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* + 1. **ОПИС НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Найменування показників** | **Розподіл годин за навчальним планом** |
| Денна форма навчання | Заочна форма навчання |
| Кількість кредитів ЄКТС – 3 | Рік підготовки: |
| Загальна кількість годин – 90 | 4 | 4 |
| Кількість модулів – 1 | Семестр: |
| Тижневих годиндля денної форми навчання: аудиторних – 1,8самостійної роботи студента – | 8 | 8 |
| Лекції: |
| 20 |  |
| Практичні (семінарські): |
| 10 |  |
| Вид підсумкового контролю: залік | Лабораторні: |
|  |  |
| Форма підсумкового контролю: залік | Самостійна робота: |
| 60 |  |

* + 1. **МЕТА НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ**

Метою вивчення навчальної дисципліни «Культурологічні аспекти перекладу» є формування теоретичних засад перекладу безеквівалентної лексики та реалій, систематизація термінологічного апарату, а також підвищення рівня володіння англійської мови для забезпечення професійної компетенції під час перекладу та інтерпретації художнього тексту, написанні чи перекладі тексту. Курс орієнтований на студентів очної форми навчання, які вивчають англійську мову як основну іноземну мову, і знайомить їх з культурологічними особоивостями перекладу художнього тексту. Увага концентрується на особливостях мовної картини світу, а також принципах та стратегіях перекладу явищ, що не мають еквівалентів у мові перекладу з метою передачі особливостей національного колориту, мовної картини світу загалом та художньої картини світу автора.

У завдання курсу входить: ознайомити студентів із основними поняттями “реалія” та відмінності між низкою синонімічних понять (екзотизм, варваризм, алієнізм, термін, “культурно-маркований знак”; розрізняти та визначати прийоми відтворення культурно- та темпорально-маркованої лексики під час перекладу;

Курс «Культурологічні аспекти перекладу» складається з курсу лекцій та практичних занять, під час яких розглядаються проблематичні аспекти перекладу, пов’язані з безеквівалентною лексикою та численним підходам до її тлумачення, а відтак перекладу та пошуку адекватного еквівалента.

Відповідно до освітньої програми, вивчення дисципліни сприяє формуванню у здобувачів вищої освіти таких компетентностей:

* переклад безеквівалентної лексики;
* переклад реалій, що передають національний колорит;
* переклад реалій власних назв;
* переклад реалій-фразеологічних одиниць;
* принципи перекладу мовної гри, каламбурів, гумору та інших позамовних явищ.
	+ 1. **ПЕРЕДУМОВИ ДЛЯ ВИВЧЕННЯ НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ**

Передумовами вивчення навчальної дисципліни «**Культурологічні аспекти перекладу»** є опанування таких навчальних дисциплін (НД) освітньої програми (ОП):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Шифр НД за ОП | Назва навчальної дисципліни |
| ОК 17 | Розділи поглибленого вивчення англійської мови |
| ОК 20 | Стилістика англійської мови |
| ОК 21 | Лінгвокраїнознавство англійської мови |
| ВК 7 | Перекладознавчий функціональний аналіз тексту |
| ОК 22 | Теорія і практика перекладу |

* + 1. **ОЧІКУВАНІ РЕЗУЛЬТАТИ НАВЧАННЯ**

Відповідно до освітньої програми «**Культурологічні аспекти перекладу»,** вивчення навчальної дисципліни повинно забезпечити досягнення здобувачами вищої освіти таких програмних результатів навчання (ПРН)**:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Програмні результати навчання** | **Шифр ПРН** |
| **Аналізувати й інтерпретувати твори української та зарубіжної художньої літератури й усної народної творчості, визначати їхню специфіку й місце в літературному процесі (відповідно до обраної спеціалізації)** | **ПРН - 13** |
| **Здійснювати лінгвістичний, літературознавчий та спеціальний філологічний аналіз текстів різних стилів і жанрів** | **ПРН - 15** |
| **Знати й розуміти основні поняття, теорії та концепції обраної філологічної спеціалізації, уміти застосовувати їх у професійній діяльності** | **ПРН - 16** |

Очікувані результати навчання, які повинні бути досягнуті здобувачами освіти після опанування навчальної дисципліни «**Культурологічні аспекти перекладу»**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Очікувані результати навчання з дисципліни** | **Шифр ПРН** |
| **Здатність вільно, гнучко й ефективно використовувати мову(и), що вивчається(ються), в усній та письмовій формі, у різних жанрово-стильових різновидах і регістрах спілкування (офіційному, неофіційному, нейтральному), для розв’язання комунікативних завдань у різних сферах життя.** | **ФК-6.** |
| **Здатність до збирання й аналізу, систематизації та інтерпретації мовних, літературних, фольклорних фактів, інтерпретації та перекладу тексту (залежно від обраної спеціалізації).** | **ФК-7.** |
| **Усвідомлення засад і технологій створення текстів різних жанрів і стилів державною та іноземною (іноземними) мовами.** | **ФК-9.** |
| **Здатність здійснювати лінгвістичний, літературознавчий та спеціальний філологічний (перекладознавчий) аналіз текстів різних стилів і жанрів.** | **ФК-10.** |

**5. ЗАСОБИ ДІАГНОСТИКИ ТА КРИТЕРІЇ ОЦІНЮВАННЯ РЕЗУЛЬТАТІВ НАВЧАННЯ**

**Засоби оцінювання та методи демонстрування результатів навчання**

Засобами оцінювання та методами демонстрування результатів навчання з навчальної дисципліни є:

* залік
* стандартизовані тести
* презентації
* виконання індивідуальних та групових завдань
* переклад тексту
* комплексні контрольні роботи
* кейс-стаді (переклад та аналіз тексту на предмет наявності, типології та проблем перекладу реалій)

**Форми контролю та критерії оцінювання результатів навчання**

Форми поточного контролю: усне опистування, презентації, переклад тексту;

Форма модульного контролю: письмова

Форма підсумкового семестрового контролю: залік

**Розподіл балів, які отримують здобувачі вищої освіти (модуль 1)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Поточне оцінювання та самостійна робота** | **Модульна****контрольна робота** | **Сума** |
| Т1 | Т2 | Т3 | Т4 | Т5 | Пр | Переклад |  |  | 50% | **100** |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 20 |  |  |

**Розподіл балів, які отримують здобувачі вищої освіти (модуль 2)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Поточне оцінювання та самостійна робота** | **Модульна****контрольна робота** | **Сума** |
| Т1 | Т2 | Т3 | Т4 | Т5 | Пр | Переклад |  |  | 50% | **100** |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 20 |  |  |

Т1, Т2 ... – теми

Пр. – презентація

Переклад – переклад художнього тексту

**Оцінювання окремих видів навчальної роботи з дисципліни**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Вид діяльності здобувача вищої освіти** | **Модуль 1** | **Модуль 2** |
| Кількість | Максимальнакількість балів (сумарна) | Кількість | Максимальнакількість балів (сумарна) |
| Практичні (семінарські)Заняття | 5 | 20% | 5 | 20% |
| Лабораторні заняття (допуск, виконання та захист) |  |  |  |  |
| Комп’ютерне тестування при тематичномуОцінюванні |  |  |  |  |
| Письмове тестування притематичному оцінюванні |  |  |  |  |
| Презентація | 1 | 10% | 1 | 10% |
| Кейс-стаді  | 1 | 20% | 1 | 20% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |
| Модульна контрольнаРобота | 1 | 50% | 1 | 50% |
| **Разом** |  |  |  | **100** |

**Критерії оцінювання модульної контрольної роботи**

**Шкала оцінювання: національна та ECTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Сума балів за всі види навчальної діяльності | ОцінкаECTS | Оцінка за національною шкалою |
| для екзамену, курсового проекту (роботи), практики | для заліку |
| 90 – 100 | **А** | відмінно  | зараховано |
| 82-89 | **В** | добре  |
| 74-81 | **С** |
| 64-73 | **D** | задовільно  |
| 60-63 | **Е**  |
| 35-59 | **FX** | незадовільно з можливістю повторного складання | не зараховано з можливістю повторного складання |
| 0-34 | **F** | незадовільно з обов’язковим повторним вивченням дисципліни | не зараховано з обов’язковим повторним вивченням дисципліни |

**Критерії оцінювання підсумкового семестрового контролю**

**Шкала оцінювання: національна та ECTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Сума балів за всі види навчальної діяльності | ОцінкаECTS | Оцінка за національною шкалою |
| для екзамену, курсового проекту (роботи), практики | для заліку |
| 90 – 100 | **А** | відмінно  | зараховано |
| 82-89 | **В** | добре  |
| 74-81 | **С** |
| 64-73 | **D** | задовільно  |
| 60-63 | **Е**  |
| 35-59 | **FX** | незадовільно з можливістю повторного складання | не зараховано з можливістю повторного складання |
| 0-34 | **F** | незадовільно з обов’язковим повторним вивченням дисципліни | не зараховано з обов’язковим повторним вивченням дисципліни |

1. **ПРОГРАМА НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ**

**6.1. Зміст навчальної дисципліни**

Тема 1. Мовна картина світу. Лінгвокультурні імплікації в перекладі.

Тема 2. Культура та переклад

 Тема 3. Еквівалентність. Типи еквівалентності.

Тема 4. Поняття реалії в лінгвістиці. Суміжні поняття «безеквівалентна лексика», «екзотизм», «варваризм», «алієнізм», тощо. Функції реалій.

Тема 5. Класифікації реалій. Переклад реалій. Основні стратегії.

Тема 6. Колорит і стирання колориту. Формальна та динамічна еквівалентність.

Тема 7. Принципи перекладу мовної гри, каламбурів, гумору та позамовних елементів.

Тема 8. Переклад реалій фразеологічних одиниць

Тема 9. Переклад реалій – відхилень від норми (діалектизми, народна мова, суржик, жаргон, арго, іншомовні вкраплення)

Тема 10. Переклад як продукт. Локалізація, глобалізація та ринок перекладу. Реалії в автоперекладі.

