

К ВОПРОСУ О ТЕНДЕНЦИЯХ В ПОДХОДАХ К ПЕРЕВОДУ (ПРАКТИЧЕСКИЕ МЕТОДЫ)

Н.Н. Хиоарэ

Перевод текста познавательного характера в некоторых случаях может рассматриваться как динамически эквивалентный перевод. Ситуация, когда текст переводится дословно, должна меняться, и правомерность каждого перевода должна зависеть как от категории исходного текста, так и от получателя, для которого выполняется перевод.

Переводчик сталкивается со сложными ситуациями, когда он может оказаться между двумя разными культурами (помимо отличительных черт есть разница в уровне), традициями, обычаями, разными социальными реалиями. В проанализированных примерах решающим фактором в переводе выступало общество, для которого был выполнен перевод.

Варианты перевода, предложенные переводчиками, продемонстрировали частичное совпадение двух культур: английской (LS) и румынской (LT) или наоборот, но в то же время показали уровень знания румынскими читателями британских социальных и культурных реалий.

Ключевые слова: переводимость, пары слов с общими корнями, пары слов с разными корнями, универсалии, относительные эквиваленты

ON TENDENCIES IN TRANSLATION APPROACH (PRACTICAL MODUS OPERANDI)

N.N. Hioarǎ

Translations that focus on cognitive content in some cases can be considered dynamic-equivalent translations. How individual translations treat the text directly should be radically different, and the legitimacy of each translation should depend on both the category of the original text and the type of receiver for which the translation is performed.

The translator / interpreter faces situations of great difficulty between two different cultures (in addition to specificity is the difference in level), traditions, customs, different social realities. In the analyzed samples, the decisive factor in the translation was the community for which the translation was performed. The choices made by the translators demonstrated the partial overlap of the two cultures: English (LS) and Romanian (LT) or vice versa, but at the same time demonstrated the level of knowledge by Romanian readers of British social and cultural realities.

Keywords: translatability, close pairs, distance pairs, universals, relative equivalents

The more difficult it is to translate TS, the more subtle is the new “mixture” of units of meaning, called seme, to be introduced into translation (TT). In this respect, the equivalence in translation will not be a word-for-word equivalence, collocation for collocation, sentence for sentence, but probably only paragraph for paragraph, or, less frequently, text for text. So for this reason, equivalence in translation, like the term “unit of translation” (UT), is sometimes a useful operational concept, but can only be roughly specified for a linguistic sequence. The authors of the paper were interested in transmitting the highest degree of translatability in a certain (economic) field. They considered dozens of confusions and pitfalls that could arise, such concepts that are completely unknown in the target culture related to traditions, clothes, faith, food, congratulations.

The first traces of civilization in antiquity is bound to the extensive use of translations. Their importance may be proved with the authority of historical documents.

In the book *Translators through History* edited by Jean Delisé and Judith Woodsworth (1995) full justice to the translators’ and interpreters’ remarkable efforts, throughout the centuries aiming at promoting cultural and scientific exchanges is engendered worldwide. Starting with 3000 B.C of the first vestiges and aftermath, the remarkable efforts of translators stretch from the Egyptian Old Kingdom to Livius Andronicus, a Greek slave who in 240 B.C. translated the Odyssey into Latin verse. Later on the famous translations were taken over by the Romans in 300 B.C., who speeded up and hit the road paved by Greeks acquainted with the Oriental texts developed by the flourishing period of the great civilization. The authors both the Greek and the Latin, appraised the worthiness of the artifact or memorabilia of humanity’s olden days and consequently, the intense translating activities were yielded during the golden age of Latin literature. The numerous approaches and many elements of

translation norms were proposed by Greek culture as well as by the Greek religious apparatus that unavoidably came forth.

