

UDK 81'25:811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2663-6042.13.2020.214324>

APPROACHES TO TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Vrabel T. T.

Ferenc Rákóczi II. Transcarpathian Hungarian Institute

The article deals with the parameters of translation quality assessment. The author distinguishes three groups of target text users who must know the criteria due to various reasons. Literature review covers outstanding linguists' views on "equivalence" and "adequacy". Though these notions were thought to be synonymous, their meanings are different. Linguists come to the conclusion that equivalence and adequacy are interrelated, the former belongs to language, while the latter refers to speech. Some scholars even distinguish equivalence at different levels: word, idiom, grammar, and text. Translation quality assessment criteria are related to the notion of translator's errors. The quality of translation is improved by attributing "weight" to each error; thus pointing to its seriousness. Linguists distinguish five to seven parameters of errors and / or subdivide them into two to four groups based on the severity of errors. The article scrutinizes quantitative and non-quantitative models of translation quality assessment. The first model checks one or several text fragments and, depending on translation quality, may allow or disallow a certain number of errors. This model assesses the translation accurately; however, it can only be used for non-expressive, i.e. technical texts. Adherents of the non-quantitative model assess texts based on their functional and stylistic characteristics. Though this model can be applied for belles-lettres style, adherents of this approach have not suggested a scale for translation quality assessment yet. The communicative and functional approach to translation takes into account pragmatic aspects of the communicative situation of both the source and the target texts. The author differentiates educational and professional translation. The former aims at making an adequate translation in cooperation with students, while the latter focuses on the final result.

Key words: translation quality assessment, source text, target text, equivalence, adequacy, translator's errors, quantitative models of translation quality assessment, non-quantitative models of translation quality assessment, communicative and functional approach.

Врабель Т. Т. Підходи до оцінювання якості перекладу. У статті розглянуто параметри оцінки якості перекладу. Виділено три групи користувачів тексту перекладу, яким з різних причин необхідно знати ці критерії. В огляді наукової літератури проаналізовано погляди видатних мовознавців на «еквівалентність» та «адекватність». Попри позицію вважати ці поняття синонімами, наголошено на відмінності їхніх значень. Проте зауважено, що дослідники доходять висновку про взаємопов'язаність еквівалентності та адекватності: перше належить мові, а друге стосується мовлення; дехто з лінгвістів навіть розрізняє еквівалентність на різних рівнях: на рівні слова, сталого вислову, граматики та тексту.

З'ясовано, що критерії оцінки якості перекладу пов'язані з поняттям перекладацьких помилок. Якості перекладу досягають наданням «ваги» кожній помилці з вказівкою на її серйозність. Дослідники виділяють від п'яти до семи параметрів помилок та / або поділяють їх на дві або чотири групи залежно від серйозності помилок.

У статті детально проаналізовано кількісні та не кількісні моделі оцінки якості перекладу, розроблені в сучасному мовознавстві. У першій моделі перевіряється один або декілька текстових фрагментів і, залежно від якості перекладу, дозволяється або не дозволяється певна кількість помилок конкретного типу. Переклад у цій моделі оцінюється точно, проте вона придатна для аналізу винятково технічних текстів, позбавлених експресивності. Прихильники не кількісної моделі оцінюють тексти на підставі їх функціональних та стилістичних характеристик. Хоча ця модель може використовуватися для аналізу художніх текстів, прихильники цього підходу ще не запропонували шкали оцінки якості перекладу. Комунікативно-функціональний підхід до перекладу бере до уваги прагматичні аспекти комунікативної ситуації оригіналу та тексту перекладу. Автор виділяє навчальний та професійний переклад. Перший спрямований на процес знаходження адекватного перекладу разом зі студентами, тоді як останній зосереджений на остаточному результаті.

Ключові слова: оцінка якості перекладу, оригінал, текст перекладу, еквівалентність, адекватність, перекладацькі помилки, кількісні моделі оцінки якості перекладу, не кількісні моделі оцінки якості перекладу, комунікативно-функціональний підхід.

Target setting and substantiation of topicality. The quality of the translated text has always been significant as it influences efficient interaction with representatives of another culture. This issue has had various solutions since the 1950 s, and remains topical even nowadays. Researchers of translation strive to find a universal scheme to objectively assess translation.

The main issue of assessing the quality of translation is to determine assessment parameters. Obviously, there are at least three groups of users of target texts

(TT) who need to know the criteria. They include clients who order a translation, professional translators, and, finally, students who study translation. The first group needs this knowledge to estimate whether the translator's fees are worth the effort spent on accomplishing their professional activity. Translators need to know the criteria of assessing the quality of their translation to argue in support of their product, to show a client the differences between a professional translator and an amateur one. And, finally, students

need to know the parameters of assessing the quality of translation in order to understand that all translation teachers have the same set of requirements to assess translation. Moreover, continuous assessment of students' work increases their motivation and more often than not improves the quality of educational translation done in the course of their training.

It is obvious that educational translation is not the same as professional one. In the course of the latter a teacher will not assess the translation like (s)he does during oral or written translation in class. However, researchers need to elaborate special criteria of assessing educational translation or agree to a universal scheme of assessing professional translation.

Analysis of latest researches and publications.

For many years linguistic theory of translation claimed that the quality of translation can only be assessed by comparing two texts: the source (ST) and the target one and the main parameter of assessing translation was the category of equivalence. The theory of equivalence was elaborated by A. V. Fedorov, Ya. I. Retsker, V. S. Vinogradov, V. N. Komissarov, and others and was of great significance for early translation studies, including terminology. The notion of "adequacy" often substituted "equivalence" and they became synonymous. However, the categories of equivalence and adequacy do not denote the same and it is proved by their definitions offered by outstanding linguists.