* 1. **Структура навчальної дисципліни**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Назви змістових модулів і тем | Кількість годин |
| Форма навчання: |
| Усього | у тому числі |
| лекції | практичні (семінарські) | лабораторні | індивідуальна робота | самостійна робота |
| 1-й семестр |
|  |
| Лінгвокультурні імплікації в перекладі. Мовна картина світу. |  | 2 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Культура та переклад |  | 2 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Еквівалентність. Типи еквівалентності. |  | 2 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Поняття реалії в лінгвістиці. Суміжні поняття «безеквівалентна лексика», «екзотизм», «варваризм», «алієнізм», тощо. Функції реалій. |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| Класифікації реалій. Переклад реалій. Основні стратегії. |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| Колорит і стирання колориту. Формальна та динамічна еквівалентність. |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| Принципи перекладу мовної гри, каламбурів, гумору та позамовних елементів. |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| Переклад реалій фразеологічних одиниць |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Переклад реалій – відхилень від норми (діалектизми, народна мова, суржик, жаргон, арго, іншомовні вкраплення) |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Переклад як продукт, локалізація,глобалізація та ринок перекладу |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| **Разом за модуль** |  | **20** | **10** |  |  | **60** |

* 1. **Теми практичних (семінарських, лабораторних) занять**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| № з/п | Назва теми | Кількістьгодин |
| денна | заочна |
| 1 | Поняття еквівалентності, підходи до вивчення, різновиди, можливості подолання | 2 |  |
| 2 | Безеквівалентна лексика. Поняття, проблеми визначення, класифікація. | 2 |  |
| 3 | Переклад реалій- власних назв, термінів, скорочень. Переклад соціально-маркованої лексики | 2 |  |
| 4 | Гумор та гра слів у перекладі | 2 |  |
| 5 | Кейс-стаді. Прагматична еквіваленьність та безеквівалентна лексика на прикладі перекладацького аналізу художнього твору. | 2 |  |
| **Разом** | **10** |  |

**6.4. Самостійна робота**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| № з/п | Назва теми | Кількістьгодин |
| денна | заочна |
| 1 | Переклад, культурна ідентичність та міжкультурна комунікація | 6 |  |
| 2 | Культурні функції перекладу | 6 |  |
| 3 | Контекст та інтертекстуальність | 6 |  |
| 4 | Стратегії перекладу безеквівалентної лексики | 6 |  |
| 5 | Форенізація та доместикація | 6 |  |
| 6 | Міжкультурна субституція | 6 |  |
| 7 | Культурні табу. | 6 |  |
| 8 | Роль перекладача та етика перекладу. | 6 |  |
| 9 | Компетенціі автора-перекладача. Локалізація | 6 |  |
| 10 | Переклад як продукт, глобалізація та ринок перекладу | 6 |  |
|  | **Разом** | **60** |  |

1. **ІНСТРУМЕНТИ, ОБЛАДНАННЯ ТА ПРОГРАМНЕ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ, ВИКОРИСТАННЯ ЯКИХ ПЕРЕДБАЧАЄ НАВЧАЛЬНА ДИСЦИПЛІНА**

*(у разі потреби)*

Технічні засоби: комп’ютер, інтерактивна дошка, проектор, мобільний телефон.

**LECTURE NOTES**

**LECTURE 1.**

**1. Lingual picture of the world — conceptual picture of the world — artistic picture of the world: parametric features and correlations**

**1. Lingual picture of the world — conceptual picture of the world — artistic picture of the world: parametric features and correlations**

* *The interrelation of language and intellection and their correlation with culture and reality remains a difficult question in linguistics and philosophy. The emergence of the term****“worldview"*** *in linguistics is due to the turn of science to the problem of reflecting a human being in language and to consideration of language as a key phenomenon that forms a man’s personality.*

One of the main trends in modern cognitive linguistics is the study of closed conceptual systems and national characteristics of a cultural speciic vision of the world, relected in an ordered set of linguistic resources. hey provide a systematic presentation of the so-called linguistic world image, the world language of the nation.

The term "**worldview**" is one of the fundamental concepts that express the relationship between man and the world. The images of the world are extremely diverse, as it is always a unique perspective of the world, its semantic construction in accordance with certain logic or outlook. They have historical, national, and social determinism. There are as many images of the world as there are ways of a worldview because each person perceives the world and builds its image considering their experience.

The term "**world image**" was introduced by Ludwig Wittgenstein in his work «**Logico Philosophicus Tractatus**", who believed that intellection is the nature of speech and basically it is an activity with signs. In anthropology, the term "world image" has been considered in the works of the German scholar **Leo Weisgerber**, who tried to bring the philosophical ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt into the concept of language.

The concept of **"linguistic world image"** is rising to Humboldt’s teaching on the "inner form" and "the spirit of people". World image is not a mirror image of the world and open **"window " to the world, but rather the image, i.e it is interpretation, the act of understanding the world ... it depends on the prism through which the vision of the world is made”.**

The role of prism most successfully executed a metaphor because it is able to provide a review of what we already know. This rethinking of the image, the underlying metaphor, plays the role of the internal form with characteristic images or associations that provide a wide range of speech subject to interpretation and display the designated arbitrarily thin "shades" of meaning.

The terms **"linguistic worldview"** and **"conceptual worldview** are differentiated in scholarly discourse. A conceptual worldview makes the basis of the linguistic worldview. "Every natural language reflects a certain way of conceptualizing(perception and organization) of the world and thus the concepts expressed in language formal unified system of beliefs, which is a kind of "collective philosophy" and it is "imposed" on all native speakers as mandatory.

Thus, the **conceptual worldview** is a system of human knowledge about the world, the mental reflection of the cultural experience of the nation; the linguistic world image is its verbal embodiment. A view of the world is reflected in the world’s image.

Culture is directly related to the ethnic worldview. **Ethnic componen**t image of the world is a peculiar view of the members of that culture to the outside world, their concept of nature. The concept allows penetrating into the inner world of a person, as a bridge between the mind, as the place of the concept of existence, and the world as a subject of reflection of a concept. Being the primary cultural entities, concepts formed in the mind of the individual linguistic image of the surrounding cultural reality. his image, made up in the mind of the individual, is an image of the world of values, which provides communication between the representatives of the same culture.

Each natural language reflects a certain way of seeing the world and the device, or "linguistic world". A set of assumptions about the world, concluded within the meaning of different words and phrases of the language, is in a certain uniform belief system or regulations mandatory for all native speakers.

**H. Herz** was the first one who used the term “picture of the world” in 1959 to refer to a “set of internal images of external subjects that may give a particular connotation and description of these objects’ mood and behaviour”.

**“Mentality”** is the key component of the linguistic picture of the world, is a multifunctional notion that consists of a former received individual as well as a collective experience that reflects the person’s own needs, desires and emotions in relation to multiple life situations.

G. Lakoff in argues that “each linguistic picture of the world is individual as well as dynamic and is capable to reflect, create and ground stereotypes. It possesses universal traits to depict the current trends, needs, modes, desires and aspirations of modern linguistics society and its representatives. There are clear differences between the notions “definition knowledge” and “encyclopaedic knowledge” since the first one shows and reveals the basic traits of words, while the second one reflects accidental characteristics of words [p. 17–40].

Scollon and Scollon (2000) define the term **“stereotype”** as the act of overgeneralization of the received information from the surrounding world as “cultural ideological statements”.

**M. Lebedko** differentiates all stereotypes into:

 – Social, are based on social opinion;

 – Political, are formed on the observation of the official’s behaviour;

– Cultural, stand on the influence of the cultural process of the world perception;

– National, are found on collective beliefs creation;

– Behavioural, depend on the individual and personal characteristics;

– Geographical, particularly based on territory/ geography/region;

– Professional, based on professional experience and field evaluation;

– Ethical, namely are hinged on gender, age, race and ethnicity [p. 4].

The **key elements of the LWP structure**:

– nominative means of language, namely phraseological units, lexemes, set expressions; and the lack of these nominative means of expression, the second subtype that is characterized by the lacunas presence;

 – functional means of language that influence the composition of the most frequent linguistic units and selection of the needed vocabulary and phraseological elements to form the communication expression;

– figurative means of language that depicts national imagery, different shadows of the figurative meaning, the inner structure of the linguistic units that find its representation within various language structures;

* phonosemantics of language
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* [**https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RKK7wGAYP6k**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RKK7wGAYP6k)

**LECTURE 2.**

1. **Culture. National Identity.**
2. **Translation as a Means of Conveying National Identity.**

**Culture. National Identity.**

The definition of **"culture"** as given in the Concise Oxford Dictionary varies from descriptions of the "Arts" to plant and bacteria cultivation and includes a wide range of intermediary aspects. More specifically concerned with language and translation, Newmark defines culture as "**the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression**" (1988:94), thus acknowledging that each language group has its own culturally specific features. Thus, translating the source language (SL) into a suitable form of TL is part of the translator's role in **transcultural communication**.

**So, what is CULTURE?**

Language and culture may thus be seen as being closely related and both aspects must be considered for translation. When considering the translation of cultural words and notions, Newmark proposes two opposing methods: **transference and componential analysis** (Newmark, 1988:96). As Newmark mentions, transference gives "**local colour**," keeping **cultural names and concepts**. Although placing the emphasis on culture, is meaningful to initiated readers, he claims this method may cause problems for the general readership and limit the comprehension of certain aspects. The importance of the translation process in communication leads Newmark to propose componential analysis which he describes as being "**the most accurate translation procedure, which excludes the culture and highlights the message**" (Newmark, 1988:96).[K. James].

Identity is a part of someone’s character that distinguishes them from other people in this vast world. There are several kinds of identity embodied in an individual, one of them is national identity. National identity can be reflected by distinctive traditions, culture, and language and found in literary works. Literary works hold the national identity from how it is written and produced. It also shows the identity of the author and the culture reflected in the works.

To assess the national identity maintenance in translated literary works, the focus is on bridging the cultural difference between the source language and target language of the translation. One of the most challenging problems in translating is found in the differences between cultures, the source language (SL) culture, and that of the target language (TL) because **different cultures have different focuses**. The notion of ‘cultural term’ is prevalent in translation, especially in literary translation. Crucial, here, are the interrelated concepts of ‘**in-betweenness**’, ‘**the third space**’ and ‘**hybridity**’ and ‘**cultural difference**’, which postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha uses to theorize questions of identity, agency and belonging in The Location of Culture (Bhabha 1994).

**2. Translation as a Means of Conveying National Identity.**

**The translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions."** (Toury 1978:200). As this statement implies, translators are permanently faced with the problem of **how to treat the cultural aspects implicit in a source text (ST) and of finding the most appropriate technique of successfully conveying these aspects in the target language (TL)**. These problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned (see Nida 1964:130).



**Is everything translatable?** J. Murray argues that **translatability** is a relative notion and has to do with the extent to which, despite obvious differences in linguistic structure (grammar, vocabulary, etc.), meaning can still be adequately expressed across languages. The meaning has to be understood not only in terms of what the ST contains, but also and equally significantly, in terms of such factors as communicative purpose, target audience and purpose of the translation. This must go hand in hand with the recognition that, while there will always be entire chunks of experience and some unique ST values that will simply defeat our best efforts to convey them across cultural and linguistic boundaries, translation is always possible and **cultural gaps are in one way or another bridgeable**. To achieve this, **an important criterion to heed must be TT comprehensibility**.

