

Multidimensional Translation, from Science to the Arts

Multidimensional Translation, from Science to the Arts

Edited by

Lina Abraitienė and Žanna Daragane

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Multidimensional Translation, from Science to the Arts

Edited by Lina Abraitienė and Žanna Daragane

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2022 by Lina Abraitienė, Žanna Daragane and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-8880-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-8880-6

CONTENTS

Lexical Transformations in the Translation of Humour in the Novel “The Old Man and the Sea” by Ernest Hemingway into Russian and Latvian	1
Ekaterina Bertule	
Translating the Institutional Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives	9
Corina Vasile	
Innovations in a Study Programme with a Focus on Translation Studies: Some Prefatory Remarks on a Future Research Project	16
Kludia Bednárová-Gibová	
Towards Efficient and Effective Toolkits in Literary Translation	23
Liana Georgiana Oprea (Moga)	
Multi-Dimensional Model of Simultaneous Interpreting as a Basis for Professional Training of Interpreters at University Level	32
Yuri Maslov	
An ICC-Assessment Model for FL-Translation in Foreign Language Education	40
Muriel Waterlot	
Introducing a Project: A Report on Methods of Measuring Interpreter Trainees' Progress	55
Martin Djovčoš and Miroslava Melicherčíková	
Making the Inaccessible Accessible: An Overview of Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility	61
Lina Abraitienė	
Professional Vocabulary Building for Art Speciality Students of Foreign Language (Russian) Classes	70
Valentina Kalinina	

Manifestations of Deficit in the Translation of Idioms.....	78
Aleksandra Ľaučuka	
Literary Translation in the Lessons of Russian as a Foreign Language ...	86
Irena Mikulaco	
Neologism: A Unit of Linguacreation and Literary Translation.....	109
Veronica Razumovskaya	
Were Silent Films Completely Silent in Latvia? Forerunners of Modern- Day Audio Describers	115
Ivan Borshchevsky	
Russian Translations of "Mirabeau Bridge" by Guillaume Apollinaire as an Original Text Creative Interpretation	120
O. Belajev	
Современная русская литература в переводах на словацкий язык (факторы отбора текстов)	128
Мартин Лизонь	

LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE
TRANSLATION OF HUMOUR IN THE NOVEL
“THE OLD MAN AND THE SEA”
BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY INTO RUSSIAN
AND LATVIAN

EKATERINA BERTULE
BALTIC INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY, LATVIA

The research is dedicated to the study of lexical transformations (hereinafter referred to as LT) that have been used in the translation of humour in the protagonist's speech in the novel "The Old Man and the Sea" by E. Hemingway into Russian and Latvian. The original text, one of its Russian translations and the only Latvian translation are analysed with the goal to determine the linguistic means (hereinafter referred to as LM) that have been applied for creating a humorous effect (hereinafter referred to as HE) and to reveal LT that have been used in translation of the expressions of the character containing humour.

As a rule, humour in a person's speech bears their ethnocultural features. Each language is characterized by its specific methods of creating humorous effect, and that is why translators face a challenge when working with literary texts containing humour. The use of LT is unavoidable in the translation of literary texts and humorous elements thereof.

Lexical systems of English, Russian and Latvian contain differences that are reflected in the particular types of semantic structure of words. The essence of LT is the substitution of lexical units in the source language for the lexical units of the target language that are not their equivalents. In general, there are eleven types of LT: concretisation, transliteration, generalisation, modulation, descriptive translation, antonymic translation, compensation, lexical addition, and omission.

The notion of humour in modern English encompasses several concepts such as comedy, fun, the ridiculous, nonsense and some others (Chiaro 2010, 14). The Russian word *юмор* has been borrowed from English. The term is defined as "a special type of the comical conjoining taunt and empathy, outwardly comical representation and inner sympathy, to a certain extent even excuse, for the object of humour" (Хазова, Юмор как ресурс совладающего поведения 2012, 177). In modern Latvian *humors* means "ability to discover in life and subjectively express contradictions and imperfections of people in a comical way" (*Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca*, online).