Definitions of equivalence can be compressed in form, as V. N. Komissarov's [14, 33] or more extended as V. S. Vinogradov's who claims that "...equivalence in the theory of translation should be understood as maintaining the equality of content, essence, semantic, stylistic, functional and communicative information of both the original and the translation" [8, 19].

V. N. Komissarov holds the opinion that equivalence between texts is set after the translation. The linguist offers to compare fragments of the ST and the TT to determine the level of rendering the ST's content in the TT. Translation is considered incorrect if equivalence relations are not at the optimal level [15, 53]. The researcher admits that the target language's (TL) possibilities are not infinite, therefore there are limitations to translation that should not be regarded as non-observance of equivalence. On the one hand, the theory of equivalence levels suggested by V. N. Komissarov serves as the main criterion of assessing the quality of translation; on the other hand, it does not give a comprehensive hopes, needs and requests. Obviously, with all their advantages, no theory of equivalence covers the functional component of translation.

The regularities and factors influencing the translation process are mainly evaluated in recent researches from the point of view of their impact on the translation product. Linguists majoring in translation studies specified the approaches to translation quality assessment and classified the criteria of assessing the quality of the TT [9; 10; 12; 13; 19; 25; 30; 32], elaborated the typology of translator's errors [5; 6], analysed the differentiation between the notions "equivalence" and "adequacy" [1; 4]. Despite the variety of views, the common feature of most works on translation studies was that the quality of translation can be assessed by comparing the ST

with the TT, as well as the combination of educational and professional translation based on the textocentric approach to translation.

In accord with the linguistic theory, all operations on the ST are predetermined by the text itself. However, V. N. Komissarov also wrote about the translator's absolute priority task, connecting his work with cultural peculiarities of the SL and the TL. Moreover, his adherents also mentioned the so-called extralinguistic factors.

V. V. Bibikhin understands "adequate" as something average, striving for compromise [3, 7]. Yu. V. Vannikov substantiates the concept of adequacy and differentiates semantic and stylistic, functional, and voluntary adequacy. This classification reflects the specific character of translator's work under various conditions, settles various tasks, and creates different texts in the TL [7, 35]. The definition of adequacy and its correlation with the notion of equivalence are analysed by V. V. Sdobnikov. He offers constructive criticism of A. D. Shveitser's theory where speech is mixed with communicative situation [30]. He claims that equivalence should characterize speech, while communicative situation factors ought to be conditions of the reality in which translation takes place [25, 21]. Thus, equivalence belongs to language, and adequacy is related to communication. V. V. Sdobnikov offers further step-by-step explanation reasoning that the process of translation is a subjective notion, it cannot be observed, therefore it cannot serve the object of estimating quality [24, 190]. One can estimate a concrete result that shows us the correct or false process of translation. Then the researcher comes to the conclusion that "both equivalence and adequacy as normative and evaluative categories characterize the result of translation" [25, 44]. This view seems to be a well-grounded one. If equivalence is stipulated by characteristics predetermined by the language peculiarities of the ST, then adequacy includes estimation that takes into account the main parameters of the communicative situation: the aim of translation, the addressee, the sender, the client, expectations of all the above-mentioned agents. According to the communicative and functional approach, the TT is equivalent to the ST due to its existence, and the level of its adequacy can only be determined in a concrete communicative situation; if the TT meets the communicants' expectations, i.e. communication is not terminated, continues at an adequate level or is even intensified, then the translation can be considered adequate.

Adherents of the linguistic, communicative and functional approaches determine the text limits of equivalence differently. A. D. Shveitser, one of the greatest representatives of the linguistic approaches to translation, claimed that the whole text can be equivalent. V. V. Sdobnikov holds the view that equivalence can be set between separate segments of the ST and the TT [25, 44]. If we understand equivalence as maximum correspondence of the ST to the TT, we cannot estimate such a correspondence at the level of the whole text. Closeness of the content planes of the ST and the TT is set at the sentence level [20, 4]. Moreover, each sentence can be translated at different levels of equivalence. This brings us to the conclusion that equivalence at text level

is hardly possible, unlike adequacy that is in correlation with the whole text as far as it reflects closeness of the translation to the communicative situation. Thus, adequacy and equivalence are interrelated: achieving optimal level of equivalence at the sentence level leads to adequate translation.

W. Wills claims that theoreticians in the field of translation studies have not yet offered an objective, generally accepted solution of issues related to intertextual equivalence and cannot state that the notion of “equivalence” can be studied by the theory of translation [47, 24]. M. Barghout holds the opinion that deviation from the norm can deviate the content of the whole text [35, 148]. N. Armstrong does not deny the existence of equivalence; however, he attributes it to the personality of an individual translator who decides after some consultations what is equivalent in each particular case and what is not [33, 128]. J. Catford views equivalence from the point of view of interlingual correspondences and speech equivalents. However, he does not consider it as an evaluative category. His equivalence is a kind of relation between the original and the translation both at the level of the whole text and at the level of its fragments. Yet in 1965, J. Catford does not hold a purely linguistic view claiming that TT is created in a particular situation. His condition for equivalence is maintaining the communicative function of the text [36]. M. Baker differentiates equivalence at word, idiom, grammatical and textual levels [34]. J. House suggests assessing translation from the point of view of functional and pragmatic equivalence. One can achieve this kind of equivalence in translation if the translator maintains the function of the ST in the TT [40, 33]. Thus, meaning is a multilayer notion: the first layer is text semantics, the second one is its pragmatics, the third comprises textual aspects. Therefore, the TT recontextualizes the ST into a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the TL. Moreover, the researcher highlights that text function lies in its use in a particular situation. The situation can be divided into three controllable components: Field, Tenor, Mode. The first includes the theme of the discussion, the second is connected with the social, temporal and intellectual relations between communicants, the third is predetermined by the type of communication and the communicants' level of involvement into the process of communication. To determine the text function more accurately the researcher suggests using one more component – Genre that connects a concrete text with the microtext of the cultural community where the text is usually used. House considers that genre plays the role of the register's plane of content and the register expresses the genre [39, 247].