A variety of different approaches have been examined in relation to the cultural implications of translation. It is necessary to examine these approaches bearing in mind the inevitability of translation loss when the text is **culture-bound**. Considering the nature of the text and the similarities between the **ideal ST and TT reader**, an important aspect is to determine how much missing background information should be provided by the translator.

Berman, argues that translator is inherently exposed to ethnocentric forces, which determine the ‘desire to translate’ as well as the form of the TT. Such tendencies can be neutralized only by psychoanalytic analysis of the translator’s work, and by making the translator aware of these forces (Berman 1985b/2004: 279).

Two fundamental approaches of translation are domestication and foreignization applied to cope with cultural terms. These are closely related to linguistic and cultural points of view. The distinction between ‘**word-for-word**’ (i.e. ‘literal’) and ‘**sense-for-sense**’ (i.e. ‘free’) translation goes back to **Cicero** (first century BCE) and St Jerome (late fourth century CE) and forms the basis of key writings on translation in centuries nearer to our own. In the domesticating translation, a translator **attempts to produce a target language translation as naturally as possible**. They try to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text in the SL for TL readers through a transparent and fluent style of translation that the TL readers feel like reading an original text, not a translated one. On the contrary, in foreignization, a translator attempts **to take the TL readers to the foreign culture of the SL and make them feel linguistic and cultural differen**ces. Here, the TL readers can recognize that they are not reading an original text but a translated one. Domestication and foreignization are often considered ideologies, strategies, or translation methods in many books and articles. When the translators believe that their translation is acceptable and correct, domestication and foreignization are considered ideologies.
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**LECTURE 3**

1. **Types of Equivalence.**
2. **Non-Equivalence and Ways to Deal with It.**
3. **Types of Equivalence.**

**Equivalence** refers to cases where **languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means**.

**R. Jakobson** describes three kinds of translation: **intralingual, interlingual** (translation between two different written languages) **and intersemiotic**. The key issues of interlingual translation are **linguistic meaning** and **equivalence**. The problem of equivalence goes back to the relation set out by Saussure between the signifier (the spoken and written signal) and the signified (the concept signified). Together, the signifier and signified form the linguistic sign, but that sign is arbitrary or unmotivated.

In Jakobson’s description, interlingual translation involves ‘substituting messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language’: The translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. (Jakobson,2004, p.139)

**Peter Newmark** introduced semantic and communicative translation. Below see the comparative table of Newmark’s semantic and communicative translation (taken from J.Munday “Introducing Translation Studies”, p.45):



**Koller** distinguishes five different types of equivalence:

(1) **Denotative equivalence** is related to the equivalence of the extralinguistic content of a text.

(2) **Connotative equivalence** is related to lexical choices, especially between near-synonyms. This type of equivalence is referred to as ‘stylistic equivalence’.

(3) **Text-normative equivalence** is related to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways.

(4) **Pragmatic equivalence**, or ‘communicative equivalence’, is oriented towards the receiver of the text or message. This is Nida’s ‘dynamic equivalence’.

**(5) Formal equivalence** is related to the form and aesthetics of the text, including wordplays and the individual stylistic features of the ST. It is also referred to as ‘expressive equivalence’.

**Katarina Reiss** links language ‘dimensions’ to the text types or communicative situations in which they are used.

The main characteristics of each text type are summarized as follows:

(1) **informative** ‘Plain communication of facts’: information, knowledge, opinions, etc. The language dimension used to transmit the information is logical or referential, the content or ‘topic’ is the main focus of the communication.

(2) **expressive** ‘Creative composition’: the author uses the aesthetic dimension of language. The author or ‘sender’ is foregrounded, as well as the form of the message.

(3) **operative** - ‘inducing behavioural responses’: the aim of the appellative function is to appeal to or persuade the reader or ‘receiver’ of the text to act in a certain way. The form of language is dialogic, the focus is appellative

(4) **Audiomedial** texts, such as films and visual and spoken advertisements which supplement the other three functions with visual images, music, etc. (Reiss, 1977: 108–9)



**M. Baker** differentiates:

1) Equivalence at a word level

2) Grammatical equivalence

3) Equivalence above a word level (collocations, set phrases, idiomatic expressions)

4) Textual equivalence (coherence and cohesion)

1. **Non-Equivalence and Ways to Deal with It.**

Non-equivalence at a word level means that the target language lacks a direct equivalent for a word that occurs in a source text. The type and level of difficulty vary depending on the nature of non-equivalence. Different kinds of non-equivalence require different strategies and tools. The context and purpose of translation frequently rule out some strategies and favour others.

Common types of non-equivalence (acc. To M.Baker):

1. Culture-specific concepts: the SL may express a concept totally unknown in the target culture which may be abstract or concrete, such as a religious belief, social custom, or a type of food;
2. The SL concept is not lexicalised in the target culture;
3. The SL word is semantically complex;
4. The source and target languages make different distinctions in meaning;
5. The TL lacks a superordinate;
6. The TL lacks a specific term;
7. Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective;
8. Differences in expressive meaning;
9. Differences in form;
10. Differences in frequency and purpose of using a specific form;
11. The use of loan words in the ST.

In dealing with any kind of non-equivalence, it is important **to assess its significance and implications in a given context**. Not every instance of non-equivalence is significant. **It is neither possible nor desirable to reproduce every aspect of meaning for every word in a ST**. A translator should try to convey the meaning of keywords, focal to the understanding and development of a text without distracting the reader who shouldn’t look up every word isolation, but have a full linguistic account of its meaning.
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**LECTURE 4**

1. **Untranslatable Words.**
2. **Culture-Specific Items and the Synonymous Concepts**
3. **Functions of Culture-Specific Items**

**1. Untranslatable Words.**

M. Baker defines translatability as **the capacity for some kind of meaning to be transferred from one language to another without undergoing radical change** (Baker, 1998). Owing to the fact that the concept of “meaning” varies greatly among different scholars, the definition of translatability itself remains a vague concept.

Untranslatable items are frequently referred to as **culture-specific words**, **culture-specific items (Aixela, 1996),** **non-equivalent vocabulary**, culture-bound elements (Nedergaard-Lassen, 1993), **culture-bound words** (P. Newmark), extralinguistic culture-bound references/ECR (Pedersen, 2005), **realia (Florin**, 1993) **nationally-biased units**, **culture-bound phenomena and terms**.

The theoretical frame of CSI translation is based on the following pillars:

1. **definition of realia**
2. **classification**
3. **Even Zohar’s polysystem theory**
4. **Venuti’s theory on translation strategies**

Speaking about the untranslatable in translation, Vlakhov and Florin (Влахов & Флорин: 1980:476) define **realias** as words (and composed expressions) of the popular language representing denominations of objects, concepts, typical phenomena of a given geographic place, of material life or of social-historical peculiarities of some people, nation, country, tribe, that for this reason carry national, local or historical colour; these words do not have exact matches in other languages, *for example, a representative of English culture, whose hairdressing does not know Cossack hairstyles, will understand the Ukrainian word* ***oseledets' (chupryna)*** *only if he knows that in this language the word "oseledets" means an ancient male hairstyle of the Cossacks in the form of a long strand of hair on the shaved head, and provided that he is familiar with the concept of "****Cossack****".*

T. Fesenko uses the term "**realias**" to denote the verbalization of the peculiarities of national picture of the world *[Fesenko, 2002: 3].*

Depending on the translator's task, he will face the eternal question: **to preserve the national colouring and cultural identity of CSI with certain losses for semantics**, or **to convey its reference value, while losing cultural identity?**

**Even Zohar’s Polysystem Theory (Even Zohar 1990)** presupposes that one literature represents a polysystem (system of various systems) and when a literary work is translated it becomes a part of the polysystem of a given national literature. The translated work can occupy a **primary** or **a secondary** position in the national literary polysystem.

The translation can occupy a primary position when it has an innovative role in the literary system, but, according to Zohar, secondary position is a normal position for translated literature. Consequently, if the translation occupies a primary position it will be source oriented, but if the translation has secondary position, it will be target oriented. In well-established literary systems, **translated literature remains on the periphery**. In other cases, however, it may have a privileged position or gradually achieve it as a result of constant competition between the centre and the periphery.

Even-Zohar outlines three cases when translation may play a central role:

 *a. when a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is “young”, in the process of being established;*

*b. when a literature is either “peripheral” (within a large group of correlated literatures) or “weak”, or both;*

*c. when there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature. (Even-Zohar 1978: 23)*

**\*Taking into consideration the fact that Ukrainian literature is not so familiar, one can assume that it will take secondary position in the “big” English (Anglophone) polysystem.**

Lawrence Venuti’s theory on domestication and foreignization (Venuti (1995: 20)) indicates **that domestication an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values, bring the author back home**, **while foreignization is ethnodeviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad).**

*Uk ST: Простягає мамі шматочок* ***млинця*** *на виделці і грайливо тицяє їй у рот, зубці встромилися в піднебіння — пішла кров.MS) EN TT: She holds a piece of* ***crumpet*** *out to Mama on a fork and, indulging her, pops it into her mouth so that the tines jab her palette — and there’s blood.*

*Uk ST: І ось знову забираєшся на двоповерхові нари і згадуєш перед сном щось приємне. От маму, наприклад. Прокинутися б вдома, а вона вже оладушки зробила, все на столі.* *(MS) EN TT: So you crawl back into the double bunk and try to think of something good before you fall asleep. Your mama, for instance. If only I could wake up at home and she would make* ***oladushki*** *and it would all be on the table*.

**2.Culture-Specific Items and the Synonymous Concepts**

**Culturemes** n. are terms or concepts that are specific to only one of the two cultural contexts involved in any act of translating. syn. the culture-bound term, etc. [Dictionary-of-translation-and-interpreting-Mason-Laver]. **Culturemes** can be described as **extra-linguistic cultural symbols**, which behave like metaphorical models, motivating figurative expressions in language (lexical or phraseological). The development of this concept in theoretical research on polysemy and phraseology shows that it can be an effective tool for organizing the representation of semantic networks of figurative meanings, according to culture-based associations of ideas [Antonio Pamies. The Concept of Cultureme from a Lexicographical Point of View, 2017].