There are various LM being applied for creating a humorous effect. Most of them represent broadly speaking a play on words. HE can be based upon the reconsideration of the lexical meanings of phraseological units, puns, or by creating the ambiguity of expressions. Incorrect pronunciation, false definitions of phenomena, inappropriate use of words, ironic use of words (Фененко, Комическое в тексте оригинала и перевода 2005, 106); terms, names, titles, metaphors, epithets, and comparisons can be applied for the above-mentioned purpose. Jokes are often built upon absurdity, nonsense situations, irrationality, self-irony and style variations (Blake 2007, 13), as well as filler words and slips of the tongue (Rozenbergs 1995, 115).

Translating humour is a challenging task from extralinguistic and cultural points of view. Ideally, an original text and its translation should cause a similar reaction of their addressees. For that reason, the specific features of the mentality and perception of the target language audience must be considered.

It is difficult to translate humour from English into Russian and Latvian since the former is an analytic language while the latter two are synthetic (Krasovska, Humour in J. R. R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit" in the Context of English and Latvian Culture 2006, 132). Expressive elements of an original text are extremely laborious to transfer to its translation (Голикова 2004, 211). Sometimes a translator is forced to employ a descriptive translation. Literal translation can also be unavoidable in some situations (Молчанова, Юмор и перевод: к проблеме адаптации юмористического текста к иноязычной культуре 2014, 102). The main LM of creating a humorous effect that are applied in the translations from English into Russian and Latvian are: generalisation, concretisation, compensation, lexical addition, antonymic translation, dephraseologisation and phraseologisation.

The comparative semantic analysis of the empirical material within this research has been conducted based on thirty-six excerpts from the original text, its Russian translation conducted by M. Mironova in 1984 and its Latvian translation conducted by V. Belsevica in 1974. The empirical material has been divided into seven microtopics.

Table 1. Microcontext of the Microtopic "Man in the World of Nature"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>Man is not much beside the great birds and beasts.</i>	<i>Человеку до многих действительно сильных птиц и зверей далеко.</i>	<i>Cilvēks nemaz nav pārāks par lielajiem putniem un zvēriem.</i>

HE in this expression is built upon paradox and comparison. In the Russian translation HE has been preserved. LM used: a set expression, an adverb strengthening the meaning. LT applied: modulation and antonymic translation, concretisation, lexical addition. HE is manifested to a lesser extent in the Latvian translation. LM used: a set expression, an emphatic particle. LT applied: lexical addition.

Table 2. Microcontext of the Microtopic "Dialog with the Marline"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>"Please eat them. How fresh they are and you down there six hundred feet in that cold water in the dark. Make another turn in the dark and come back and eat them."</i>	<i>- Ну, пожалуйста, кушай. Смотри, какие они свеженькие, а ты вон на какой глубине: шестьсот футов – шутка ли? – в холоде, в потемках. Ну, сделай еще круг и назад, и кушай на здоровье.</i>	<i>"Ēd sardīnes, zivs! Ēd viņas! Lūdzu, ēd viņas! Kur tu vēl dabūsi tik svaigas sardīnes tādā tumsā un sešdesmit pēdu dziļumā? Pagriezies vēlreiz, nāc atpakaļ un apēd tās!"</i>
<i>"Come on," the old man said aloud. "Make another turn. Just smell them. Aren't they lovely? Eat them good now</i>	<i>- Ну, давай, -сказал старик вслух. – Сделай еще круг. Ты их только понюхай. Хороши, а? Теперь</i>	<i>- Nāc atpakaļ, - sirmgalvis teica. – Pagiezies nu! Un paod! Vai viņas nav jaukas? Ēd droši, vēl jau ir arī tuncis.</i>

<i>and then there is the tuna. Hard and cold and lovely. Don't be shy, fish. Eat them."</i>	<i>скушай их как умница. А там еще тунец. Тверденький, холодный, прямо объеденье. Не стесняйся, рыба. Кушай.</i>	<i>Stingrs un vēss, un smaržīgs. Nekaunies, zivs! Ēd viņu nost!</i>
---	--	---

HE in the microcontext has been created with the aid of personification. There is a well manifested HE in the Russian translation. LM used: emphatic particles, colloquial lexis, vernacular language, ironic use of words, words with diminutive suffixes, a metaphor, interjections, a comparison. LT applied: lexical addition, concretisation, omission, antonymic translation, modulation. In the Latvian translation HE has also been preserved. LM used: additional sentences with climax, exclamation, colloquial lexis. LT applied: lexical addition, concretisation, modulation, omission.