We analysed this theory in detail to see how it influences the researcher's understanding of the objective assessment of the translation quality. J. House differentiates two types of translation: overt and covert. In the first case a text is created that is perceived by the receiver as translation, the original function of the ST is not lost, just like its role in the SL culture. However, the TT functions differently in the TL and the target culture. The second type of translation presupposes creating a text that substitutes the ST in the TL and target culture.

Moreover, the functions of the ST and the TT coincide. Despite J. House's desire to use the possibilities of the functional approach, her theory is a linguistic one and translation can only be assessed by means of a comprehensive linguistic analysis.

Purpose statement. This paper aims at the analysis of the elaborated scientific approaches to assessing the quality of translation (linguistic, as well as communicative and functional) taking into account the world view of a modern human, the level of development of modern communication, as well as the peculiarities of the translation services market.

Presentation of the basic material of the research. Having differentiated the categories of equivalence and adequacy, let us turn our attention to distinguishing the criteria of assessing translation. It is related to the notion of “translator's error”. Researchers in the field of translation studies suggest various classifications of translator's errors [6; 23; 28]. The most comprehensive, to our mind, is N. K. Garbovskiy's classification who reveals cause-and-effect relations between an error and understanding the source message. The researcher distinguishes errors at various levels: errors at the level of a simple concept, complex concept, judgement, and the idea of the situation [10, 514–536]. However, this classification is also textocentric and reflects the linguistic approach to translation. The criteria elaborated by the researchers in the field of translation studies enable one to attribute “weight” to each error, thus improving the quality of translation.

The major difference of assessing the quality of translation in the communicative and functional approach to translation as compared to the linguistic one is its orientation towards a person. The main criterion of assessing the quality of translation lies in the ability of the TT to satisfy the needs of both SL and TL communicants. Furthermore, not only the receiver of the TT has the right to assess the quality of translation. Various communicative situations involve different requirements. One can assess translation from the point of view of the ST's author, receiver of the TT, as well as the client who ordered translation. Consequently, quality assessment of one and the same translation can differ.

Any classification of translator's errors is based on the theory of equivalence, though not all equivalent translation is adequate. For instance, do bottom-line factory employees need equivalent translation on how to install a piece of equipment reflecting every aspect of the ST if they cannot understand it? It is generally accepted that a translator has the right to change the ST. E. Prunch holds the opinion that a modern translator is a full member of communication with the same set of rights as any of the other communicants [22, 186].

Professional translator's task is to guarantee maximum adequacy of translation [11, 307]. In practice it can be achieved by setting optimal equivalence at all text levels for each particular situation. V. V. Sdobnikov suggests a detailed mechanism of translation quality assessment depending on the type of communicative situation which is of practical significance for translators as it gives a reliable scheme for translation.

Now let us analyse the classifications of translator's errors offered by leading researchers in the field. Many

schemes attribute some “weight” to each error showing its seriousness. Yu. L. Uspenskiy distinguishes five parameters: sense distortion, non-motivated omission of an equivalent, discrepancy in communicating rhematic information, non-observance of the cause-and-effect development of the notion, stylistic and spelling errors [29, 44]. Thus, alogism “weighs” only 0.25, while the “weight” of omitting an equivalent is 1. In 2007, V. V. Sdobnikov offered his own classification based on seven parameters: sense errors, content errors, logical errors, stylistic errors, spelling and punctuation errors. Sense errors have the “heaviest weight” – 1 [24, 185].

When speaking of written translation, M. A. Kunilovskaia divides translator’s errors into two big groups: sense errors and language errors. The first group includes errors in communicating referential information, structural and logical errors, logical misrepresentations, errors in rendering pragmatic information. The second group comprises lexical, morphological, syntactic, spelling, and punctuation errors [17]. D. M. Buzadzi, V. V. Gusev, V. K. Lanchikov and D. V. Psurtsev offered a more detailed classification that includes four groups of translator’s errors: sense errors at the level of denotative information, stylistic errors, errors related to miscommunication of author’s position, normative and common errors [6]. A. B. Shevchin subdivides translator’s errors into two types: errors related to incorrect understanding of the original and errors arising from misunderstanding during text creation [31, 26]. The linguist specifies the causes of errors without classifying them.

Classification of translator’s errors draws the attentions of managers of translation companies as well. Recent decades showed a tendency to formalize the process of assessing the quality of translation aimed at increasing the level of unbiased assessment of the result of translator’s professional activity. The “weight” of an error is one of formalization means. The TT is often marked to identify the severity of errors and to calculate the translation quality index (TQI) [18, 10]. For instance, European Commission’s Directorate General for Translation suggests codes to mark errors and define them. It distinguishes errors leading to change of the ST’s sense; sense errors that do not hinder the general comprehension of the text; relevant and irrelevant omissions to maintain the sense of a phrase; incorrect use of terms; grammatical errors altering or not altering the general sense of the text; spelling errors causing misunderstanding of the ST; punctuation errors; misprints; translator’s carelessness in using reference information [28, 25]. The severity of errors varies depending on the aim of the TT, as well as ways of its practical application.

Linguists distinguish two big groups of approaches to translation quality assessment: quantitative and non-quantitative models. Each of these models is used for particular types of texts: special and fiction resulting in deviations in the approaches to assessing translation. However, there is no generally accepted view on how to assess publicistic texts containing elements of both text types.

