristic of the text itself.

According to [5], there is a problem concerning “the use of the term ‘equivalence’ in connection with translation. It implies that complete equivalence is an achievable goal, as if there were such a thing as a formally or dynamically equivalent target-language (TL) version of a source-language (SL) text. Accordingly, they argue that the term ‘equivalence’ is usually intended in a relative sense, and the concept of ‘adequacy’ in translation is perhaps a more useful one. Adequacy of a given translation procedure can then be judged in terms of the specification of the particular translation task to be performed and in terms of users’ needs” made a distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence [8, p.8].

On the one hand, all translation is, in a sense, communicative. Similarly, a translator who aims at formal equivalence usually has good reasons for doing so and the formally equivalent version may well, in fact, achieve equivalence of reader response. Consequently, it seems preferable to handle the issue in terms of equivalence of intended effects, thus linking judgements about what the translator seeks to achieve to judgements about the intended meaning of the ST speaker/writer.

Closely related to 'the literal versus free issue' is the debate on the primacy of content over form or vice versa. The translator is here faced with what amounts to a conflict of interests. The ideal, according to [5] would be to translate both form and content, but this is frequently not possible. According to [8], the overriding criteria are (1) type of discourse, and (2) reader response: "the standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse differ radically from language to language" [8, p. 169]. Thus, adherence to the style of the source text may, in certain circumstances, be unnecessary or even counterproductive.

This sophisticated problem leads to the question 'What is the translators' need to know and be able to do in order to translate?' In this regard, Bill [2] argues that the professional (technical) translator has access to five distinct kinds of knowledge; target language (TL) knowledge; text-type knowledge; source language (SL) knowledge; subject area ('real world') knowledge; and contrastive knowledge. This means that the translator must know (a) how propositions are structured (semantic knowledge), (b) how clauses can be synthesized to carry propositional content and analyzed to retrieve the content embedded in them (syntactic knowledge), and (c) how the clause can be realized as information bearing text and the text decomposed into the clause (pragmatic knowledge). Lack of knowledge or control in any of the three cases would mean that the translator could not translate. Without (a) and (b), even literal meaning would elude the translator. Without (c), meaning would be limited to the literal (semantic sense) carried by utterance which, though they might possess formal cohesion (being tangible realizations of clauses), would lack functional coherence and communicative value [2]. As Malone J. argues, given the goal of linguistics to match speaker's competence, an applied linguistic theory of translation should aim at matching the bilingual native speaker's translation competence [7]. This would necessarily involve seeking integration between the linguistic knowledge of the two languages with specific and general knowledge of the domain and of the world via comparative and contrastive linguistic knowledge.

One approach would be to focus on the competence of the 'ideal translator' or 'ideal bilingual' who would be an abstraction from actual bilinguals engaged in imperfectly performing tasks of translation... but (unlike them) operating under none of the performance limitations that underlie the imperfections of actual translation [6]. This approach reflects Chomsky's view of the goal of the linguistic theory and his proposals for the specification of the competence of the 'ideal speaker-hearer'. Accordingly translation theory is primarily concerned with an ideal bilingual reader-writer, who knows both languages perfectly and is unaffected by such theoretically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention or interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying this knowledge in actual performance. An alternative to the 'ideal translator' model would be to adopt a less abstract approach and describe translation competence in terms of generalizations based on inferences drawn from the observation of translator performance. A study of this type suggests an inductive approach: finding features in the data of the product which suggest the existence of particular elements and systematic relations in the process.

It also should be noticed that communication between different individuals and nations is not always easy, especially when more than one language is involved. The job of the translator and/ or interpreter is to try to bridge the gap between two foreign languages. This can also include translation problems arising from historical developments within one language [4]. We are all involved in translating all the time, if not between languages, then between dialects, registers and styles. Translating was and is a profession, with its own codes of conduct and criteria of performance, not accessible to all. In short, inside or between languages, human communication equals translation. A study of translation is a study of language. Translation and interpreting as activities have existed for many centuries, and there is long tradition of thought and an enormous body of opinion about translation [10]. But it was not until the second half of this century that Translation Studies developed into a discipline in its own right. Although at first conceived as a subdiscipline of applied linguistics, it has taken on concepts and methods of other disciplines, notably text linguistics, communication studies, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, comparative literature, and recently, cultural studies. Instead of a unified theory, we have a multiplicity of approaches, each of which focus on specific aspects of translation, looks at the product or the process of translation from a specific angle, and uses specific terminology and research methods [4].