Table 3. Microcontext of the Microtopic "Self-irony"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>I'm being towed by a fish and I'm the towing bitt.</i>	<i>Меня тащит на буксире рыба, а сам я вроде буксирной тумбы.</i>	<i>Es esmu sasiets ar šo zivi, un viņa velk mani, nevis otrādi.</i>

HE in the original text is based upon personification. In the Russian translation HE has been strengthened. LM used: comparison, ironic use of words. LT applied: omission, lexical addition. There is a weak manifestation of HE in the Latvian translation. The translator does not use comparison and selects a more neutral lexis. LM used: a collocation emphasising a nonsense situation. LT applied: generalisation, lexical addition, compensation.

Table 4. Microcontext of the Microtopic "Uplifting phrases"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>I'm being towed by a fish and I'm the towing bitt.</i>	<i>Меня тащит на буксире рыба, а сам я вроде буксирной тумбы.</i>	<i>Es esmu sasiets ar šo zivi, un viņa velk mani, nevis otrādi.</i>

HE has been created by means of personification and the absurd. In the Russian translation HE has been preserved. LM used: a particle expressing disagreement, a particle expressing preference, a feminine personal pronoun instead of masculine, vernacular lexis, a colloquial expression, ironic use of words, a verb in figurative meaning. LT applied: lexical addition, modulation, concretisation. There is a less manifested HE in the Latvian translation. LM used: a particle expressing preference, an emphatic particle. LT applied: lexical addition, concretisation, compensation.

Table 5. Microcontext of the Microtopic "Self-criticism"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>"You give me much good counsel," he said aloud. "I'm tired of it."</i>	<i>- Ну тебя с твоими полезными советами, - сказал он громко. – Надоело!</i>	<i>Tu man esi apnīcis ar saviem labajiem padomiem, – viņš ģurdēja.</i>

HE has been created since the character speaks to himself. There is an intensely manifested HE in the Russian translation. LM used: colloquial expressions, collocations, ironic use of words. LT applied: modulation, concretisation. In the Latvian translation a less manifested HE has been revealed. LM used: colloquial lexis, evaluative lexis. LT applied: modulation, omission, concretisation.

Table 6. Microcontext of the Microtopic "On the God, Faith, Religion"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>"I am not religious," he said. "But I will say ten Our Fathers and ten Hail Marys that I should catch this fish, and I promise to make a pilgrimage to the Virgin of Cobre if I catch him. That is a promise."</i>	<i>- Я не больно-то набожный, – сказал он. – Но я десять раз прочту "Отче наш" и десять раз "Богородицу", только бы поймать эту рыбу. И еще обещаю, что схожу на богомолье к Мадонне медных рудников.</i>	<i>- Es neesmu dievticīgs, -viņš teica, -bet es noskaitīšu desmit Mūsu Tēvus un desmit Svētās Marijas, lai noķertu šo zivi, un es apsolos doties svēceļojumā pie Kobras Dievmātes, ja es viņu noķeršu. Goda vārds!</i>

HE has been created by means of irony and paradox. HE has been preserved in the Russian translation. LM used: colloquial and vernacular lexis. LT applied: concretisation, lexical addition, omission, compensation. The Latvian translation contains a less manifested HE, as well as fidelity to the original text at the levels of lexis and grammar. LM used: exclamation, colloquial expression. LT applied: concretisation, modulation.

Table 7. Microcontext of the Microtopic "On Happiness, Luck and Values"

Original text	Russian translation	Latvian translation
<i>It is better to be lucky. But I would rather be exact. Then when luck comes you are ready.</i>	<i>Понятно, хорошо быть везучим, но уж лучше я буду все по правилам делать. По крайней мере, если удача придет, так уж я не проморгаю.</i>	<i>Ir jau labi būt laimīgam... Toties es kārtīgi daru savu darbu. Un, ja laime nāks, es to pratīšu saņemt.</i>

HE has been created due to the character's specific attitude towards the subject of discourse. HE has been preserved in the Russian translation. LM used: colloquial lexis, a conjunction with a different meaning, parenthesis, an interjection, the first-person pronoun instead of the second-person

pronoun. LT applied: lexical addition, concretisation, modulation, compensation, generalisation, omission. The Latvian translation demonstrates a more moderate HE. LM used: an emphatic particle, a conjunction with a different meaning, the first-person pronoun instead of the second-person pronoun. LT applied: lexical addition.