As a rule, quantitative models of assessing the quality of translation are created for particular

organizations for practical use. This model is based on a selective check of one or several text fragments where a specified number of translator’s errors is or is not allowed. Depending on the quantity and quality of errors the translation is considered acceptable or unacceptable. One of the first organizations to elaborate their own scale and criteria of translation quality assessment was Canadian Translation Bureau that offered its assessment model Sical (Canadian Language Quality Assessment System). In this model the quality of translation is assessed based on a four-layer scale and analyses a text extract containing 400 words. It differentiates between translator’s and language errors, major and minor errors [46]. Thus, superior translation allows no major errors and a maximum of 6 minor ones (A); fully acceptable translation contains 0 major errors and up to 12 minor ones (B); in case the translator has made one major and up to 18 minor errors, the translation is considered satisfactory, but revisable (C); if there is more than one major error and over 18 minor ones, the translation is unacceptable (D) [46, 3].

The company SAE that works in the automobile industry and creates industry-related technical texts suggested its own scale of assessing the quality of translating technical texts. This organization subdivides errors into wrong terms, syntactic errors, omissions, wrong word structure, spelling errors, punctuation errors, mixed errors (any language error in the TL text that is difficult to refer to one of the above-mentioned categories [44]. All of these categories contain a detailed description of translator’s errors. Moreover, there are subcategories subdividing errors into serious and minor ones [44, 3], as well as a degree of severity for each of the seven categories. Thus, an incorrectly used term in the TT carries 5 points in case it is a serious error and 2 points if it is a minor one [44, 6]. In case of a syntactic error, omission, wrong structure or combinability of words 2 and 4 points are added correspondingly [44, 6]. Therefore, the higher the number of serious errors and the total sum of points, the lower the quality of the translation. If the editor is in doubt whether an error is major or minor, (s)he is to refer it to the former. The authors of this classification stress that it has been elaborated for technical texts, the automobile industry in particular. Thus, if one wants to use it for assessing fiction texts where functional and stylistic aspect is of great significance, this classification is not suitable because it has been developed to assess texts devoid of expressiveness [44]. However, this classification is rather practical, just like the previous one where a certain quantity of errors is allowed in a text containing a particular number of words.

Another quantitative system of assessing the quality of translation is ITR BlackJack developed by the British company ITR for technical texts. American Translators Association elaborated its own quantitative-system-based-model in which it distinguished 24 types of errors (addition, ambiguity, cohesion, etc.) to assess the quality of translation [38]. However, the number of error types and sometimes ambiguous definition of errors makes it impractical and might cause difficulties in assessing the quality of translation [27].

From the point of view of applicability for non-fiction texts the best model of translation quality assessment is elaborated by the Localization Industry Standards Association. It is also based on the classification of translator's errors from the point of view of their severity. The list of errors and inconsistencies is quite big and it is easier to use it in electronic form – with the help of software developed by this company [27]. This software presents an intuitive table where translator's errors are subdivided into categories: the first columns display types of errors (incorrect translation, accurateness of translation, terminology, etc.), while lines show errors based on the degree of severity (minor, major and critical). The next column demonstrates the total number of errors, as well as the maximum acceptable quantity of errors (minor, major and critical) per specified number of words in the text. To estimate the quality of the translation, a translation quality index is applied. It is calculated based on a formula depending on the number of errors in a particular text extract [45].

Thus, the system of quantitative assessment of the quality of translation is quite practical for certain types of texts. This system assesses translation accurately, however it can only be used for texts devoid of expressive means, though some models of assessing the quality of translation (LISA, ATA) do have columns for stylistic errors and the register.

Nevertheless, the quantitative model was criticized by adherents of the non-quantitative model of assessing the quality of translation claiming that adherents of the quantitative method are guided by the microtextual level of assessing the quality of translation without taking into account the macrotext. As far as text is one whole, errors cannot be viewed at the level of separate lexemes or sentences in isolation from the rest of the text. However, this approach is rather theoretical. One of its representatives is Katharina Reiß / Reiss who suggests assessing texts depending on their functional and stylistic peculiarities. The researcher subdivides all texts into four categories: 1) texts aimed at content with the description of facts and communication of the sense of the message being in focus. Here belong newspaper articles, scientific works. The translator's main task is to render the sense of the message; 2) texts oriented at form; here the aesthetic and belles-lettres function are in the foreground. Examples include fiction and poetry; 3) texts with appellative function aimed at persuasion. Here belong propaganda and advertising. In translating texts of this type, the main target is to produce the same effect on the recipient as the ST; 4) media texts that are not communicated in written form. They include plays and oral speeches. Thus, Reiss differentiates between sense of the message and its form. She distinguishes linguistic elements (semantics, lexis, grammar) and stylistic aspects of extralinguistic elements (communicative situation, theme, period of time, location, auditorium, etc.) [37]. Christiane Nord holds the same view within the framework of the Skopos Theory of translation. The most important notions in her view are aim (or "end result to be achieved by means of action"), purpose (as "a preliminary stage in the process of achieving the aim"), function and intention [43, 28]. She distinguishes four text functions: factual, referential, expressive and

appellative that have various forms of expression in the text and can cause some difficulties in translation [42]. The researcher analyses examples, problems and ways of translating various texts, however does not suggest a clear scale of assessing the quality of translation.

Thus, non-quantitative model can be applied to assess expressive texts, however the adherents of this approach do not offer a concrete scale to assess the quality of translation.

Russian scholars are more inclined to apply the non-quantitative approach paying special attention to adequacy and equivalence as the main criteria of assessing the quality of translation [26]. V. N. Krupnov reviews various approaches to assessing the quality of translation and comes to the conclusion that translation quality assessment has to include four main operations: 1) assessment of the quality of translating words and word combinations; 2) assessing the translation of sentences and the text as a whole; 3) assessment of the quality of rendering expressive elements and stylistic peculiarities of the ST; 4) assessing how natural translation sounds and the influence the TT has compared to the ST [16, 60].