The number of culturemes is difficult to quantify and is probably in the thousands. Though they may be opaque, **culturemes constitute a shared knowledge**, generating **implicit allusions to customs, prejudices, religion, mythology, superstitions, historical facts, famous characters (real or fictional), agriculture, hunting, fishing, livestock, trade, folk medicine, colors, fine arts, literature, songs, gastronomy, clothing, artistic creations, games, sports**, etc.

**False (pseudo-culturemes)** are items, whose meaning can be **both culture-specific and neutral, depending on the context** (*сотня – one hundred, сотня – Cossack military division, небесна сотня*)

**Excessive culturemes** – the use of these items is not necessary, at times even excessive, they often serve for the sake of extra decoration of the text rather than preserving the national colouring *(Теркин курил* ***махорку*** */ вместо* ***табак,***  ***vodka, whiskey, rakia – alcohol beverages: There he drank some weird vodka – “amadovka”, a cocktail, made of zubrowka and percovka).***

**Neologisms –** items, referring to novel concepts and phenomena, therefore they are included in this group exclusively in a narrow sense

**Author neologisms** embrace a wide layer of vocabulary: from obvious things and actions to the names of new unreal objects, animals and personages. They are all newly created lexical units, and most of them will not become a unit in a dictionary.

***Exotic words or ethnoculturemes*** are items, denoting phenomena, absent in the TL culture, however, known to the TL recipients (*snow in Tropical countries*).

Often require **exoticising translation** n. - the **practice of retaining source-text words or phrases in a translation, perhaps highlighting them by the use of italics, in order to add local colour**

**Barbarisms** are items, as a rule, borrowed from other (classical) languages to retain the national colouring (*protégé, apropos, alter ego, beau monde*).

Florin and Vlakhov claim that **these should be restricted to stylistics, not translation** studies, since:

1. realias are not always borrowed;
2. their signified has material equivalents in the TL culture,
3. they are often lexicalised and can be found in dictionaries)

**Lacunes** are non-translatable items, denoting phenomena and situations, absent in the TL culture.

* **Full lacunes** – absolute absence of a phenomenon in the TL culture : *primarily grammatical forms, missing in one or another language. For example,the grammatical category of* ***smikhut*** *is typical of Semitic languages, but missing in Slavonic languages****. Smikhut*** *is a grammatical category, which is similar in function to a combination of different parts of a language, such as an adjective and a noun, a noun and a noun, but has slightly different features. Most commonly noun laughter forms words with new meanings, moreover, its components - sumakh and nismakh - are not always semantically identical to their first meanings*;
* **Partial lacunes** – a range of the existing synonyms to refer to a similar phenomenon or situation in the TL (***Grammar lacunes*** *– articles, that can be compensated in Ukrainian by pronouns, numerals, etc.)*
* **Alienisms** - culture-specific items also referred to as stylistic exoticisms, frequently borrowed from rare or indigenous languages (*e.g, читалиште – просвіта у Болгарії, баница – a sort of sweet dish, etc.*)
* **localisms (dialectisms) - items, denoting locally-bound phenomena, yet devoid of historical or national colouring. They** require **dialect translation n**. - the treatment by the translator of non-standard features in a source text due to geographical, historical or social variation, sometimes referred to as **linguistic variation**. Seeking to replace a source-language dialect with a target-language dialect, deemed in some way to be its equivalent, **tends to be problematic** because of culture-specific nature of dialects. For this reason, **the default option** for plays and films is simply to use **standard language features in the translation**. However, where an underlying motivation for the use of dialectal forms in a source text can be discerned, **it may be possible to signal the intended values by the use of non-standard (but not dialect-specific) features of the target language.**
* **Terms** - **artificially coined items to designate a new object / phenomenon, hence they have no either national colouring or affiliation, they “belong to the whole mankind”.** There are no numerous equivalents for titles, organisations and international events, tthus translators in the sphere of international and mass communication has to know certain terms and names of culture-bound names: ***UN Security Council*** *– Рада Безпеки ООН;* ***Cuban missile crisis*** *– Карибська криза (рідше Кубинська криза),* ***House of Commons*** *– Палата Громад. Experienced translators are aware that* ***«Середня Азія»*** *is* ***«Central Asia» in English,******«Близький Схід»*** *is* ***«Middle East,*** *«****Пекін****» is* ***«Beijing****», therefore calques like «Центральна Азія», «Середній Схід» і «Беджінг» are inappropraite* (Белецька О.А., 2016).
* **culturally-marked signs -** Language units, denoting **concepts specific to a particular historical epoch, culture, and society**. A culturally-marked sign is a concept much **broader in scope** than that of realia (R.Zorivchak, S. Vlakhov, S. Florin). They are actualized through a variety of culturally and temporally marked signs of material and ideational character, additionally filtered by the authors’ artistic perception of the world.
* **Culturally marked signs** may be generally understandable to the TL reader, however they do not always evoke associations that a SL speaker might entertain. **The cultural marker is always more meaningful to the society in which it appeared, it is capable of invoking multifaceted associations**. When translating a literary text, it is necessary to transmit not only the reference nucleus of the cultural mark, but also **to truthfully render its “associative train”** (“асоціативний шлейф”) [Chala]. *\*З 13 назв вікторіанських транспортних засобів, кожний з яких був покажчиком рівня престижності (як і зараз феррарі) –* ***barouche, brougham, cab,******carriage, chariot, dog-cart, equipage, hansom, landau, one-horse conveyance, phaeton, sociable, Victoria*** *– в українських перекладах відтворено лише сім. Проте, в українській мові і літературі того часу (зокрема, у прозі Т.Г. Шевченка) можна знайти чимало різних позначень – гіпонімів поняття* ***екіпаж****. Словник С. Караванського надає більше двох десятків слів, серед них: берлин, бричка, бричка-нетичанка, віз, візок, дормез, карета, коляса, ридван, тарантас, тачанка, повіз, фаетон, фіра, фіякр (наймана карета), фура.*
1. **Functions of Culture-Specific Items**
* **Conveying local (national) colouring.** National affiliation is the key feature that indicates the ethnographic nature of **culturemes**, its connection with various forms of material and spiritual culture of the people. Hence, **culturemes** reproduce ethnographic features of life.
* **Conveying historical colouring.** Temporal relativity of culturemes is associated with the factor of time, which plays a crucial role in the creation of a model of a human-being in peculiar historical environments, making them a sign of a certain epoch.
* **Aesthetization of household objects.** Culturemes convey specific, visually-perceptible and spatial relationships (R-realities) of an object, making it a part of the "item dictionary", which often serves as the main material of an artistic text.
* **Symbolic function**. In this function, culturemes can become the key image of the work, its meta-image, which brings together other core motive imagery. Being in complex relations, symbolic meanings form a system by which expresses the artistic purport of the author.
* **Associative function** (implemented in case a cultureme is used as a part of or the title of the very title of an artistic text.
* The function of **a different culture marker**
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**LECTURE 5**

1. **Classification of Culture-Specific Items**
2. **Approaches to Translation of CSI. Translation Strategies**
3. **Classification of Culture-Specific Items**

**Peter Newmark** in 1988 first proposed five domains for classifying foreign cultural words. These domains are:

1) **Ecology** (flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills)

2) **Material culture** (food, clothes, houses and towns, transport)

3) **Social culture** (work and leisure)

4) **Organizations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts** (political and administrative, religious, artistic

5) **Gestures and habits**

**B. Nedergaard-Larsen** in Semantic Classification of “Culture Specific Elements”

proposed 4 groups:  geography, history, society, and culture divided into various subgroups.

 (Nedergaard-Larsen: 1993, p. 210–211)

* **The group geography:** mountains, rivers, weather, climate
* **The group history:**  buildings, events, and people.
* **The group society:** social organization, social conditions, ways of life, customs (food, meals, clothing…) etc.
* **The group culture**: religion, education, culture, etc.

\*This classification does not take into account the personal names of fictional characters, different from historical and political figures



Given all the existing controversies, a new classification of Culture-specific items was proposed by Florin and Vlakhov, based on the following parameters:

* **Object division**
* **Location division**
* **Time framework division**
* **Linguistic or particularly translation studies division**

**Classification on the Basis of the Signified:**

* **Geographic words**: Objects of physical geography and meteorology

(*крига, прерія, Океанія, raining cats and dogs, smog*)

* **Geographic objects, connected with human activities**

(*igloo, чалтик, etc*.)

* **Names of endemic animal and plant species**

(*йеті, секвойя, ківі, кенгуру*).

In the broadest sense, this group is **close to terms** (*степ* as a notion may be referred to as a term, however its types, characteristic of particular geographic zones - *пушта, прерія, пампа* – are **culture-bound words**). Similarly, the word “*jungle*” is a forest, typical of Indian mountainous areas, however, it acquired a new meaning “*thick woods*” that cannot be restricted to this geographical location.

**Classification on the basis of ethnographic parameters:**

* **Everyday life**: ***food and drinks*** (*чебуреки, спагетті, латте, піца, такос, начос, бограч*), ***restaurants and other food outlets*** (*бістро, McDonalds, etc*.)
* **Headgear and traditional dresses** (*вишиванка, сарі, кокошник*)
* **Accommodation, furniture, crockery and kitchenware**

*(хата, патио, фазенда, хутір, амфора, буржуйка)*

* **Transport - vehicles and drivers**

*(рікша, фіакр, кеб, гондольєр)*

* **Labour:** working people (*консьержка, грум, феллах*), tools and equipment (*лассо,мачете, бумеранг*), organisation of labour and household (*ранчо, латифундія, колгосп, керхан*)

**Art and culture**

* **Music and dance** (*гопак, лезгинка, хава-нагила, блюз*)
* **Musical instruments** (*бандура, балалайка, банджо, кастаньєти*)
* **Folk lore** (*байка, былина, сага, витязь, богатир, частушки*)
* **Theatre** (*кабуки, мистерия, коломбина, комедиа дель арте*)
* **Other arts** (*икебана, сино, маконда*)
* **Performers** (*трубадур, менестрель, скальд, кобзар, гейша*)
* **Customs and rituals** (*коляда, бетлегем, масниця, тамада, рамазан, намаз*) – “Christmas carol”
* **Holidays and games** (*паска, Івана Купала, Thanksgiving*)
* **Mythology and mythical creatures** (*мавка, леший, ельф, гном, вурдалак, валькірія*)
* **Cults, priests and followers** (*Далай-лама, друіди, квакери, дервіш), cult buildings (мечеть, розп’яття, синагога*)
* **Calendar** (*вересень, жовтень, Indian summer*)

**Ethnic objects**

* **Ethnonyms** (*гуцули, бойки, лемки, фріц, шваб, казах, осетин*)
* **Nicknames** (*mostly derogative or insulting: хохли, москалі, грінго*)
* **Nationalities, or location-derived nouns** (*гасконець, каріокас, подолянка*)

