

TRANSLATION EQUIVALENCY THROUGH THE PRISM OF LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD

Ковалевська Т. І.

Вінницький торговельно-економічний інститут
Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету

Мацера О. А.

Вінницький торговельно-економічний інститут
Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету

The article discusses the concept of equivalency in translation, types and degrees of equivalency, and the factors influencing the choice of equivalency type by a translator. A significant aspect of source and target text equivalency appears to be the concept of linguistic picture of the world that manifests itself via linguo-cultural differences of different languages, which in practical terms of translation is realized through national-specific realities and equivalent-lacking items.

Key words: *equivalency, translation, linguistic picture of the world, culture, national-specific realities, equivalent-lacking items.*

Ковалевська Т. І., Мацера О. А. Еквівалентність перекладу крізь призму поняття лінгвістичної картини світу. У статті розглянуто поняття еквівалентності у перекладі, типи та ступені еквівалентності, а також фактори, що впливають на вибір перекладачем того чи іншого типу еквівалента. Значущим в аспекті еквівалентності вихідного та цільового текстів є поняття лінгвістичної картини світу, що відзначається лінгвокультурними відмінностями та невідповідностями різних мов, що в практичній площині перекладу виявляються в національно-специфічних реаліях та безеквівалентній лексиці.

Ключові слова: *еквівалентність, переклад, лінгвістична картина світу, культура, національно-специфічні реалії, безеквівалентна лексика.*

Ковалевская Т. И., Мацера О. А. Эквивалентность в переводе через призму понятия лингвистической картины мира. В статье рассматривается понятие эквивалентности в переводе, типы и степени эквивалентности, а также факторы, влияющие на выбор переводчиком того или иного типа эквивалента. Значимым в аспекте эквивалентности исходного и целевого текстов оказывается понятие лингвистической картины мира, отображаемой через лингвокультурные различия и несоответствия языков, которые проявляются в практической плоскости перевода в национально-специфических реаліях и безэквивалентной лексике.

Ключевые слова: *эквивалентность, перевод, лингвистическая картина мира, культура, национально-специфические реаліи, безэквивалентная лексика.*

Problem statement and its relationship with important scientific and practical tasks. Mankind uses a language of sounds based on many general principles of arrangement and functioning as a tool of thought and communication. However, this common language really exists in the form of several thousand national languages possessing their own phonological, lexical, and grammatical systems, as well as numerous specific forms and structures, owing to which each language is considered to be unique. Fundamental distinctions between languages are not reduced, as a rule, to the features of linguistic expression means. What is of more importance, each language is distinctive in terms of semantics, and the meanings of language units dissect the reality phenomena reflected by them in a different way and thus create a specific linguistic picture of the world. Linguistic picture of the world is defined as different segmentation of reality in the network of semantic categories of each language [10, 26]. In other words,

the language we speak influences how we perceive reality. Thus, people speaking different languages actually view the world differently.

This issue is of specific importance as well as controversy when viewed in relation to the problem of equivalency in translation. Translation stands out as a kind of cross-linguistic, cross-cultural and cross-social communication [9, 41]. Being a kind of communication, the first and foremost purpose of translation is to establish equivalence between the source text and the target text. In other words, the translation as the receiver of the source message and the sender of the target message struggles to convey all the contents of the source text into the target text, otherwise, translation as a kind of communication would end in failure.

Analysis of the last researches and publications. The role of equivalency as the means of achieving the accuracy of translation, its types and as well as the degrees of correspondence between the source text and target language has long been in the focus of modern researchers' studies (Anderman G. M., Rogers M., Cronin M., Faull K. M., Munday J., Robinson D.,

Tonkin H., Esposito Frank M.). The cases of translating equivalence-lacking concepts and culture-specific notions which arise due to the differences in world perception and categorization by the carriers of different cultures and consequently different languages, present a special challenge and are of constant interest for the translation theorists and practitioners. (Baker M., Faull K. M., Hickey L., House J., Saldanha G., Steiner E., Yallop C.) There is nevertheless room for further investigations in this area, which seem perspective in the light of increased globalization and tightening of intra-European relations.