Manuals on editing translation present their own requirements to the final TT. Thus, besides complying with the client's requirements G. Moiseyenko emphasizes obligatory adequacy of the TT to the ST, viz. adequacy of communicating the sense of the ST, similarity of terminology and style of the whole document, absence of omissions in the text, correspondence to the rules and norms of the TL [21, 6–7]. The author suggests practical guidance on the translation of units that may cause difficulties for the translator (translation of geographical names, abbreviations, physical value units, etc.). He gives examples of correct and incorrect variants of translating "difficult" units explaining why a particular variant is preferable. In addition, the linguist offers help in formatting documents, the use of IT resources to provide for adequate translation. The manual proves helpful for practising translators and editors; however, it does not give a universal criterion to assess the quality of translation, i.e. a scale to assess the quality of translation quantitatively.

O. A. Albukova suggests three levels of translation quality assessment for non-fiction texts: microlevel, mesolevel, and macrolevel. Microlevel is the lowest one and analyses the translation of morphemes and separate lexical units. Mesolevel is a syntactic level of assessing the quality of translation and is performed at the level of word combinations and sentences. Macrolevel is the highest level; it takes into account the communicative and pragmatic aim, shows the correspondence of rendering the communicative purpose between the ST and the TT and determines the adequacy of the translation in general [2, 67–68].

According to the communicative and functional approach to translation, the result of translation is viewed as a text created in a particular communicative situation and is determined by a clear aim and function. Unlike the linguistic approach to translation where TT is recoding of the ST and the translator's task is to fully exchange the ST, the communicative and functional approach presupposes analysing both the ST and the TT

in a common communicative situation. If we assess the TT from the point of view of its comparison with the ST only, it can prove equivalent, however the assessment can be quite different if we take into account the historical period when the ST and the TT were created, analyse the conditions of translation, think of the target audience, its requirements, recall the client's aims, remember the authors of the ST and the TT [25, 35].

1995 marks the appearance of researches differentiating between educational and professional translation; the former being predetermined by the teacher. K. Klaudy claims that educational translation is directed at working out an adequate translation together with the students, finding the best translation solutions, reveal typical errors to avoid them in future, to develop students' professional skills [41, 201]. Thus, educational translation is aimed at the process of translation whereas the final result is of utmost significance in the professional one.

The translation performed in class is not, as a rule, used as a means of communication between speakers of different language cultures as far as both students and teacher speak the same language. No methods or techniques can recreate the real conditions of translation activity to put it in line with the professional translation; educational translation is a situation to be regarded as pedagogical activity. On the other hand, "Educational translation activity is to be built to imitate real translation activity" [25, 29–30].

It seems obvious that assessing educational translation from the point of view of communicative and functional approach can enhance students' self-evaluation and prepare them for their professional activity in the field of translation. Despite the fact that

educational translation differs from the professional one, recreating real conditions of professional translation and assessment of the translation by the teacher who discussed his role (client, recipient, author) with the students beforehand, though in the form of a game, gives students an insight into a real communicative situation of professional translation.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research.

Within the communicative and functional approach to translation quality assessment one takes into account the aim of the translation and all the parameters of the communicative situation. Dependence of the translation on the communicative situation predetermines the strategy of translation, thus the quality of translation isolated from the communicative situation can hardly be assessed for the value of the translation and the TT lies in satisfying the requirements of the participants of the communicative situation of translation. As to the theory, the communicative and functional approach do not repudiate the terms "equivalence" and "adequacy", but clarify their sphere of usage, the former being used in linguistics, while the latter characterizes the activity of communicants.

It is obvious that whatever the achievements of the linguistic approach to translation, the modern market of translation services, change of a modern person's view of the world make both theoreticians and practising translators enter a new level of researches in the field of translation studies. This new paradigm is the communicative and functional approach to translation that gradually and logically solves the majority of topical tasks related to the theory and practice of translation, including translation quality assessment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алексеева И. С. Текст и перевод. Вопросы теории. Москва : Международные отношения, 2008. 184 с.
2. Альбукова О. А. Обзор существующих подходов к проблеме оценки качества перевода. *Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики*. Тамбов : Грамота, 2016. № 4 (58) : в 3 х ч. Ч. 2. С. 65–69.
3. Бибихин В. В. К проблеме определения сущности перевода. *Тетради переводчика* : науч.-теорет. сб. Москва : Международные отношения. 1973. Вып. X. С. 3–14.
4. Блох М. Я. Эквивалентность и адекватность в переводческой проблематике. *Новое в переводоведении и лингвистике* : материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф. Орехово-Зуево : МГОГИ, 2012. С. 3–7.
5. Бродский М. Ю., Скворцов О. Г. Типология ошибок в свете компетентностного подхода. *Вестник Нижегородского государственного лингвистического университета*. 2007. Вып. 1. С. 18–28.
6. Бузаджи Д. М., Гусев В. В., Ланчиков В. К., Псурцев Д. В. Новый взгляд на классификацию переводческих ошибок / под ред. д-ра филол. наук, проф. И. И. Убина. Москва : ВЦП, 2009. 120 с.
7. Ванников Ю. В. Проблемы адекватности перевода : типы адекватности, виды перевода и переводческой деятельности. *Текст и перевод*. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 34–37.
8. Виноградов В. С. Перевод. Романские языки : общие и лексические вопросы : учеб. пособие. 4-е изд. Москва : Изд-во КДУ, 2007. 238 с.
9. Воеводина Т. В. О соответствии перевода жанровым традициям ПЯ в свете социологической теории перевода. *Тетради переводчика* : науч.-теорет. сб. Москва : Международные отношения. 1979. Вып. 16. С. 83–91.
10. Гарбовский Н. К. О переводе. Москва : Форум, 2016. 752 с.
11. Ивлева А. Ю. Основные этапы обучения переводу. *Перевод в меняющемся мире* : материалы Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. (Саранск, 19–20 марта 2015 г.). Москва : Азбуковник, 2015. С. 307–312.
12. Княжева Е. А. Оценка качества перевода: проблемы теории и практики. *Вестник Воронежского государственного университета. Серия : Лингвистика и международная коммуникация*. 2010. № 2. С. 190–195.
13. Комиссаров В. Н. Слово о переводе (Очерк лингвистического учения о переводе). Москва : Международные отношения, 1973. 216 с.
14. Комиссаров В. Н. Лингвистика перевода. Москва : Международные отношения, 1980. 167 с.
15. Комиссаров В. Н. Лингвистика перевода. Москва : УРСС, 2009. 170 с.
16. Крупнов В. Н. В творческой лаборатории переводчика. Москва : Международные отношения, 1976. 190 с.