**Measures and money**

* Measures
* Currencies
* Colloquial terms for the former and latter (*bucks, пятак, гривенник*)

**Public and political realia**

* Administrative and territorial division and units (*кантон, губернія, арат*)
* Settlements, cities, towns (*хутір, аул, станиця*)
* Details and peculiarities of towns, cities, etc. (*променад, медина, корзо*)

**Authorities and officials**

* Political activities and politicians (*троцкисты, куклус-клан*)
* Patriotic and national movements (*партизани, хайдути, хунвейбіни, слов’янофіли*)
* Social and public phenomena (*hippie, bietnik, lobbyist*)
* Titles, forms of address, scientific posts (*кандидат і доктор наук, заслужений діяч культури і мистецтв, містер, сер, панна*)
* Establishments (*муніципалітет, райвно, рацс*)
* Cultural establishments (*ліцей, місіонерське училище, кампус)*
* Social strata and castes (*дворяни, брахман, кшатрія, самурай, купець, недоторкані*)
* Symbols and heraldic signs (*fleur de lis – біла лілія, тризуб, свастика, union jack*)

**Military realia**

* Military divisions (*дивізія, ескадрон, фаланга, орда, легіон*)
* Weapons (*мушкет, ятаган, таран, арбалет, катюша*)
* Military equipment (*шолом, кольчуга, кытель, бушлат*)

**Geographic classification** contemplates CSI, yet **through a different prism**.

Geographic classification contemplates the same phenomena , yet through a different prysm.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In the plane of one language | In the plane of two languages |
| Own realia-national (князь, гетьман, булава)-local (жупан)-microrealia | Internal realia |
| Foreign realia#-international (Business, computer, internet) -regional (бринза) | External realiaA word is foreign to both TL and SL(фйорд) |

**Classification by location** :

* **National realia (CSI)** – CSI, belonging to a particular nation, associated with a certain country: *бандура, галушки, козак*
* **Regional realia** - associated with a group of neighbouring countries or geographic region, thus belonging to several countries as well as nationalities: *большевик, колхоз*
* **International realia** – not restricted to a particular country and available in dictionaries, yet they bear some national colouring (*cowboy, sombrero, pizza*)
* **Local realia** - associated with dialectal words
* **Microrealia** – very narrow terms, associated with one village, street or even family (*четвертый километр – назва божевільні за географічною ознакою – відстанню від певного села*)

**In interlinguistic comparison**:

* regional realia
* international realia, “existing in the lexicon of many languages, which entered the vocabulary though preserving their initial colour ***Thematic classification by T.Ischenko (2012: 275)***

Linguistic realias are “**the units of translation**” (abbreviations and phrases).

From a thematic viewpoint, they may be subdivided into:

* **geographic** (names of the geographic and atmospheric objects and endemic species)
* **ethnographic** realias (which describe the daily life and culture of nations, their spiritual and material culture, traditions, religion, art, folklore, items connected with everyday life, names of residents and ethnic objects, currency units, etc .)

**According to the structure, all CSI can fall into:**

* **1-word realias** (*Princeton – коледж у Прінстоні, Quaker – квакер (Квакери – релігійна секта в Америці*)
* **multi-word realias** (*Pencey Prep – Пенсі (закрита школа інтернат для хлопців); Brin Mawr College and Shipley – Брін Мор, Шіплі – жіночі коледжі в штаті Пенсільванія)*
* **realias-phraseological units** (*reach the woolsack – стати лорд-канцлером, нім. Donnerwetter, das nennt man Schwein haben! – Сто чортів, оце-то пощастило!)*
1. **Approaches to Translation Culture-Specific Items**

The cultural distances between the **source text (ST) audience** and the **target text (TT) audience** can produce a fundamental dissimilarity between the **effects of the ST and those of the TT**. **The cultural gap** can best be seen in literary translations; literary works, due to their great number of culture-specific items (CSIs), specific values, aesthetic, and expressive features, are more difficult to translate than other kinds of texts. **The more a translator is aware of the complexities of the differences between cultures, the better they will translate**. Therefore, language and culture are closely related to and also inseparable from each other.

**Eugene Nida** coined the term **dynamic equivalence translation** to describe a "meaning-based" approach to translation— one that looks **for functional equivalence rather than formal resemblance in translation.**

A **metaphrase** is ***a verbal translation; a version or translation from one language into another, word for word; a literal translation; — opposed to paraphrase}****. Dryden. [1913 Webster].* Today, a metaphrase translation is more commonly called a *formal equivalence* translation.

In contrast to metaphrase, there is a **paraphrase or *saying something in different words. Paraphrase is not a true translation, but is, at best, an interpretation and commentary, and, at worst, is an intentional change of what the source text says***.

**The Socio-Cultural Theory of Peter Newmark**.

This theory examines some concepts set by this theoretician to show that t**ranslation as a process aims to transfer all the elements of the source text ST into the target text TT paying more attention to the cultural dimension**. This notion of "culture" is given more importance by Newmark who intends to maintain the ST cultural features while translating.

**Newmark’s strategies for translating CSIs (1988):**

* T**ransference**: transferring an SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure. It includes **transliteration**, which relates to the conversion of different alphabets: for example, Russian (Cyrillic), Greek, Arabic, and so on into English, and **transcription**.
* **Naturalization**: conforms the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then, to the normal morphology of the TL.
* **Cultural Equivalent**: replacing a cultural word in the SL with an, although not accurate, TL word.
* **Functional Equivalent**: a culture-free word is used, and sometimes a new specific term is used; therefore, it generalizes the SL word.
* **Descriptive Equivalent**: the meaning of CBT is explained in several words.
* **Componential Analysis**: comparing an SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning, although not being its one-to-one equivalent, by presenting, first, their common, and then, their differing sense components.
* **Synonymy**: It is a near TL equivalent. Here economy trumps accuracy.
* **Through-Translation**: the literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations and components of compounds. It can also be called **calque or loan translation**.
* **Shifts or Transpositions**: a change in the grammar from SL to TL, e.g.:
1. change from singular to plural;
2. when a specific SL structure does not exist in the TL, a change is required;
3. change of an SL verb to a TL word, change of an SL noun group to a TL noun, and so forth.
* **Modulation**: reproducing the message of the SLT in the TL text in accordance with the current norms of the TL, because, the SL and the TL may be different in perspective (It’s easy – It is not difficult).
* **Recognized Translation**: using the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term.
* **Compensation**: it occurs when the loss of meaning in one part of a sentence is compensated in another part.
* **Paraphrase**: in paraphrasing, the meaning of the CBT is explained. The explanation in paraphrasing is much more detailed than in the descriptive equivalent.
* **Couplets**: when the translator applies two different procedures together.
* **Notes, Additions, Glosses**: additional information that a translator may have to add to his version; the additional information that the translator adds is normally cultural.

**Luc Van Doorslaer's model**  **(2007)** introduces the following relevant and possible strategies to find a proper equivalent for CSIs**:**

* Acculturation
* Amplification
* Calque
* Compensation
* Condensation
* Direct transfer (Borrowing: a source language (SL) item is transferred directly to the target language (TL)
* Expansion
* Implicitation
* Interpretation (the elaboration of a CSI from the SL in the TL because of the fact that the CSI belongs to the SL culture with no counterpart in the TL culture)
* Modification
* Recategorization
* Adaptation
* Borrowing
* Coinage
* Concision
* Denominalization
* Dilution
* Interchange
* Modulation
* Paraphrase
* Reformation
* Omission

**Lawrence Venuti’s Cultural Studies-Oriented Analysis** [The Translator’s Invisibility, 1995]

**Foreignization** is a source-culture-oriented translation which strives to translate the source language and culture into the target one in order to keep a kind of exotic flavour.

As Venuti argued, it is ***to represent the type of translation in which a TT is produced which deliberately depart from target conventions by keeping something of the foreignness of the original.*** The strategy of foreignization (1995:20) proposed by Venuti is closer to literal translation, a foreignizing strategy attempts to bring out the foreign in the TT itself, sometimes through calquing of ST syntax and lexis or through lexical borrowings that preserve SL items in the TT.

**Domestication** refers to the translation which is oriented to the target culture and in which unusual expressions to the target culture are transmuted and changed into some familiar ones so as to make the translated text easy to be understood by the target readers. ***It is the translation strategy in which a lucid, fluent style is used in order to minimize the foreignness of the foreign text for TL readers*** (Schuttleworth & Cowies, 1997). Making a text’s meaning transparent and making it fit with the expectations of the TT audience is what the American theorist Lawrence Venuti (1995:21) calls domesticating translation or domestication. This is the strategy Venuti says is preferred by Anglo-American publishers, and readers, and involves downplaying the foreign characteristics of the language and culture of the ST.

**Vlakhov and Florín (1970)** suggest six procedures for translating realia: transcription, calque, formation of a new word, assimilation, approximative translation and descriptive translation.

**The Hervey and Higgins’ model (1992**) gives a four-degree classification for culture-specific items which the authors label as degrees of “cultural transposition” (exoticism, calque, cultural borrowing, communicative translation and cultural transplantation).

**Franco Aixelà (1996)** places translation procedures on a scale from conservation (repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, extratextual and intratextual gloss) to substitution (synonymy, limited universalisation, absolute universalisation, naturalisation, deletion and autonomous creation).

**Mayoral and Muñoz (1997)** offer an inventory of translation techniques that consists of established translation, validated translation, functional translation, borrowing, paraphrasing, a combination of resources, omission and creation.

 **Katan (1999:87)** only distinguishes three main translation strategies: generalisation, deletion and distortion.

 **Kwieciński (2001)** proposes exoticising, recognised exoticisation, rich explicatory and assimilative procedures.

 As **Ramière** points out (2006:3); “scholars do not agree on the number of procedures available to translators, or on to label them.”
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**LECTURE 6**

1. **The Definition of National Colouring**
2. **Formal and Dynamic Equivalence. Erasure of National Colouring**
3. **The Definition of National Colouring**

A person experiences this world by transforming objects into cultural phenomena and turning them into signs. Such a process combines the development and appropriation of reality, making it possible to consider objects as things and signs as social facts of human communication. To represent world perception and its reflection in verbal language, we apply a dynamic process of self-realisation, involving three types of self-deployment products of the universe, in which the life of a person goes on: **physical world** (“natural” world), **semantic construct** (spiritual world), **system of attributes, caused by public relations** (social world)

The notion of **colouring** appeared in literary criticism to refer to a **special quality of literary work, speech characteristic of personage, a special emotional or linguistic look of separate literary work or a writer’s works, that is all peculiarities and originalities.**

National colouring is complicated to render as it has to do with the connotation. Colouring of a word shows its belonging to a certain people, country, concrete historical translating. Connotations and colouring are part of the meaning which means they must be translated equally with semantic load of a word. If a translator managed to convey only a semantic component, the translated text loses its coloring for the reader.