Cicero (*De Oratore*) favoured free translation approach, he believed and foresaw the artistic potential of the Latin language, which has the necessary elements to synchronize and accompany the translators' creative capacity. Quintilian (*De Institutio Oratoria*) distinguished an element of "challenge" between the target text version and the source text. Religious translations, like King Arthur the Great in the ninth century, Luther's Bible (1522), King James's Bible (1611) gave rise to certain translation theory approaches which were structured as a series of dichotomies closely related to each other. The translations had a great impact on the development of literatures both for Germany and English. The series of dichotomies like: **faithful / unfaithful** translations, **literal** / free translations, possibilities / impossibilities of translating, source language (and culture) / target language (and culture) oriented translations, etc. were explained from the religious, philosophical and linguistically point of view [Dumitriu, Rodica, p.106].

The main concern of professional translators and scholars alike gravitated round such indispensable and key proceeding as the possibilities and fidelity of translation. Although the beginning of translations was interpreted as a warning that certain texts are doomed to failure, as the Word of God, still the conspicuous translators performed an adequate interpretation of it. The concept of language as a linguistically separated universe (Humboldt) imposed its own values and distinctions on thought. Both Helmsmen and Sapir adopted the idea of universe considering that each language proceeds, thoughts and the interpretation is peculiar to each language, leading to various difficulties (impossibilities) of translations, usually pertaining to the lexical level of language (wondering how different cut-outs of the surrounding world can be connected). For example, some unites smaller than the word (morphemes) can carry, on the one hand, meanings, gender, plurality, grammatical functions, tense which are not expressed on the surface. Everyday communication (in business, for example) creates continuously new languages' structure (new collocations), either by extending an existing range or by deliberately putting together words from different or opposing ranges. The established patterns in a language can therefore be used as a backdrop against which new images and new meanings can be invoked. The great number of existing meanings in a language vocabulary as well as new meanings may create difficulties while translating from the source language (SL) into the target language (TL).

The units smaller than words –*able, re-*, can carry meanings in words like: **practicable**, **procurable**, **reviewer**, **reusable**, **revalorization**, **revalue**. The other morphemes detain different grammatical functions as framing plurality: **securities**, **durables**, **fishmongers**, **rechecks**, they also can carry lack of plurality: **goods**, **logistics**, **statistics**, **Lloyd's**, etc. A number of small units can identify gender: **manageress**, **leopardess**, etc., tense: **graded**, **keeping**, **kite-flying**, **probates**, etc. A less number of similar items can identify more distinct formal elements of meaning which are not expressed as usual – on the surface (**man = male + adult + human**), that is, they are carried by units much more complex than words; it suggests that there is *no one-to-one correspondence* between orthographic word and elements of meaning within or across

languages.

Counterbalancing the difficulties in translating the smallest units and, on the other hand, the most complex ones, the capacity to find the closest and the most adequate approach in order to demonstrate the language potential, to tackle lots of hindrances, complications and snags one can refer to the procedure or to the *modus operandi* of presentation and production of several subtleties of translatability as in the case of the Brazilian word **arruacao** meaning *clearing the ground under coffee trees of rubbish and piling it in the middle of the row in order to aid in the recovery of beans dropped during harvesting*.

Another oddity and ilk befalling and arising in pledging and venturing translatability is the process of electing the proper equivalent needed for a certain text and context. English has endless hyponyms under *relaxation* and the translator finds it difficult to choose the precise analogous and commensurate variant in the TL among which are: **loosening up, repose, rest, informality, ease, abatement, alleviation, lessening, mitigation (informal), remission, slackening, weakening**. The same transpires with the adjective **difficult** with its numerous hyponyms which (even) have no equivalents in some languages, for example **stiff, onerous, peruse, unwieldy, beset with difficulties Herculean, Sisyphean**. Under **house** there are also a lot of hyponyms without equivalents in many languages; it is often adjoined and related with the geographical surroundings like: **box, pied-à-terre, gazebo, folly, house-boat, manor, croft, while under mixam** there exists a number of specific words (hyponyms) as **gnome, saw, wisecrack, catchword, byword, scholium, lemma, truism**, etc.