17. Куниловская М. А. Классификация переводческих ошибок и их разметка в brat. *Проблемы теории, практики и методики перевода* : сб. науч. тр. Серия «Язык. Культура. Коммуникация». Нижний Новгород : НГЛУ им. Н. А. Добролюбова, 2013. Вып. 16, т. 1. С. 59–71.
18. Кутузов А. Б. Применение дескриптивной разметки для формализации оценки качества перевода : веб-сайт. URL: http://tc.utmn.ru/files/Kutuzov_xml.pdf (дата звернення : 30.07.2020).
19. Ланчиков В. К. Язык переводов как отражение их коммуникативной специфики. *Проблемы теории, практики и методики перевода* : сб. науч. тр. Серия «Язык. Культура. Коммуникация». Нижний Новгород : НГЛУ им. Н. А. Добролюбова, 2011. Вып. 14, т. 1. С. 58–66.
20. Митягина В. А. Коммуникативное действие как фактор перевода. *Ното Лоқиенс : Вопросы лингвистики и транслатологии* : сб. ст. / отв. ред. В. А. Митягина. Волгоград : Изд-во ВолГУ, 2014. Вып. 7. С. 3–10.
21. Моисеенко Г. Практический справочник переводчика и редактора. Москва, 2014. 123 с.
22. Прунч Э. Пути развития западного переводоведения. От языковой асимметрии к политической : пер. с нем. Москва : Р. Валент, 2015. 512 с.
23. Сапожникова О. С. Критика перевода : поиски объективных критериев. *Вестник Нижегородского государственного лингвистического университета*. 2009. Вып. 6. С. 11–18.
24. Сдобников В. В. Критерии оценки качества перевода и типология переводческих ошибок. *Проблемы лингвистики, перевода и межкультурной коммуникации* : сб. науч. тр. Серия «Язык. Культура. Коммуникация». Нижний Новгород : НГЛУ им. Н. А. Добролюбова, 2007. Вып. 8. С. 183–198.
25. Сдобников В. В. Оценка качества перевода (коммуникативно-функциональный подход). Москва : Флинта : Наука, 2015. 112 с.
26. Сдобников В. В., Петрова О. В. Теория перевода. Москва : Восток-запад, 2006. 448 с.
27. Тишин Д. Приложение 17. О приемах формализованной оценки качества перевода : веб-сайт. URL: http://philologician.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=227:prilozhenie-17-o-priemakh-formalizirovannoj-otsenki-kachestva-perevoda&catid=110:rekomentatsii&Itemid=538 (дата звернення : 30.07.2020).
28. Убин И. И., Пушнов И. А. Перевод в Европейском Сообществе : объём перевода и оценка качества перевода. Обзор. Москва : Всероссийский центр переводов научно-технической литературы и документации, 2011. 56 с.
29. Успенский Ю. Л. О профилактике типичных ошибок в письменном переводе и критерии оценки его качества. *Проблемы обучения переводу в языковом вузе* : тез. докладов Первой междунар. науч.-практ. конф. (16–17 апреля 2002 г.). Москва : Изд-во МГЛУ, 2002. С. 42–45.
30. Швейцер А. Д. Теория перевода : статус, проблемы, аспекты. Москва : Наука, 1988. 280 с.
31. Шевнин А. Б. Эрратология : монография. Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. гуманитар. ун-та, 2003. 216 с.
32. Штанов А. В. Критерии оценки учебных письменных переводов с русского языка на иностранный. *Проблемы обучения переводу в языковом вузе* : тезисы V Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. Москва : МГЛУ, 2006. С. 155–157.
33. Armstrong N. Translation, Linguistics, Culture. A French-English Handbook (Topics in translation 27). Clevedon; Buffalo ; Toronto : Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2005. 218 p.
34. Baker M. In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. London ; New York, Routledge, 1992. 305 p.
35. Barghout M. A.-M. Translation Quality Assessment. An Application of Rhetorical Model : A thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Salford, 1990. 286 p.
36. Catford J. C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation : An essay in applied linguistics. London : Oxford University Press, 1965. 103 p.
37. Delpech E. M. Comparable Corpora and Computer-Assisted Translation. London, ISTE Ltd, 2014. 304 p.
38. Framework for Standardized Error Marking Explanation of Error Categories : веб-сайт. URL: http://www.atanet.org/certification/aboutexams_error.php (дата звернення 30.07.2020).
39. House J. Translation Quality Assessment : Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation. *Meta*. 2001. Vol. XLVI, no. 2, P. 243–257.
40. House J. Translation. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009. 122 p.
41. Klaudy K. Quality Assessment in School vs Professional Translation. Dollerup C., Appel V. (eds.) Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3 *Teaching Translation and Interpreting-3* : New Horizons. Papers from the Third Language International Conference (Elsinore, Denmark 9–11 June, 1995). Amsterdam, Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995. P. 197–204.
42. Nord Ch. Translating as a Purposeful Activity : a Prospective Approach. *TEFLIN Journal*. 2006. Vol. 17, no. 2. P. 131–143.
43. Nord Ch. Translating as a Purposeful Activity : Functional Approaches Explained. Florence: KY, USA: Routledge, 2014. 161 p.
44. SAE Translation Quality Metric : веб-сайт. URL: http://www.apex-translations.com/documents/sae_j2450.pdf (дата звернення : 30.07.2020).
45. The Measurement of Quality in Translation. Using Statistical Methods : веб-сайт. URL: <http://www.translationquality.com/files/QualityMeas2002.pdf> (дата звернення : 30.07.2020).
46. Williams M. Translation Quality Assessment : An Argumentation-Centered Approach. Ottawa : University of Ottawa Press, 2004. 188 p.
47. Wills W. The Science of Translation. Problems and Methods. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, 1982. 292 p.