Verbal images usually denote not nationally

biased notions, but those objects or phenomenon which pertain to the humans in

general, only the means is specific to the language background. to do with the connotative meaning. The reproduction of the national spirit of the original is one of the central problems in translation studies.

The impact which the natural coloring produces on the recipient of the source language text differs from the one it produces on the target language recipient. **National colouring** reveals itself specifically in different fields of spiritual culture of  people and thus in various types of translation. CSI as units of non-equivalent vocabulary, cause considerable difficulties for translators. The difficulty is that there are no equivalent means to render the national colouring and connotations of emotional, semantic and stylistic nature that accompany them in the source text.

However, a translator should not overuse the means that emphasize national colouring. If the text is overloaded with coloured exotic components, the reader could be fatigued by a vast amount of unfamiliar details. His attention might be diverted from the key means of the message. However, there are cases when connotation of a CSI dies down, erases. Such erasure logically leads to the turning of realia into a common, uncoloured word.

1. **Formal and Dynamic Equivalence**

**Formal equivalence** is a contextually motivated method of translation (i.e. a procedure purposefully selected in order to preserve a certain linguistic/rhetorical effect).We can sometimes preserve these effects in translation simply by doing nothing, which happens quite often when we do not need to interfere with the formal arrangement of words, structure, etc.

Preserving ST form, no matter how odd it might sound. This is formal equivalence, **a translation strategy strictly reserved for those situations in which ST form becomes inextricably linked to intended meaning and must therefore be preserved** (e.g. preserving intended ambiguity of form or meaning, with a focus on the ST);

The decision to opt for formal equivalence must always be a conscious decision (i.e. taken for a good reason and not gratuitously). The aim to adhere to the form would be to bring the target reader nearer to the linguistic or cultural preferences of the ST.

**Dynamic equivalence** was proposed by Nida (1964:139) as an overall translation technique which may take several forms. In dealing with texts that are likely to produce a dense translation, for instance, we may opt for building in redundancy, explicating or even repeating information when appropriate.

Alternatively, we may opt for **gisting**, a technique most useful in dealing with languages characterized by a noticeably high degree of repetition of meaning. Also as part of the adjustment, we may at times have to re-order an entire sequence of sentences if the ST order of events, for example, does not match normal chronology, or proves too cumbersome to visualize.

Various forms of adjustment, in an attempt to arrive at a wording that communicates **ST meaning without in any way offending against TL linguistic and rhetorical norms** (i.e. translating with naturalness and fluency). This is dynamic equivalence which focuses on the TT reader. But whichever kind of equivalence we eventually settle on, the decision must always be ‘contextually motivated’ (i.e. taken on adequate linguistic, rhetorical or conceptual grounds).**Unmotivated formal equivalence is a form of blind literalism, while unmotivated dynamic equivalence is a form of blatant re-writing** (J.Murray, p. 253)



**References:**

Matchanova M. The Role of Nationally Colored Words in Literary Translation. International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR) ISSN: 2643-9670 Vol. 4 Issue 11, November - 2020, Pages: 136-137

**LECTURE 7**

**Translation of Humour. Challenges and Translation Strategies**

**1. Humour: the Definition and Research Theories**

**2. Humour Translation Strategies**

**1.Humour: the Definition and Research Theories**

The translation is an important aspect of intercultural communication, as it enables speakers of one language to get insight into the artistic world of another language. Such communication is twice as significant in today's globalized society. Hence, a translator faces certain problems in search of equivalents to render untranslatable lexical units or lexical-grammatical structures that lead to humorous situations. Likewise poetry, humour poses a real challenge for translators: from a single sentence up to an entire work. A piece of writing is a verbal message with its own logical, figurative, emotional and evaluative information, which is the subject of our consideration because it is connected with the humorous effect of reading, listening or contemplating.

The difficulties of translating humour are stipulated by cultural aspects. The cultural reasons for the inability to translate humour are related to violation of social taboos, unfulfilled expectations, etc. Anecdotes are an extremely common type of humorous text in countries with a high level of political taboos. Similarly, popular home comedians are completely unknown abroad, because taking humour across the border deprives humour of its emotional impact, as it frequently requires additional explanations, i.e. descriptive translation. Despite its accuracy, such a translation is much longer than that of the ST.

Notably, humour is both an individual and a national trait.

**Humour is defined as:**

* **the actual moment of fun** (a “quality of being funny” or “**the situations, speech, or writings thought to be humorous**” [Collins]. Humour is used in everyday parlance to refer simultaneously **to an effect** and **its (con)textual causes**, an occurrence so normal(ized) that we don’t even notice it [Vandaele, 2002, p. 152-154].
* In its simplified version, **humour is an umbrella term for concepts like ‘pun’, ‘bonmot’, ‘satire’, ‘irony’, ‘nonsense’, ‘joke’, ‘comic’, ‘tease’, ‘whim’ and ‘practical joke’ within the boundaries of a square delimited by ‘wit’, ‘ridicule’, humour’ and ‘fun’** [Attardo, 1994, p.7]

V. Samokhina argues that “comprehension of a humorous text is not only a cognitive process aimed at building up the plane of content but the outcome of this process. The mental processing of humorous information is in essence an interpretation, and the cognitive specificity of a humorous text is related to creative thinking and speech. Humour is not just about meaning and significance. This is the effect that occurs due to its interpretation”.

**APPROACHES TO HUMOUR UNDERSTANDING**

Throughout the centuries, the two most general concepts used in humour research, as ways to characterize humour, have been incongruity and superiority.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Superiority (aggressive goal)** | **Incongruity (humour for the sake of humour)** |
| **Any (anti)social effect, intention or cause that humour may have, either interpersonal and socially visible or ‘private’ but with reference to the social world: superiority feelings in any possible ordinary sense of the word, self-esteem, feelings of intelligence, a sense of inferiority, stupidity, aggression, hostility, derision, disparagement, deprecation, in- and out-group feelings, solidarity, stereotyping and cueing.** ***Genres: Irony, satire, sarcasm, pamphlet, etc.******Teacher – "What is the meaning of the word matrimony?"*** ***Willie – "Father says it isn't a word, it's a sentence" (Language and Humour)*** | **all humour is essentially playful, aggression in humour is not necessary. Prototypical humour feelings are spontaneous but humour can be conventionally forced via cues, the right preliminary conditions or humorous stereotypes that are supposedly funny per se.*****Genres: jokes, anecdote, grotesque****,etc* ***"I had a fall last night which rendered me unconscious for several hours.“*** ***"You don't mean it? Where did you fall?"*** ***"I fell asleep" (Language and Humour).*** |

**2.Humour Translation Strategies**

Translatability of humour varies greatly with the changes in the views of what is translation. The fact that linguistic humour has long been considered untranslatable is greatly due to the conventional concept about the nature of translation and translation criteria.

**HUMOUR TRANSLATION STUMBLE-BLOCKS (J.Vandaele):**

* the force of reality’: different languages create different concepts for different realities (if a culture doesn’t know some type of tree,

it may not have a word for it);

* ‘the conceptual freedom of language’: different languages create different concepts for the same reality (think of the different colour systems);
* ‘sociolinguistic force’: different languages attach different connotations to similar denotations;
* ‘metalingual force’: different languages adopt different ways of joining various realities in one form (e.g. wordplay)

**4 CHALLENGES OF HUMOUR TRANSLATION (by J. Vandaele, 2002, p. 150)**

* humour has an exteriorized manifestation (laughter/smiling), whereas the ‘meaning’ of other texts is sometimes ‘less compelling’ in terms of perception;
* comprehension of humour and humour production are two distinct skills, as individuals may be very sensitive to humour but unable to produce it; translators may experience it but feel unable to reproduce it;
* the appreciation of humour varies individually (a translator may recognize an instance as comic but not find it funny, or be confronted with a personal dilemma of ‘translating a bad joke’ or going for a ‘real’ funny effect;
* the rhetorical effect of humour on translators may be so overwhelmingly strong that emotions may hinder analytic rationalization.

**Wordplay** (or *word play*, and also called *play-on-words/ play upon words*) is the clever and witty use of words and meaning. **It involves using various** [**literary devices**](https://literaryterms.net/literary-device/)**and techniques to form amusing and often humorous written and oral expressions.** Using wordplay techniques relies on several different aspects of rhetoric, like spelling, phonetics (sound and pronunciation of words), and semantics (meaning of words). Wordplay techniques are as follows:

* **Acronym -** [*shit*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shit) *from "ship/store high in transit*
* **Alliteration -** *Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers*
* **Assonance and Consonance -** *the fool called a duel with a mule*
* **Double Entendre -** *The baker has great buns*
* **Idiom –** *to have cold feet*
* **Malapropism -** “*Don’t give me an old tomato” instead of “Don’t give me an ultimatum”*
* **Onomatopoeia –** *Schnapps is gin that bites*
* **Pun -** *love at first bite*
* **Spelling -** *“Chris P. Bacon,” whose name sounds like “Crispy Bacon”*
* ***Neologisms*** – *sexorcism* – *eviction of a mother-in-law from a couple’s home by having sex*

***TRANSLATION OF WORDPLAY:***

* use of a wordplay that partly differs in semantic potential, but conveys the semantic component and retains a humorous effect of the ST;
* the omission of the wordplay in the TT and use of a phrase with humorous potential, which: (a) conveys only one of the meanings of the original; (b) does not reproduce or partially reproduces the meaning of the original; (c) weakens the strength of the humorous effect. The general humorous dominance of the work is thus preserved.
* Literal replication of the wordplay, adding translation comment that explains the meaning of the word game in the ST. However, it fails to convey the original humorous effect and leads to losses or distortions of the ST meaning

***Example****: «As for Mr Pin and Mr Tulip, all that need be known about them at this point is that they are the kind of people who call you* ***'friend'****. People like that* ***aren't friendly****» [Pratchett, p. 11].: «Що ж до пана Шпильки та пана Тюльпана, то головне, що слід про них знати – це те, що вони належали до категорії людей, які зазвичай називають вас* ***«братан».*** *Як правило, такі люди* ***не викликають братніх почуттів****».*

**A pun is a type of joke in which one sound sequence (e.g., a word) has two meanings, and this similarity in sound creates a relationship between the two meanings from which humour is derived.**

* What did the fish say when it swam into the wall?