Thus, **the aim** of this article is to highlight existing types of equivalency in translation, analyze the most productive ways of equivalence-lacking items translation as well as to point out the linguistic picture of the world role for the adequacy and faithfulness of translation.

The concept that language influences perception of the world goes back to the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose ideas about the close connection of language and thought (or in his term, mind), the active role of language in thought construction and the reflection in language of the world outlook of nations were interpreted by his followers as the existence of a particular linguistic world standing between consciousness and the real world [2, 207]. We talk about linguistic selectiveness – a phenomenon consisting in the existence of a preferred means for both reflection of things and persons and description of real situations [1, 78]. For example, one and the same object can be presented from different sides, that is, by its length, height, width, density, elasticity, etc. Upon selecting it, it is turned, showing its different sides, and a man sees these different sides, but not all of them equally clearly.

The same thing happens in describing one and the same situation by means of different languages. In each language the situation is turned, showing its different sides, with each language having its own preferred sides for presenting the situation. This comprehensive description of the situation with different languages seems to be the most complete, since various features that remain undescribed in a language can be found in another one.

Differences in the ways of linguistic presentation of the reality are not doubtful; however, this does not mean principle differences in the consciousness of different language speakers. The phenomenon of linguistic selectivity causing differences in the description of reality can be related to marginal phenomena in terms of the unity of the cognition process [3, 90]. The fact that languages segment reality in different ways does not indicate the existence of "a magic circle", which a language makes up around human consciousness and which a man cannot leave. A person is capable of comprehending the condition character of the linguistic picture of the world and comparing it to actual knowledge and experience.

The normal translation should aim at the comprehension of the message of the original which is defined as the total meaning of a discourse, the concept and feeling, which the author intends the reader to understand and perceive.

Presentation of the main research material.

Equivalency is used as a measure of semantic similarity between the source language and target text [7, 19]. It is based on mathematical law of transitivity. If A equals C and B equals C then A = B, where A is a word of one language that equals to a certain concept, B is a word of another language, which equals to the same concept. A equals B when a word or word combination of one language equals to a word or word combination of another language [7, 20].

Equivalents are functional substitutes for SL units. Some SL units have permanent equivalents in TL. Equivalents can be permanent: full or regular, or non-permanent: contextual and partial. There is one to one correspondence between such units and their equivalents (terms, geographical names). In frames of equivalency, language units are classified into two groups: those that have equivalents and those that don't have equivalents.

In this respect the following types are distinguished:

- 1) **equivalents** – constant correspondences that don't in the majority depend the context;
- 2) **analogy** – TL synonyms correspond to SL words, the choice of which is conditioned by the context.;
- 3) **descriptive rendering** is applied, when foreign words denote notions and phenomena that don't exist in our life: "to dine with duke Humpry", "to give a wet Willy" [5, 62].

Since the concept of culture is essential to understanding the implications for literary translation and culture-specific items in translation, many translation theorists have dealt with the definition of culture [4, 23].

Culture can be defined as a complex of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules which a group of people share. It is the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression [4, 12].

In translation, equivalence should not be based on one aspect of meaning (say ideational meaning); the translator must pursue equivalence of three aspects of meaning at the same time [5, 48]. Since the complete identity of situational context and meaning system between cultures is impossible, the complete equivalence is equally impossible. Texts in different languages can be equivalent to different degrees (fully or partially equivalent in respects of context, semantics, grammar, lexis etc.), and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence). Something is always lost in the process.

Then what should be "preserved" and what should be "given up"? The translator should take these register variables into consideration while translating rather than make decisions randomly or according to their personal favor. This concept throws new light to the age-old debate concerning the translator's priorities: literal versus free, form versus content, formal versus dynamic equivalence, semantic versus communicative translating, domestication versus foreignization and translator's visibility versus invisibility [3, 31–32]. In order to answer the above question, the translator has to turn to cultural context, since language is a substantial but partial reflection of a culture.