REFERENCES

1. Alekseeva, I. S. (2008). Tekst i perevod. Voprosy teorii [Text and translation. Issues of theory]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia [in Russian].

2. Albukova, O. A. (2016). Obzor sushchestvuiushchikh podkhodov k probleme otsenki kachestva perevoda [Overview of the available approaches to the problem of assessing the quality of translation]. *Philologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii s praktiki*. Tambov: Gramota, 2, 65–69 [in Russian].
3. Bibikhin, V. V. (1973). K probleme opredeleniya sushchnosti perevoda [On the problem of determining the essence of translation]. *Tetradi perevodchika*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 10, 3–14 [in Russian].
4. Blokh, M. Ya. (2012). Ekvivalentnost i adekvatnost v perevodcheskoi problematike [Equivalence and adequacy in translation activity]. *Novoe v perevodovedenii i lingvistike*. Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii. Orekhovo-Zuevo: MGOGI, 3–7 [in Russian].
5. Brodskiy, M. Yu., Skvortsov O. G. (2007). Tipologiya oshibok v svete kompetentnostnogo podkhoda [Mistakes classification from the viewpoint of competence approach]. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta*, 1, 18–28 [in Russian].
6. Buzadzi, D. M., Gusev, V. V., Lanchikov, V. K., Psurtsev, D. V. (2009). Novyi vzgliad na klassifikatsiyu perevodcheskikh oshibok [New scope of translation mistakes classification]. Moskva: VCP [in Russian].
7. Vannikov, Yu. V. (1988). Problemy adekvatnosti perevoda: tipy adekvatnosti, vidy perevoda i perevodcheskoi deyatel'nosti [Problems of translation adequacy: types of adequacy, types of translation and translation activity]. Moskva, 34–37 [in Russian].
8. Vinogradov, V. S. (2007). Perevod. Romanskii yazyki: obshchie i leksicheskie voprosy [Translation. Romance languages: General and lexical questions]. 4th ed. Moskva: KDU [in Russian].
9. Voevodina, T. V. (1979). O sootvetstvii perevoda zhanrovym traditsiiam PYa v svete sotsiologicheskoi teorii perevoda [On compliance of translated text to genre features of target language from the viewpoint of sociological translation theory]. *Tetradi perevodchika*. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 16, 83–91 [in Russian].
10. Garbovskiy, N. K. (2016). O perevode [On translation]. Moskva: Forum [in Russian].
11. Ivleva, A. Yu. (2015). Osnovnye etapy obucheniya perevodu [The main stages of translation teaching]. *Perevod v menyayushchemsya mire*. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii (Saransk, 19–20 marta 2015 g.). Moskva: Azbukovnik, 307–312 [in Russian].
12. Knyazheva, E. A. (2010). Otsenka kachestva perevoda: problem teorii i praktiki [Assessment of translation quality: problems of theory and practice]. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya*, 2, 190–195 [in Russian].
13. Komissarov, V. N. (1973). Slovo o perevode (Ocherk lingvisticheskogo ucheniya o perevode [On translation (sketch on the linguistic approach to translation)]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia [in Russian].
14. Komissarov, V. N. (1980). Lingvistika perevoda [Linguistics of translation]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia [in Russian].
15. Komissarov, V. N. (2009). Lingvistika perevoda [Linguistics of translation]. Moskva: URSS [in Russian].
16. Krupnov, V. N. (1976). V tvorcheskoi laboratorii perevodchika [In a translator's creative laboratory]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia [in Russian].
17. Kunilovskaya, M. A. (2011). Klassifikatsiya perevodcheskikh oshibok i ikh razmetka v brat [Classification of translation mistakes and their markup in brat]. *Problemy teorii, praktiki i didaktiki perevoda: sbornik nauchnykh trudov. Seriya "Yazyk. Kultura. Kommunikatsiya"*. Nizhny Novgorod: HGLU im. N. A. Dobrolyubova, 16 (1), 59–71 [in Russian].
18. Kutuzov, A. B. Primenenie deskriptivnoi razmetki dlia formalizatsii otsenki kachestva perevoda [Descriptive markup to formalize translation quality assessment]. Available at: http://tc.utmn.ru/files/Kutuzov_xml.pdf (accessed : 30.07.2020) [in Russian].
19. Lanchikov, V. K. (2011). Yazyk perevoda kak otrazheniye ikh kommunikativnoi spetsifiki [Language of translation as a reflection of the communicative situation]. *Problemy teorii, praktiki i didaktiki perevoda : sbornik nauchnykh trudov. Seriya "Yazyk. Kultura. Kommunikatsiya"*. Nizhny Novgorod: HGLU im. N. A. Dobrolyubova, 14 (1), 58–66 [in Russian].
20. Mityagina, V. A. (2014). Kommunikativnoye deistvie kak faktor perevoda [Communicative act as a factor of translation]. *Homo loquens: Voprosy lingvistiki i translyatologii*: sb. st. Volgograd: VolGU, 7, 3–10 [in Russian].
21. Moiseenko, G. (2014). Prakticheskii spravochnik perevodchika i redaktora [Translator's and editor's practical guide]. Moskva [in Russian].
22. Prunč, E. (2015). Entwicklungslinien der Translationswissenschaft. Von den Asymmetrien der Sprachen zu den Asymmetrien der Macht. Berlin, Frank & Timme, 2012 [Russ. ed.: Prunch E. Puti razvitiia zapadnogo perevodovedeniia. Ot iazykovoi asimmetrii k politicheskoi. Moscow: R. Valent [in Russian].
23. Sapozhnikova, O. S. (2009). Kritika perevoda : poiski objektivnykh kriteriev [Translation criticism; In search of objective criteria]. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta*. Nizhny Novgorod: NGLU im. N. A. Dobrolyubova, 6, 11–18 [in Russian].
24. Sdobnikov, V. V. (2011). Kriterii otsenki kachestva perevoda i tipologiya perevodcheskikh oshibok [Translation quality assessment criteria and classification of translation mistakes]. *Problemy lingvistiki, perevoda i mezhkulturnoi komunikatsii: sbornik nauchnykh trudov. Seriya "Yazyk. Kultura. Kommunikatsiya"*. Nizhny Novgorod: NGLU im. N. A. Dobrolyubova, 8, 183–198 [in Russian].
25. Sdobnikov, V. V. (2015). Otsenka kachestva perevoda (kommunikativno-funktionalniy podkhod) [Assessment of translation quality (communicative and functional approach): monograph. Moskva: Flinta: Nauka [in Russian].
26. Sdobnikov, V. V., Petrova O. V. (2006). Teoria perevoda [Translation theory]. Moskva: Vostok-zapad [in Russian].