Damn.

“When is a door not a door? When it is a jar [ajar]”

Puns can be:

* **homophonic** (identically sounding)
* **homographic** (identically written)

**Puns can be:**

* expressions used in a broader context of a text
* independent expressions, used as miniatures or epigrams
* newspaper headlines, short humorous stories, anecdotes
* captions to photos, pictures, and caricatures in advertising [Флорин, Влахов, с. 288]

*Hence, each type of pun requires different approaches and translating techniques, as it is somewhat easier to translate puns in a broader context. Context-less puns compel translators to exercise their ingenuity, translating skills, knowledge of the culture of both languages, and personal sense of humour to the fullest.*

Pun translation strategies:

* **Introducing the author’s neologisms or creative reinterpretation of the pun – making new puns in the TT and adjusting them to the ST context**

***"We called him Tortoise because he taught us".*** *" Вчителем у нас був старий вусатий Кит! Ми його ще прозивали Зубром, коли він**примушував нас зубрити!...“(Г. Бушина)*

* **using calque translation**

*«The* ***dwarfs dwarfhandled*** *their overloaded, creaking cart along the street, peering ahead in fog» [299, с. 10] - «Гноми, докладаючи* ***нелюдських, чи то пак – негномських зусиль****, штовхали свою перевантажену рипучу фіру вулицею, вдивляючись у туман» [291, с. 2].*

Puns are mostly translated with the help of a compensation strategy, i.e. in which the meaning components of the original, which are lost in translation, are rendered in the TT in some other way to compensate for the semantic loss. In other words, it is the replacement of an untranslatable element of the ST by a similar or any other element that compensates for the loss of the ST information and is capable of producing a likewise effect on the reader.

*Hey! You know why they call it a choir? Because ‘choir’ we listening to this crap?”*

*- Агов! Знаєте, чого ви зветесь ‘хор’?*

*-Бо хор зна чому ми слухаємо це лайно.*

**TRANSLATION OF SITUATIONAL HUMOUR WITH ETHNOCULTURAL COMPONENT*.*** Most losses in the translation of English humour into Ukrainian arise in the reproduction of situations based on the realia, connected **with ethnic stereotypes and associations.** The difficulty is that the realization of humour **depends on the background knowledge of the reader.** Translators make extensive use of **explanatory comments** in the TT or a **translation commentary in the footnotes** with the purpose to replenish the background knowledge of TT reader. However, this method either significantly **reduces the humorous effect or leads to a complete loss of humour. Translation strategies:**

* **addition of the word**

*«I remember going to the* ***British Museum*** *one day to read up the treatment for some slight ailment of which I had a touch (…)» [Jerome K.Jerome, p. 12] - « Я пішов до* ***бібліотеки Британського музею****, щоб прочитати, чим лікують одну легку хворобу, що саме причепилася до мене» [Ю.Лісняк, с. 8],*

* **cultural/contextual substitution**

*The only malady I could conclude I had not got was* ***housemaid’s knee»*** *[Jerome K. Jerome, p. 12]. - єдиною хворобою, якої я у себе не знайшов, була* ***мастопатія****» [О.Негребецький, с. 5]*

* **explanatory translation or omission of an ethnocultural component**

*Example 1.”“They ain’t a-going to cross the Atlantic,” struck in Biggs’s boy; “they’re a-going to find Stanley”» [Jerome K.Jerome, p. 44]. - «– Вони не збираються перепливати Атлантичний океан, вони будуть шукати Стенлі\*, – втрутився хлопчик Біггса» [Прокопчук, с. 43] with the comment («\*Стенлі, Генрі Мортон (1841-1904) – відомий англійський мандрівник (Прим. ред.)»)*  - *«– Вони не перепливатимуть Атлантичний океан. – втрутився Біґсів хлопець, – вони вирушають на пошуки Стенлі» [О.Негребецький, с. 56].*

*Example 2. «Alphabetically, there were no more diseases after* ***zymosis****, so I concluded there was nothing else the matter with me» [Jerome K. Jerome, с. 13].*

*«****Інфекційні захворювання*** *знаходились в книзі на останньому місці, тому я вирішив, що більше хвороб в мене нема» [В.Прокопчук, с. 6]*

*«****Після інфекційних хвороб*** *у переліку не залишилось нічого, і я вирішив, що більше жодна хвороба до мене не вчепиться» [О.Якушик, с. 8].*

***Allusions.*** An allusion is a reference, typically brief, to a person, place, thing, event, or other literary work with which the reader is presumably familiar. As a literary device, allusion allows a writer to compress a great deal of meaning and significance into a word or [phrase](https://literarydevices.net/phrase/): *Due to the widespread Corona Virus, the whole world is living through* ***the Great Depression****.*

However, allusions are only effective to the extent that they are recognized and understood by the reader, and that they are properly inferred and interpreted by the reader. If an allusion is obscure or misunderstood, it can lose effectiveness by confusing the reader.

**Allusion Translato8n Strategies:**

characteronyms or literary text anthroponyms which contain in their inner stem explicit, disguised or allusive characteristics of the person who is the bearer of the given name. Сharacterizing proper names are also called ‘speaking names’

* **Transcoding**
* **Calque** (*Василиск Бородавкин – Basilisk Wartkin, Младенцев – Infantov)*
* **Creative reintepretation of the original author’s design:***William de Worde* - *Вільям де Ворд* – transcription; *Otto von Chriek* - *Отто Крикк*; *Gunilla Goodmountain* - *Гунілла Вернигора* – word-to-word/calque translation; *Havelock Vetinari* - *Хевлок Ветерані* (Henry Havelock + pun:Medici – medicine, Vetinari – veterinary) – cultural adaptation; *Rufus Drumknott* -*Руфус Тулумбас*; *Altogether Andrews* - *Ендрюз-Разом-Нас-Багато* – descriptive translation; *Coffin Henry* - *Домовина Генрі* – false adaptation.

**Phraseologisms and idiomatic expressions:**

* **Transcription or transliteration** (*in case of a proper name component: John Bull – Джон Буль, або чистокровний британець*)
* **Finding an equivalent** - ***to talk billingsgate*** *(“сваритись, як базарна баба”)**Billingsgate –назва великого рибного базару в Лондоні*)
* Omission of an idiom

*Edward Cullen: I'm just checking for cold feet.*

*Bella Swan: Mine are toasty warm.*

*Edward Cullen: It's not too late to change your mind.*

*Едвард Каллен: Мені здається, що хтось тремтить.*

*Белла Свон: Я спокійна, як ніколи.*

*Едвард Каллен: Ще не пізно все скасувати*

* **Creative reinterpretation or playing upon the meaning of the ST idiom**

*«'Ah, Mr Word. Times is hard in the hot sausage trade,' said* ***Dibbler****. 'Can't make* ***both ends meat****, eh?' said William» [299, с. 11]*

*«Ах, пане де Ворде, зараз такі кепські часи для торгівлі перепічками, – пожалівся* ***Нудль****. – Еге ж, як подумаєш,* ***то аж нудить****, – вставив Вільям»* [291, с. 3]

Translating humour, the translator must consider the broad context of the literary work, focusing on the play on words, the use of allusions, proper names and nicknames, and the creation of novel lexical expressions in the TT. The translator's task is to decide upon the level of adaptation of the ST to the conditions of the TL, leaving it either mostly intact (foreignizing strategy and the use of barbarisms), or completely adjusting the ST to the TL norms as possible (domesticating strategy). A rational balance between the two is of utter importance, the main issue being the maximum adaptation of the overall emotional context, as the ST primarily aims at imagery and emotional impact. The appropriate translation of humour involves plenty of implicit knowledge, based on ethical and political aspects and cultural component. Another challenge of humour translation is the lack of very SL concepts in the TL, requiring additional explanations and comments and huge creative potential on the part of a translator.
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**LECTURE 8**

**Translation of Idioms, Set Expressions, and Collocations.**

1. **Equivalence above the Word Level**
2. **Translation Strategies to Render Idioms, Set Expressions, and Collocations**



1. **Equivalence above the Word Level**

What happens when words combine with each other to form a stretch of language? M.Baker: “**Words are not strung together at random in any language, there are always restrictions on how they can be combined to convey meaning**”.

* **Collocations**
* **Set / fixed Expressions and Idioms**

**Collocations** are semantically arbitrary restrictions that do not follow logically the propositional meaning of the word [Baker, p.47]. **A tendency of certain words to co-occur regularly in a given language.**

**Marked and register-specific collocations -** an unusual combination of words, one which challenges our expectations as hearers or readers. Often used in fiction, humour, advertisements, and poetry to create unusual images, produce laughter, and catch the reader’s attention: *Some tout at the book fair wanted me to take UK rights in a book on glasnost and the crisis of peace. Essays by past and present hawks, reappraisals of strategy. Could real peace* ***break out*** *after all? (John le Carre. “The Russia House, 1989, p.102). War* normally *breaks out* but *peace prevails*.

These unmarked collocations suggest that the war is a temporary and undesired situation. Collocation refers to the way that words are typically used together. In English, to borrow the well-known example from Leech (1981:17), *pretty woman* is a typical (or strong) collocation, and so is a *handsome man*. This does not mean that *a handsome woman* or *a pretty man* is impossible, just that they are very unusual or marked. *An interesting example using just this collocation occurs in the episode* ***Fathers and Sons*** *of the American sitcom* ***Frasier****. An old friend of the family turns up after many years and, looking for Niles, sees a female character, Ros. The friend at first thinks Niles must have undergone a sex change. When he is made aware of his error, he concludes by telling Ros ‘You are a handsome woman’ where the marked collocation is humorous because it shows that his initial perception continues* (Murray, Hatim, p.251).

‘The collocational range of equivalent words between languages will not be identical. It will overlap but not match completely.’ This is where corpora can help. By comparing with results from a concordance of related words in the TL, the lexicographer is able to map the two language systems onto each other and make more accurate decisions about correspondences between the two languages (Larson).

**Set / fixed Expressions and Idioms** are structurally, lexi­cally and semantically fixed phrases or sentences having mostly the meaning, which is not made up by the sum of meanings of their componentsth. A feature of idiomatic (phraseological) expressions is their figurative, i.e., metaphorical nature and usage.