In the course of the research, the use of the following linguistic means for creating HE in the original text has been revealed: paradox, comparison, personification, absurdity and nonsense, deliberately inappropriate and ironic use of words, colloquial lexis, unexpectedness, and ambiguity. As for the Russian and Latvian translations, several additional LT have been applied. Particularly in the former, such LM as specific Russian colloquial words, collocations and set expressions, strengthening particles, interjections and parenthetical words, substandard lexis, vernacular language, obsolete vocabulary, bookish words, adjectives with diminutive suffixes, words in figurative meaning, metaphors, hyperboles, and exclamations are employed. Accordingly, in the Latvian translation the following LM have been additionally used: specific Latvian colloquial words, collocations and set expressions, emphatic particles, words in figurative meaning, climax, and exclamation.

It has also been determined that for translating humour in the analysed expressions from English into Russian such LT as concretisation, generalisation, meaning extension, lexical addition, omission, and compensation have been applied. As the result of the above-mentioned LT application, the following effects have been achieved: amplification of the evaluative connotation; antithesis amplification, emotive colouring of lexemes; amplification of HE; amplification of imagery, poetics, and expressivity; semantic accent shift; avoidance of lexical redundancy; collocation observation; and phenomenon essence specification.

The results of the comparative semantic analysis of the empirical material demonstrate a more frequent and intensive application of LT in the Russian translation as compared to the Latvian translation. Additionally, in the Russian translation HE has been transferred in a more figurative and expressive way.

Moreover, it has been stated that by means of expressive vocabulary, various grammatical forms of words and puns, such features of the Russian national humour as openness and naturalness are reflected in the translation conducted by M. Mironova. A self-improvement tendency and moralistic elements are also manifested in the Russian translation. However, the

translation conducted by V. Belsevica demonstrates a more neutral lexis, a small number of complex rhetorical figures and a less active use of puns. The above-mentioned characteristics are probably caused by such features of the Latvian national humour as reticence and self-restraint. The Latvian translation gives preference to syntactic transformations. Obviously, the established differences in the Russian and Latvian translations result from the mentality of the translators themselves, as well as the specific features of lexis, grammar, and syntax of the target languages, and the national characteristics and expectations of the target audiences.

Bibliography

1. Blake, Barry J. 2007. “Playing with Words.” In *Playing with Words* by Barry J. Blake. Equinox Publishing Ltd.
2. Chiaro, Delia. 2010. “Translation, Humour and Literature.” In *Translation, Humour and Literature* by Delia Chiaro. Continuum International Publishing Group.
3. Krasovska, Elīna. 2006. *Humour in J. R. R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit" in the Context of English and Latvian Culture. Kultūras krustpunkti. Latvijas Kultūras akadēmijas zinātnisko rakstu krājums. 2.laidiens.* Rīga: Apgāds "Mantojums".
4. Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Accessed October 20, 2021. <https://tezaurs.lv/mlvv/>.
5. Rozenbergs, Jānis. 1995. *Latviešu valodas stilistika.* Rīga: Apgāds "Zvaizgne ABC".
6. Голикова, Ж. А. 2004. *"Learn to Translate by Translating from English into Russian. Перевод с английского на русский"*. Москва: ООО "Новое знание".
7. Молчанова, Л. В. 2014. *"Юмор и перевод: к проблеме адаптации юмористического текста к иноязычной культуре"*. Вестник Череповецкого государственного университета, № 4, Филологические науки.
8. Фененко, Н. А. 2005. *"Комическое в тексте оригинала и перевода"*. Вестник ВГУ, Серия "Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация", № 2.
9. Хазова, С. В. 2012. *"Юмор как ресурс совладающего поведения"*. Сибирский педагогический журнал, № 3, Психология развития: 177-182.