Conclusion. Some researchers postulate an autonomous status for translation studies, arguing that these studies bring together work in a wide variety of fields, including literary study, anthropology, psychology, and linguistics. Others claim that the domain of translation studies is an important sub-branch of applied linguistics. Proponents of both opinions would have to admit, however, that the field of translation studies has multidisciplinary dimensions and aspects [1]. The gap between theory and practice in translation studies has existed for too long. Thanks to work being done in several different but related areas, there is an opportunity to narrow that gap. Recent trends in sociolinguistics, discourse studies, pragmatics and semantics, together with insights from the fields of artificial intelligence and conversation analysis, have advanced our understanding of the way communication works. The relevance to translation studies of all this is obvious as soon translation is regarded not as a sterile linguistic exercise but as an act of communication [9]. In the course of its development, the focus of Translation Studies has, thus, shifted markedly from linguistic towards contextual and cultural factors which affect translation.

Modern translation studies sees itself increasingly as an empirical discipline, aiming to describe translations (both as products and processes), to explain why translators act in certain ways and produce target texts of a specific profile, and to assess effects of translations. The question, then, is what is it that the translation can characteristically bring to the linguist's work which should not continue to be ignored? On the one hand, as linguists, there is an opportunity of seeking the universal through the particularity of languages, drawing on the comparisons and equivalences sought by the translator in professional work. Much more than this, however, if only translation research would focus more on it, is the opportunity translation (or more exactly, translating) gives to the linguists in understanding how it is that we do construct texts and how we do go about making meanings. In short, it concentrates our attention on the process in a very tangible and goal-directed way [4]. Translators as applied linguists do have certain obligations to the furthering of our understanding of language and of our ability to explain the acts of communicating in which we are continually engaged.

There has been an influence on linguistics of work done in the area of translation studies. The use of translating as a tool in language teaching has been of interest to many in applied linguistics, while psycholinguistics and the study of bilingualism are concerned with the evidence provided by 'natural' or spontaneous translation. Translation is a communicative transaction taking place within a social framework, a useful way of thinking about translation and language is that translators do not translate words; they translate what people do with words. Translation is, after all, an operation performed both on and in language.

REFERENCES

1. Baker M. Translation and Conflict / M. Baker. - London and New York : Routledge, 2006. – 243 p.
2. Bell R. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice / R. Bell. - Longman. London and New York, 1994. 145p.
3. Chesterman A. A causal model for translation studies / A. Chesterman // Intercultural Faultlines, Manchester, 2002. – P.15-27.
4. Gutmacht C. Translation / C. Gutmacht // Aronoff, M. and Miller, J. (eds.), The Handbook of Linguistics. Blackwell Publishers, 2001. – 243 p.
5. Hatim B. Discourse and the Translator / B. Hatim, I. Mason.- London : Longman, 1990. – 261 p.
6. Katz J. Propositional structure and illocutionary force: A study of the contribution of sentence meaning to speech acts / J. Katz. - Harvester Press, New York, 1978. 251 p.
7. Malone J. The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation / J. Malone. - State University of New York Press, 1998. – 231 p.
8. Nida E. Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating / E. Nida. - Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. – 243 p.
9. Numan D. Language and Culture / D. Numan. - Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2011. – 215 p.
10. Robinson D. Becoming a translator: An introduction to the theory and practice of translation / D. Robinson. - Routledge, London and New York, 2005. – 143 p.
11. Toury G. Descriptive Studies and Beyond / G. Toury. - John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1995. – 134 p.
12. Widdowson H. Explorations in Applied Linguistics / H. Widdowson. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 304 p.

Иваницкая Н.Б. Взаимосвязь переводоведения и лингвистики: современные подходы.