The lexical meaning of idiomatically bound expressions can coincide with their direct, i.e., not transferred mean­ing, which facilitates their understanding as in : ***to make way дати дорогу; to receive a hero's welcome зустрічати як героя; wait a minute/a mo­ment зачекайте хвилинку/ один момент; to tell (you) the truth правду казати/правду кажучи; to dust one's coat/jacket витрусити пальто/ піджака - дати духопеликів (idiom).***

**Idiomatic/phraseological expressions should not be mixed up with different**

* fixed/set prepositional, adjectival, verbal and adverbial phrases: *by George, by and by, for all of, for the sake of, cut short, make-believe*;
* compounds : *topsy­-turvy, higledy-piggledy;*
* coordinate combinations like *high and dry, cut and run, touch and go; Tom, Dick and Harry, etc*.

Unlike idioms, fixed expressions have a fairly transparent meaning that can easily be deduced from the meaning of their constituents*: Many happy returns, As a matter of fact, Merry Christmas*. They encapsulate all the stereotyped aspects of experience and therefore perform a stabilizing function in communication. These are **situation or register-specific formulae** [Baker].

**Difficulties in Translating Idioms**

Two main complexities:

1. the ability to recognize and interpret the idiom
2. The ability to render various aspects of meaning that an idiom or a fixed expression conveys into the target language

**Interpretation of Idioms**

1) **some idioms are easily recognisable** (*it’s raining cats and dogs, storm in a teacup,* etc.) The more difficult an expression, the less sense it makes in a given context, and the more likely a translator will recognise an idiom)

2) **some idioms are misleading**, in English they can have both a literal and idiomatic meaning: *go out with, take someone for a ride*

*Example: I’d just done my stint as rubber duck, see, and pulled off the grandma lane into the pitstop to drain the radiator.*

**Strategies to Translate Idioms**

1) **using an idiom of similar meaning and form**: *«an early bird» - «Рання пташка»;* *«against the grain» - «Проти шерсті (гладити)», «way of life» - «Спосіб життя», «old wives’ tale» - «Бабині казки»*.

2) **using an idiom of similar meaning but dissimilar form**: *one good dog deserves a good bone, to carry coal to Newcastle*

3) **translating by paraphrasing:** *Programmes to teach heritage languages to ethnic youngsters in upper elementary or high school are all quite laudable, but if it is merely a question of trying to reinforce or replant first language competence already lost for all practical purposes, then it is rather like shutting the stable door when the horse has bolted.*

4) **translation by omission (when there is no counterpart, or for stylistic reasons**: *It was bitter but funny, to see that Professor Smith had doubled his own salary before recommending the offer from Fayed, and added a pre-dated bonus, for good measure.*

5) **translation by compensation** (to omit idiomaticity at the point it occurs in the ST and introduce it elsewhere in the TT): *because they were unable to translate certain puns at the points where they occurred in the text, the translators of ASTERIX resorted to inserting English puns in different frames of a cartoon.*

**Culture-specific collocations -** Express ideas previously unexpected in the target language. Like culture-specific words, they point to concepts not easily accessible to the target reader.
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**LECTURE 9.**

**TRANSLATION OF SOCIOLECTS**

1. **The Definition and Typology of Sociolects**
2. **Translation of Sociolects**
3. **The Definition and Typology of Sociolects**

The terms “sociolect” and “social dialect” are used interchangeably but according to John Platt, it is better to use the concept of dialect when dealing with regional variations. (Platt 1978, 28).

**Dialect** is defined as “a variety of language that differs from others along three dimensions: vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation”, dialects are language forms that are particularly associated with geographical areas.

**Sociolect** is “a variety related to its speakers’ social background rather than a geographical background” (Trudgill). Sociolect is the language spoken by a particular social group sharing the same features. Hence, sociolects are *defined* on a social basis rather than a regional one.

**Idiolect** is “the linguistic idiom of an individual, his/her linguistic ‘fingerprints’” (Roger 1995, 39). Whereas sociolect is associated with a social group’s use of language, idiolect reflects a particular use.

Sociolects are characterized by several features:

* they are primarily social,
* they can be defined in terms of geographical factors and can represent a variety within a regional dialect itself (Schatz 1986, 240),
* they are overlapping speech varieties, interacting with one another.
* they include age, gender, social class, education, socioeconomic circumstances and ethnicity and can define an individual identity.

The subdivisions of sociolects:

* occupational sociolects (a professional language, not coded like jargon) and “technolects” (professional terminology, abbreviations and acronyms)
* expressive sociolects (slang and jargon, typically associated with specific social groups)
* religious sociolects (registers similar to medical and philosophical texts)
* Political sociolects or “sociocultural versions of sociopolitical speech” (Sheigal 2004, 237), whose characteristic feature is doublespeak or deceiving at a core.
1. **Translation of Sociolects**

Translators should always take into account sociolects since their “features …convey important speaker-related information. If they are salient features of the ST, the translator cannot ignore them when deciding on a strategy” (De Sándor, Hervey & Higgins 2002, 165). Thus, the translator should identify sociolects from the very beginning. Once they have identified the sociolect in the TT, they can decide on the appropriate strategy to use to ensure adequacy.

There are two approaches to translating sociolects

* using a target language dialect with similar denotative and connotative meanings, although this may lead to unwanted associations. This strategy requires a translator to analyse thoroughly the ways language is used in the ST and how the relations of power and status are represented, then choose the appropriate TL equivalent to render both language and cultural variations since they are interlinked.
* translating a sociolect in a standard language which ensures readability but makes these variations disappear. Some scholars consider replacing a sociolect with a standard language equivalent **an under-translation** that modifies the original message. Moreover, sociolects impact speech behaviour and style. Haywood, Thompson & Hervey argue that *“the speech of a pipe-fitter who speaks in a formal way, may resemble the speech of a salesman who speaks a casual way”* (2009, p. 177).
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**LECTURE 10**

**1. Localization, globalization, and automatic translation**

**2. Corpus-based translation**

**1. Localization, globalization, and automatic translation**

**Globalization** has redefined the role, relationship and status of translators, as well as a translator’s role in the global environment. In the computerized age, translation has become big business and in the industry (especially the software industry) is often subsumed into the acronym GILT – Globalization, Internationalization, Localization, Translation.

The difference between **localization** and translation is blurred, but localization is seen as a superordinate term that encompasses translation. Thus, in the words of LISA, the Localisation Industry Standards Association, **localization** involves taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold.

**Internationalization** leads to the adaptation of accepted communication models. Thus, the production of multiple TL versions (e.g. software localized for distribution worldwide in the local languages) modifies the ‘simple’ model of ST–TT transfer. Internationalization is above all concerned with the **functionality** of the target text rather than representing a measure of TT against its ST.

**Video game translation** is a blend of audiovisual translation and software localization. This type of activity is also called ‘game localization’ since the games may be subtitled or dubbed or both. The important defining feature is the ‘creativity and originality’ that is demanded of the translator (Murray, p. 189) in order to ensure that the game is entertaining. Such creativity includes the **renaming of elements and characters, using neologisms, and the deliberate choice of non-standard dialects**. The process is sometimes referred to as **transcreation**.

**2. Corpus-based Translation**

New technologies have transformed translation practice and are now exerting an impact on research and, as a consequence: **corpus-based translation studies**, **audiovisual translation**, and **localization**.

The rapid evolution of computer systems enabled the creation of an **electronic corpus (plural corpora) of naturally occurring texts** (i.e. texts which had been written for a communicative context and not artificially invented by the language researcher) **that could then be processed and analysed with software to investigate the use and patterns of the word-forms it contained**.

The major reason for using computer corpora was **the quality of linguistic evidence, particularly on collocations and typical uses of lexical items.**

Translations are often characterized by grammatically correct but artistically clichéd terms. It is with the advent of large computerized databases and readily-available tools that these hypotheses could actually be tested on vast amounts of text.

**Types of Corpora:**

(i) **monolingual corpora**, large collections of texts which may be analysed for naturalness (e.g. by translators translating into their L2). In addition, it is important to add that such monolingual corpora, such as the British National Corpus and the Cobuild Bank of English may serve as representative **reference corpora**, a yardstick of the language against which to measure deviation.

(ii) **comparable bilingual corpora**, which are normally specialized collections of similar STs in the two languages and which can be ‘mined’ for terminology and other equivalences

(iii) **parallel corpora**, of ST–TT pairs, which, when aligned (sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph), can allow the strategies employed by the translator(s) to be investigated.

Some scholars adopt a **contrastive analysis** approach, using the analysis of comparable corpora that may **be genre specific**.

.
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**Seminars:**

**Seminar 1.** The Notion of Equivalence, Approaches to its Study, and Varieties.

➤ Choose two kinds of text (a news report and a fiction text, preferably on the same topic), and translate into Ukrainian.

➤ Try out the idea of initially opting for a literal translation and of moving on to other forms of equivalence only when necessary.

➤ Go through the translation and reflect on the decisions you have made. Record these decisions and label them (L = literal, F = formal if contextually motivated, D = departure, Sy = syntactic, Se = semantic, P = pragmatic, etc.).

➤ Are departures from the literal fairly common and in which kind of text: the news report or the fiction text?

➤ In addition to the type of text, what other factors can you identify as playing a role in translating? What aspects of language are affected most, and in which kind of text?

➤ You can now extend the sample to include other translations and examine the kind of complex decision-making necessitated specifically by (a) the need to capture the connotative meaning and (b) the need to comply with textual and rhetorical norms relevant to respective texts.

**Seminar 2.** The Problems of Translatability, Untranslatability, and Non-Equivalence. Culture-Specific Items: Definition and Classification. Theoretical Background.

**Seminar 3.** Equivalence at a Word Level. Translation of Proper Names, Historic Terms, and other Culture-Specific Items.

**Seminar 4.** Equivalence Above a Word Level. Translating Humour, Puns, Idiomatic Expressions and Sociolects.

*Translate the following texts into Ukrainian, and comment on the strategies you have resorted to as well as any change in the level of informality. Compare the English collocations and idiomatic expressions and their Ukrainian counterparts.*



**Seminar 5.** The Case Study: Translation Analysis of Pragmatic Equivalence and Culture-Specific Items in a Selected Fiction Text.

*A list of five steps for the translator to follow in moving from ST to TT:*

*(1) Identify the units of translation.*

*(2) Examine the SL text, evaluating the descriptive, affective and intellectual content of the units.*

*(3) Reconstruct the metalinguistic context of the message.*

*(4) Evaluate the stylistic effects.*

*(5) Produce and revise the TT.*

**Додаток 2**

**Результати перегляду**

**робочої програми навчальної дисципліни**

Робоча програма перезатверджена на 20 / 20 н.р. без змін; зі змінами (Додаток ).

(потрібне підкреслити)

протокол № від « » 20 р. Завідувач кафедри

(підпис) (Прізвище ініціали)
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(підпис) (Прізвище ініціали)