The authors of the paper interested in conveying the highest degree of translatability in a certain domain (economic) took into consideration dozens of embarrassments and pitfalls that may befall or come about, for example, **concepts** which are totally unknown in the target culture related to **traditions, clothes, belief, food, greetings**, i.e. the *culture-specific words* historically related to a different regions or countries; *the non-lexicalized concepts* in the TL which may be easy to understand and very accessible by most people, yet with no word specially *allocated* to express it; words with *two plurals* (**geniuses, genii**) and words with *similar forms and different meaning* (to *lay-lain-lain* and to *lie – lay – lain*) or the adjective (English) meaning **brilliant, man of genius** which is translated into the Romanian language as **genial**, although the English word **genial** means *cute, pleasant, favourable* (i.e. the Romanian equivalents are: **plăcut, agreeable, favorable, binevoitor, cald, înnăscut, congenital**) [Bantaș, Andrei et al., p. 144]; words with several meanings like *landslide* or complex semantic words like **solus** (Ro. *amplasare izolată a unei reclame în pagina de ziar* or *run cerere persistentă din partea creditorilor, depunătorilor sau clienților*); words that make more or fewer *distinctions* in meaning as **went away** with two variants in Russian *уехал, ушел*; languages with lots of hyponyms and no variants for *superordinates* (general words) like the English *facilities* meaning **services, premises, equipment** and rendered into Russian as **средства, услуги, помещение**; the case, when the source language expressive meaning differs from the target language one or when the more emotionally loaded meaning needs additional *evaluative elements* like *modifies* or *adverbs* as to reach a proper degree of translatability.

There come other categories of *untranslatable words (terms)*, relating to a specific geographical, historical, socio-cultural experience; which have always been touchstones for the translator. This interpretation is peculiar to each language, as each language has its own way of structuring reality, hence the difficulties of connecting nuances, dissensions, divergences of the surrounding world. Words such as *esprit, charme* (French), **understatement, establishment** (English), **spațiu mioritic, dor, tulburel, vârzari** (Romanian) [Levițchi, 53], **pilmeni, blini, maslenița** (Russian) belong to this category. Aspects of this kind (with lots of examples) have led Friederick Schleiermacher to the conclusion that there is not a single word in one language to have an exact correspondent in another. Gasset (1937) states that translation is an utopian task, because differences concern both the denotational (purely descriptive) and the connotational (subjective) meaning of the words. It makes an ample use of the latter (connotations) frequently used in poetic discourse advocating untranslatability. In this case Mary Snell-Hornby appeals to inner and outer forms of languages, furthermore, she promotes the opposite side of the translatability.

According to the second promoters of translatability, as Rene Descartes, they reverse the relationship between *reality* and *thought* in favour of the former considering that language representing the most important means of communication in society, entirely covers the total field of human knowledge and remains (expresses) the principle instrument for representing reality. Neo-Humboldtian theorists didn't take into consideration four (at least) issues reflecting the specificities of languages: 1) the evolution of any language under the pressure of everyday experience; 2) the similarities between various languages (see the „*cognate pairs*” (related languages) and „*distance pairs*” (non-related languages), in Russian - *близко-родственные языки и далеко-родственные языки*; 3) a more detailed analysis operated by a language over a particular *semantic field* that obviously reveals its importance for the respective culture; 4) The existence of specialized professional sub-codes (languages, jargon, terms, etc.). Here the authors will operate with terms of export and import and their quantitative indices in different semantic fields (XVIII) of economy pertaining to a single Harmonized System of Trade terms accepted as Standard Terms in EU. The research is based on the materials of the Association Agreement between EU and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, on the one part, and RM on the other part. Title IV. Economic and other sector Cooperation.