TRANSLATING THE INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE: INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES

CORINA VASILE

UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA, ROMANIA

1. Introduction

Although in recent years institutional discourse has been one of the focal points of linguists, there is still a need to investigate it in depth due to the (interconnected) areas that it covers. Consequently, the translations dedicated to it should encompass its characteristics and should be determined by related competences to produce an accurate translation. Institutional norms, as varied as they might be, should allow for socially integrated text production and consumption, translation included. When dealing with institutional discourses the translator must react to the texts that compose them, delimiting their language functions, remaining true to their boundaries while still communicating the intended meaning. As such, institutional contexts will force the translator to apply the cultural and social norms devised and embraced by that organization.

2. Institutional Discourse – Language and Power

In linguistics, discourse refers to a unit of language longer than one sentence. Institutions are shaped through discourse; it is not "action per se that provides the basis for institutionalization" (Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy 2004, 635), but the text that links the words together, and institutions are outcomes of discursive actions and are influenced by them. The social context, which can come in many shapes and sizes (written, spoken, public, private, organizational, social, relational), becomes of utmost importance, whereas discourse studies look into the shape and performance of language in conversation. In a broader definition, discourse refers to practices of writing and talking, limiting or freeing conversations (Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy 2004, 635). The common core is that language in action leads to

discursive products (notably, Perais 2013, de los Ángeles Gómez González et al. 2014) and that discourse analysis is concerned with linguistic interactions, which are linked to the texts that represent them (Fairclough 2003). Discourses are more of a combination of texts rather than a single distinct one, which must be interpreted to acknowledge the full discursive meaning (Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy 2004, 636).

The labels *institution* and *organization* are used more or less consistently by linguists, "although 'organization' seems to be used more for commercial corporations, whereas 'institution' is more associated with the public organs of the state" (Mayr 2008, 4). Institutions, according to Phillips et al. (2004) and to Koskinen (2014), tend to cover all areas of life, from family life to education, religion and so on. Institutional discourse will happen within the boundaries of such organizations. Translating such discourses has to be context-embedded on the grounds that social norms are adhered to in a more visible way through institutions.

Perais (2013) argues that the context of institutional discourses enters a dialectical relation with communication practices, which presupposes complex, multi-layered interconnections in the social system at large. The language used in discourses will automatically become a construct that will be studied and defined by organizations and would orient the individual towards these constructions and structures, finally determining the individual to embody them. Mayr (2008) rightly points to the "communicative" and "strategic" use of language in institutional discourses. The communicative function of language is meant to carry information across and make receivers understand the (intended) meaning, while the strategic function of language is meant to impose the meaning on receivers. Both functions are subsided to socio-cultural factors and the knowledge background necessary to the production and understanding of all institutional discourses, be they written or spoken, in compliance with the linguistic norms governing discourse making. When language is a barrier in communication, we make use of the translational practices. Discursive practices go beyond solely mirroring conventions utilized by communities; they are additional social conventions, including social changes.

3. Discursive translations

Institutional translation nowadays has become more complex since it covers many fields or, to put it in other words, it is fuzzy at the edges. Due to the multitude of languages and areas to which they can be applied, this type of translation depends largely on "disciplines", having to do with the terms

used in certain fields, where the translator needs to keep the original sense without "distorting it" (Sehan 2010). A translation model is viewed as a tentative description of a sequence of cognitive and metacognitive operations that a translator performs to translate the supplied text in full or partially. A linguistic model of translation methods describes them as a sequence of source text transformations that ought to theoretically produce the required result and a similar effect on the target text readership. Any translation model is theoretical since there is no evidence that a translator acts specifically as the model suggests. Translations should, nonetheless, replace the text without changing the form (unless required to do so by the client), rendering the same meaning as in the original form. To this end, Sehan (2010) identifies five competences that a translator must develop and operationalise: language competence, textual competence, subject competence, cultural competence, and transfer competence. Language competence is important since the translator must know both the target language and the source language so that the translation could be complete and true to its original meaning: the "language master role in translation is not only to translate words or sentences, but also to know how the target language receiver says something that is different from the source language user" (Sehan 2010, 2). Language functions – mainly, the expressive, informative, and vocative ones – are at the basis of any translator's work, as they set the standards of translating and secure the fitness for purpose or skopos of translation. The expressiveness level relates to the producer's intended purpose, which the translator must be familiar with to change the text correctly. The informative role is different, rendering facts and must be as concrete as possible, but the translator's work might be difficult unless he or she is familiar with the norms and the specific terms applied to such types of texts. The vocative function of language relies on persuading the addressee, who must be convinced of the authenticity and the truthfulness of the translated text. If the translator lacks such competence, then indeed "the lack of language competence in this regard may create an unintended product of translated text" (Sehan 2010, 3). The translator therefore should master two languages (at the discourse level) and their functionality, with connections with the socio-cultural and psychological aspects of the language use. The metalinguistic features must count for the communicative aim that any translated text must have. It is so for the institutional discourse where the tradition of writings, genres and text types become critical in the (re)writing process, and, as a rule, closely related to how content is translated. The translator must be competent to accurately detect the distinctiveness of the target language; he/she must be familiar with the various sources that the language uses.