27. Tishyn, D. Prilozhenie 17. O priemakh formalizirovannoi otsenki kachestva perevoda [Appendix 17. On the methods of formalized translation quality assessment]. Sojuz perevodchikov Rossii. Sankt-Peterburgskoie otdelenie. Available at: http://philologician.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=227:prilozhenie-17-o-priemakh-formalizirovannoj-otsenki-kachestva-perevoda&catid=110:rekomentatsii&Itemid=538 (accessed: 30.07.2020).
28. Ubin, I. I., Pushnov, I. A. (2011). Perevod v Yevropeiskom Soobshchestve: ob'em perevoda i otsenka kachestva perevoda. Obzor [Translation in the European Community: capacity for translation and translation quality assessment]. Moskva: Vserossiyskiy tsentr perevodov nauchno-tekhnicheskoi literatury i dokumentatsii [in Russian].
29. Uspenskiy, Yu. L. (2002). O profilaktike tipichnykh oshibok v pismennom perevode i kriterii otsenki yego kachestva [On the prevention of typical mistakes in translation and criteria of its quality assessment]. Problemy obucheniya perevodu v iazykovom vuze: tezisy dokladov Pervoi mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii (16–17 apreliya 2002). Moscow: Moscow State Linguistic University, 42–45 [in Russian].
30. Shveytser, A. D. (1988). Teoria perevoda: status, problem, aspekty [Translation theor: status, problems, aspects]. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
31. Shevnin, A. B. (2003). Erratologiya [Erratology]. Yekaterinburg: Ural Humanitarian University [in Russian].
32. Shtanov, A. V. (2006). Kriterii otsenki uchebnykh pismennykh perevodov s russkogo yazyka na inostrannyi [Educational translation assessment criteria of the written translation from Russian into a foreign language]. *Problemy obucheniya perevodu v iazykovom vuze: tezisy V mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*. Moskva: MGLU, 155–157 [in Russian].
33. Armstrong, N. (2005). Translation, Linguistics, Culture. A French-English Handbook. Topics in translation 27. Cleve-ndon; Buffalo; Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
34. Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. London; New York, Routledge.
35. Barghout, M. A.-M. (1990). Translation Quality Assessment. An Application of Rhetorical Model: A thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Salford.
36. Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An essay in applied linguistics. London: Oxford University Press.
37. Delpech, E. M. (2014). Comparable Corpora and Computer-Assisted Translation. London: ISTE Ltd.
38. Framework for Standardized Error Marking Explanation of Error Categories. Available at http://www.atanet.org/certification/aboutexams_error.php (accessed: 30.07.2020).
39. House, J. (2001). Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation. *Meta*, XLVI (2), 243–257.
40. House, J. (2009). Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
41. Klaudy, K. (1995). Quality Assessment in School vs Professional Translation. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting-3: New Horizons. Papers from the Third Language International Conference (Elsinore, Denmark 9-11 June, 1995)*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 197–204.
42. Nord, Ch. (2006). Translating as a Purposeful Activity: a Prospective Approach. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17 (2), 131–143.
43. Nord, Ch. (2014). Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained. Florence: KY, USA: Routledge.
44. SAE Translation Quality Metric. Available at: http://www.apex-translations.com/documents/sae_j2450.pdf (accessed: 30.07.2020).
45. The Measurement of Quality in Translation. Using Statistical Methods // 43rd ATA Conference (Atlanta, 2002). Available at: <http://www.translationquality.com/files/QualityMeas2002.pdf> (accessed: 30.07.2020).
46. Williams, M. (2004). Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-Centered Approach. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
47. Wills, W. (1982). The Science of Translation. Problems and Methods. Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.