Back to our flock, i.e. to the translatability; some scholars adopted the notion of relative equivalence (the third approach) between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) by explaining their *midway position* that the general meaning can be reproduced in any language. Though the degree of translatability is historically determined and never thoroughly achieved Steiner shows that „not everything can be translated at any time”, and „an argument against translatability is (...) often no more than an argument based on local temporary myopia”. There exists the strongest argument for the translation based on the existence of universals in languages, thought and culture. Due to the presence of *lingua universalis* human reason can be expressed in all language systems (as to R.Descartes's and G.W.Leibniz theories).

This is the case, as to Nida (1982), when the *semantic criteria* are adopted being

aware that all languages have common classes of references: **activities, states, entities, processes, characteristics, relationals, on the other hand, and solidarity (power) relations, religion, cultural community**, on the other. All kinds of asymmetries can be solved through the expressive resources of each language by operating within the Saussurian concept of *parole* (language in use) rather than of *langue* (language as an abstract system). Each time the translator is choosing which of these two alternatives to support, which is valid for a concrete case. The degree of translatability varies with the distance of ST and TT (or target audience) in terms of time and place. The texts embedded in a culture of the *distant past*, tend to be less easily translatable than those texts dealing with the *universals* of modern sciences.

The analyses of translation using the *similarity* between various languages (Romanian, English and Russian) identified two types of approaches in making the translators' job much easier in providing the quantitative data of import and export terms useful within different semantic fields of economy. All in all, eighteen categories of goods pertain to fields such as: **animal and vegetable products, foodstuffs, mineral and chemical products, plastics, raw skins, pulp of wood, textiles, footwear, articles of stone, pearls, base metals, machinery, aircraft, surgical instruments, etc.**

Analysing 412 terms determining different goods, the teaching process (in terminology) became fruitful and workable when there was applied the *similarity* (and disimilarity) approach through *cognate pairs* (related words) and *distance pairs* (unrelated words), *CP* and *DP* – respectively. [Ruga E. et al., p.106]. Here are some examples taken from the 15th (in our research) semantic field entitled **Base metals and articles of base metal**. The articles are traded between the Republic of Moldova and 5 European countries as: Ukraine, Romania, Russia, Germany, Belarus. The goods classified according to the Harmonized System of Goods within the EU are translated and described starting with the Romanian terms versus English and English terms versus Russian variants identifying *close pairs (CP)* and *distance pairs (DP)*.

1. Ro. <i>articole din fontă fier și oțel</i>	1-CP 5-DP	Engl. <i>articles of cast iron and steel</i>	0-CP 6-DP	Ru. <i>Изделия из железа чугуна и стали</i>
2. Ro. <i>construcții și părți de construcții din fontă</i>	3-CP 4-DP	Engl. <i>Structures and parts of structure of cast iron</i>	0-CP 8-DP	<i>Металлоконструкции и части металлоконструкций из черных металлов</i>
3. Ro. <i>Bare din oțeluri nealiate</i>	2-SP 2-DP	<i>Bars of non-alloy steel</i>	0-CP 4-DP	<i>Прутки из железа или нелегированной стали</i>

There were identified 6 *cognate pairs* (1+3+2) in the translation of terms from Romanian into English and not a single *cognate pair* in the translation from English into Russian. There predominate *distance pairs*: 11 (5+4+2) and 18 (6+8+4) in the first two columns i.e. **Ro.- Engl.** and in the second **Engl.-Ru.**

Here the similarity approach is rendered predominately by word-for-word translation. Out of 412 terms of export and import 157 of them stand for *one-member*