Word determination in translating texts based on a specific content gets to be exceptionally imperative for a translator. Words in texts are dependent on a certain context, and therefore "some text must be translated faithfully, word for word, and some texts are enabled to translate freely" (Sehan 2010, 4). Awareness of genres and text types is highly important in all cultures (national and supranational ones), as it will not only make the translator's work easier, but it will also secure the quality of the translation. Admittedly, textual competence will enable the translator to identify the text type and it will also commit the "translator to keep the original genre of the text, to keep the function of the text, to avoid misunderstanding from the receiver on the text, to avoid the dysfunction of the text, and to create a communicative situation from both the sender and the addressee interaction" (Sehan 2010, 4). Translating textual content is not an easy task, the translator needs to be aware of the subject area, because the translation aspires to gather the traits of textual content; one of them is the field where the textual content is taking place. Domains are different and they use different terminology and different stylistic conventions, which the translator must be familiar with. Furthermore, the translator must know about the audience design or readership expectations, the text genre, and the language functions, which will be of great help in case there are no direct equivalent words or expression into the target language due to the existence of linguistic and/or cultural gaps.

The basis for the discourse and communication translation model is formed by a two-level structure of translation methods enclosed within the general scheme of text, discourse, and communication interrelation. Text and discourse exist within the structure and content of communication. Volkova (2012) makes the comment that communication consists of three joined components that replicate, and that it is a framework, a basis for communication, an "introspect figure of text", which determines the content and language parameters of communication, "an extroverted figure of discourse", which determines the content and speech parameters of the communication participants' interaction. Some of the words and phrases in linguistic communication could have completely different meanings in the target language, or perhaps they do not exist at all. By having cultural competence, the translator will bridge such gaps (activating coping mechanisms) in order to make sure he/she reaches the optimal textual equivalence. Basically, there are two strategic options: to concentrate on the source language text (an author-oriented strategy), or to focus on the readership of the target text (a readership-oriented strategy).

Cultural ability in text-based translation is very important in terms of translating some words and phrases that do not exist in the translator's native language, and are known as culture-specific items. Thus, the translator will choose a few relevant translation procedures which could be said to count as creating alterations of the original text. For instance, transfers or borrowings are used to render what cannot normally be rendered in the target language, either because there are no direct equivalents, or the meaning cannot be easily inferred from the word-to-word translation. It is commonly stated that if the translator displays sufficient linguistic, encyclopaedic and cultural competence, he/she will also have transfer competence, "an ability of transferring a message from source text to target text communicatively" (Sehan 2010, 7), that is why it has been claimed that instead of translating, linguists should use the term "transferring" since the "translator explains how certain language users say or express a certain phenomenon" (Sehan 2010, 8). Volkova (2012) is of the opinion that the translation process includes a minimum of two stages: understanding the supplied text and choosing a translation variant. These steps showcase the transition from the source text to the target text. Translators typically do not notice what has guided them through the method and made them opt for a specific variant, and their actions are often intuition-driven. This, however, does not mean that the selection is completely random or accidental. It is determined, to an oversized extent, by the mechanisms used to produce a message within the source and target languages. Translation production and evaluation are delimited by "the customer and the cultural factors" (Mossop 1988, 66). If there is not enough documentation, there will be misinterpretations, as "the cultural factor in translation is a set of background conditions whereas the institution is an actor in the translation process" (Mossop 1988, 66). Mossop agrees that the translator must not address the entire culture; nonetheless, he or she must comply with the group's collective culture and address a particular readership.