Одна из главных целей этой работы состоит в том, чтобы показать взаимосвязь между лингвистикой и переводоведением, и выявить, какую пользу они приносят друг другу. Одной из причин относительного разделения двух отраслей языкознания, пожалуй, является доминирование

формальных подходов к изучению языка на протяжении длительного периода времени. Однако, с развитием функциональной лингвистики в течение последних трех десятилетий, показательной есть тенденция к установлению взаимосвязей между лингвистикой и переводоведением. В данной статье позиционируется мысль о необходимости и важности тесного взаимодействия теории перевода и лингвистики. Значительное внимание уделено также современным тенденциям преодоления разрыва между теорией и практикой перевода благодаря работе, проводимой в смежных областях лингвистики, таких как дискурсология, прагматика, семантика, когнитивистика и сопоставительное языкознание. Подчеркивается, что в ходе своего развития переводоведение в значительной степени переориентировалось от сугубо языковой модели перевода к контекстуально и культурно обусловленной.

Ключевые слова: переводоведение, лингвистика, межъязыковое общение, эквивалентность.

Іваницька Н.Б. Взаємозв'язок перекладознавства та лінгвістики: сучасні підходи.

Одна з головних цілей цієї роботи полягає в тому, щоб показати взаємозв'язок між лінгвістикою та перекладознавством та виявити, яку користь вони приносять один одному. Однією з причин відносного розмежування цих двох галузей мовознавства, мабуть, є домінування формальних підходів до вивчення мови протягом тривалого періоду часу. Однак, із розвитком функціональної лінгвістики протягом останніх трьох десятиліть, показовою є тенденція до встановлення взаємозв'язків між лінгвістикою та перекладознавством. У пропонованій статті провідною є думка про необхідність і важливість тісної взаємодії теорії перекладу та лінгвістики. Значну увагу приділено також сучасним тенденціям подолання розриву між теорією і практикою перекладу завдяки роботі, що проводиться в суміжних галузях лінгвістики, таких як дискурсология, прагматика, семантика, когнітивістика та зіставне мовознавство. Наголошено, що в процесі свого розвитку перекладознавство значною мірою переорієнтувалося від суто мовної моделі перекладу до контекстуально і культурно зумовленої.

Ключові слова: перекладознавство, лінгвістика, міжмовна комунікація, еквівалентність.

Олена Ковтун
(Київ)

УДК 811.111+ 347.78.034

**СЛОВА-РЕАЛІЇ В ТУРИСТИЧНИХ ТЕКСТАХ:
ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ І ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВЧИЙ АНАЛІЗ**

Статтю присвячено комплексному лінгвістичному і перекладознавчому аналізу слів-реалій (на матеріалі текстів туристичної галузі). Переклад туристичних текстів відрізняється за формою, мовними засобами, яскраво вираженою комунікативною спрямованістю. У процесі перекладу туристичних текстів перекладачеві доводиться розв'язувати як лінгвістичні проблеми, зумовлені розходженнями в семантичній структурі й використанні двох мов у процесі комунікації, так і проблеми соціокультурної адаптації тексту. Слова-реалії слугують для номінації понять і явищ, що не мають точних лексичних відповідників у соціокультурних парадигмах інших мов. Труднощі перекладу реалій зумовлені: 1) відсутністю в мові перекладу відповідника (еквівалента, аналога) через брак у носіїв мови об'єкта, який ця реалія позначає; 2) необхідністю передання не лише предметного значення (семантики) реалії, а й колориту (конотації) – її національного та історичного забарвлення. Визначено основні способи відтворення слів-реалій у туристичних текстах: транскрипція, транслітерація, переклад функціональним аналогом, повне і часткове калькування, контекстуальний переклад, дескриптивна перифраза, комбінована реномінація, безперекладне запозичення і вилучення реалії.

Ключові слова: мовна реалія, туристичний текст, труднощі перекладу, прагматична адаптація, перекладацькі трансформації.

Постановка проблеми. Розвиток міжнародного туризму значно підвищив попит на переклад туристичних текстів, оскільки перше враження про країну, регіон, місто чи місцевість туристи здебільшого формують з інформації, яку одержують із перекладених туристичних