(**IM**) or mono-valent terms, i.e. 38.1 per cent of the total amount [Dee Gardner and Mark Davies, p.305]. The rest of 255 terms signalizes the dominance of poly-valent members, out of which 126 terms are two and four member (**IIM**, **IVM**) terms with the indices of 46 (11.1%) and 40(97%); the third category of terms poses the five-member and six member-terms (**VM** , **VIM**) with the common data of 12 covering 2.9 percent, respectively, and the last category of terms lay the eight-, nine-, ten-, eleven- (**VIIIM**, **IXM** , **XM**, **XIM**) member terms disclosing the *lowest distribution* in the whole system of standardized terms with the quantitative indices of 6, 9, 2, 2 making up 1,4 percent within the endorsed and certified picture. It means that 255 terms dominate and produce 61.8 percent of the total picture. The more detailed analysis operated by this research over particular semantic fields or categories of activities (they are eighteen) which cover 137 divisions (or subcategories) reveals the entire portfolio and information ensuring the potential degree of acquiring the capacity of handling the techniques of translation.

Here is the data that each field of knowledge detains, as to the vocabulary, mono- or poly- member terms. Category I (**C.I**) holds 8 mono-valent terms and 20 poly-valents; **C. II** – 10 monovalent terms and 19 polyvalents; **C. III** – 2 monovalent and 6 polyvalent terms; **C. IV** – 8 monovalent and 8 polyvalent; **C. V** – 9 monovalent and 12 polyvalent terms; **C. VI** – 21 and 15; **C. VII** – 3 and 7; **C.VIII** – 5 and 4; **C. IX** – 1 and 9; **C. X**- 5 and 11; **C. XI** – 20 and 22; **C.XII**- 5 and 3; **C. XIII**- 17 and 14; **C. XIV**-2 and 5; **C. XV**- 13 and 21; **C. XVI** – 17 and 55; **C. XVII** – 4 and 7; **C. XVIII** – 7 and 17 summing up, literally, **157** monosemants making up 38.1 per cent and **255** polysemnats bringing about 61.8 per cent (out of the total amount of 412 terms of export and import, representing the EU Harmonized System of Goods [Gardner et al., p.306].

CONCLUSION:

1. Promoters of translation theories representing different schools identified lots of approaches making translation possible affirm that: a) language as an active principle imposes its own values and distinctions on *thought* and on *non-lingvistic world*; b) each language has its own way of structuring reality; c) the differences among languages (historic, cultural, etc) cannot create exact correspondence in other languages; d) the adoption of *relative equivalence* referring to the capacity of adjustment of languages is used as an argument of translatability based on *universals* in languages where *semantic criteria* reflects the human common classes of referents embedded in rich expressive resources of each language.

2. Similarity and dissimilarity in translation can be applied and trained while considering the close related or distance related languages. Although Romanian and English languages belong to different groups (Romance and Germanic groups) they possess a great number of common terms in export and import due to various historical contacts common in commerce and not only. There was also attested lack of similarity between languages in terms of synonymic series within semantic fields.

3. Teaching terminology the instructor should pay attention to language *universals* especially when the texts amounts discrepancies both in vocabulary and grammar and also to the **terms intensity**, i.e. to the number of *monosemants* and *polysemants* (the latter predominates twice (157:255)).

Literature

1. BANTAŞ, A; CROITORU, E. Didactica traducerii, Teora, Bucuresti, 1998, 144p. ISBN 973-20-0019-8
2. DIMITRIU, Rodica, Theories and Practice of Translation, Institutul European, Timpul, Iasi, 2002, ISBN 973-611-171-7
3. GARDNER, Dee; and DAVIES, Mark. A New Academic Vocabulary List. Applied Linguistics, Vol. 35 Number 3, July 2014. Portland State University, Portland USA, p.305-328. ISSN 0142-6001
4. LEVIŢCHI, Leon, Manualul traducatorului de limba engleza. Teora, Bucuresti, 1993, 126p. ISBN 973-601-048-1
5. RUGA, E; HIOARĂ, N; Teaching Terminology is not New. It exists since Adam was a boy. In: New approaches in Foreign Language Teacher Training. National Conference Materials. Sept 28, 2013, Balti, pp.106-113. Balti. ISBN 978-9975-4487-1-0