A language reflects the culture of a society, not only in its choice of vocabulary, but also in its syntax and way of

organizing ideas. In single context world, the author communicates with the source text readers who share the same cultural background knowledge with him/her. Therefore, they can co-operate with each other in the process of communication quite harmoniously. But the process of translation often breaks this harmony. Translation is displaced and disjointed communication [1, 26]. In translation, the original text is deprived of its context and the information it carries is encoded in an entirely different language with an entirely different context. The reader may not be able to meet the expectation of the author, thus there comes information gap [7, 24]. The translator's job is to fill this gap and harmonize the communication.

The translator needs to understand beliefs, attitudes, values, and the rules of the SL audience in order to adequately understand the ST and faithfully translate it for people who have a different set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules. And since each language group has its own culturally specific features, that don't have equivalents in other languages the interpreter or translator should rely on the ways to create occasional equivalents and to render equivalent-lacking units. The most common of them seem to be the following:

1) using long words – imitating in target language the forms of the SL word or word combinations. By this technique we understand using transcription of transliteration exclusively;

2) by transcription of transliteration and explication of their genuine nationally specific meaning;

3) using a descriptive explanation to convey the meaning of the ST unit;

4) by translating componential parts and additional explanation of units of the nationally-bound lexicon;

5) using appropriate substitutes or semantic analogy, i.e. words with similar meaning, which is extended to convey information;

6) by ways of word for word translation;

7) using all kinds of lexical transformation modifying the meaning of a SL word [9, 56].

Equivalent-lacking idioms are translated either by reproducing their form in TL through a word for word translation or by explaining the figurative meaning of the idiom.

The following types of rendering equivalent-lacking units are typically distinguished:

1) zero translation – when meaning of grammatical unit isn't rendered in the translation since it is practically identical to the meaning of some other units and can be safely left out;

2) approximate translation – when the translator makes use of a TL form, partially equivalent to the equivalent-lacking source language unit;

3) transformational translation – when the translator resorts to one of the grammatical transformations [1, 37].

Types of equivalence in translation include formal correspondence, which consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. It is clear that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. Therefore these formal equivalents should be used wherever possible if the translation aims at achieving formal rather than dynamic equivalence. The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the TT since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience.

Formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard.

Whereas dynamic equivalence is a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the TC audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience [7, 19]. Frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful.

Conclusions from this research and prospect.

Drawing the line it should be said that a translator is expected to convey the message of the source text to target readers; however, there is no completely exact translation between any two languages and the degree of approximation between two language systems determines the effectiveness of the translation, which leaves room for further investigation in the area of contextual equivalency and descriptive rendering.

REFERENCES

1. Anderman G. M., Rogers M. Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives / G. M. Anderman, M. Rogers. – Multilingual Matters, 2003. – 232 p.
2. Baker M., Saldanha G. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies / M. Baker, G. Saldanha. – Routledge, 2009. – 704 p.
3. Cronin M. Translation and Globalization / M. Cronin. – Routledge, 2012. – 190 p.
4. Faull K. M. Culture and translation / K. M. Faull. – Bucknell University Press, 2004. – 171 p.
5. Hickey L. The Pragmatics of Translation / L. Hickey. – Multilingual Matters, 1998. – 242 p.
6. House J. Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited / J. House. – Gunter Narr Verlag, 1997. – 207 p.
7. Munday J. Evaluation in Translation : Critical Points of Translator Decision-making / J. Munday. – Psychology Press, 2003. – 197 p.
8. Robinson D. Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course / D. Robinson. – Psychology Press, 1997. – 330 p.
9. Steiner S., Yallop C. Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content / E. Steiner, C. Yallop. – Walter de Gruyter, 2001. – 336 p.
10. Tonkin H., Esposito Frank M. The Translator as Mediator of Cultures / H. Tonkin, M. Esposito Frank. – John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. – 201 p.