4. Conclusion

Translating or transforming requires good interpretation skills, especially when we refer to institutional discourses. Limitations are sometimes given by the translator's abilities, or by the language limitations. Considering the many types of contexts that can produce communication, and the many types of discourses, the translator must possess solid knowledge about the domain, language, subject, and culture and must know how to transfer all these into meaningful productions that are as true to the original form as possible. Also, a good understanding of linguistic features should add to the

translator's ability to deal with many institutionalised domains and endless occurrences when word-for-word translation must be avoided as not securing accuracy, naturalness, and fluency. If discourse is seen as language in practice, then the translator's work is to perceive the limitations that institutional discourses might show and adopt the adequate translation method and procedures, when meeting the institutional needs, to fulfil the task: creating a comprehensible discursive translation that reads as an original.

References

1. Bangerter, Adrian, and Joep Cornelissen. 2017. "Studying Discourse Processes in Institutional Contexts." In *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Processes*. Routledge. November 21, 2017. Accessed February 23, 2020. <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315687384-4>.
2. de los Ángeles Gómez González, María and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, eds. 2014. *The Functional Perspective on Language and Discourse: Applications and Implications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
3. Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse-Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
4. Phillips, Nelson, Thomas B. Lawrence and Cynthia Hardy. 2004. "Discourse and Institutions". *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 29, No. 4, 635-652. Accessed October 25, 2020. https://www.academia.edu/2973111/Discourse_and_Institutions.
5. Koskinen, Kaisa. 2014. "Institutional translation: the art of government by translation." In *Perspectives* 22, 479-492. Accessed October 25, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.948887>.
6. Mayr, Andrea. 2008. *Language and Power. An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
7. Mossop, Brian. 1988. *Translating institutions: a missing factor in translation theory*. Accessed October 25, 2020. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/search?q=Translating%20institutions%3A%20a%20missing%20factor%20in%20translation%20theory&sort=relevance>.

8. Perais, Lucas. 2013. *Institutional Online Discourse. A Critical Enquiry into the Websites' Communication of the Social Services Providers of Brussels*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
9. Sehan, Zainurrahman. 2010. *Five Translation Competencies*. Accessed October 25, 2020.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325058040_Five_Translation_Competencies/link/5af3f089aca2720af9c479d9/download.
10. Volkova, Tatiana Aleksandrovna. 2012. *Translation Model Parameters Revised: Text, Discourse, and Communication*. Accessed October 25, 2020.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/translation-model-parameters-revised-text-discourse-and-communication>.

INNOVATIONS IN A STUDY PROGRAMME WITH A FOCUS ON TRANSLATION STUDIES: SOME PREFATORY REMARKS ON A FUTURE RESEARCH PROJECT

KLAUDIA BEDNÁROVÁ-GIBOVÁ
INSTITUTE OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES,
UNIVERSITY OF PRESOV, SLOVAKIA

1. Introduction: the subject of innovation

Following its more recent cognitive, sociological, technological, anthropological, and economic "turns"¹ (cf. Bednárová-Gibová 2018a), translation studies (henceforth TS) have become one of the most dynamically evolving fields of study in the humanities. This fast pace of the development naturally imposes higher requirements on the preparation of study materials to make them meet the requirements of the contemporary age. For this reason, it is becoming imperative to continuously update and improve translation textbooks. Methodologically, it is also desirable to tailor them to certain study programmes, considering their specificities as well as undergraduates' theoretical pre-preparation and their overall study profile.

This chapter aims to present an innovative teaching conception for the Introduction to Translation Theory and Practice course as part of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme at the BA level in the Faculty of Arts of the University of Presov in Slovakia. The study programme was accredited within the last complex accreditation affecting higher education levels. The purpose of the subject of the given study programme is to familiarize course attendees with TS as an interdiscipline through linguistic, cross-cultural, sociological and technological lenses,

¹ The term «turn» has been borrowed from Snell-Hornby's influential work (2006).

deriving from "a lack of awareness of the complexity of the translational activity" (Bednárová-Gibová 2018b, 15) in the target audience.

The current state of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme requires an update of teaching methodology of TS courses. The didactic conceptualization of the Introduction to Translation Theory and Practice course strives to be a contribution to English philology within higher education, combining both traditional as well as progressive approaches to the elaboration of study materials.

The course, currently implemented in a first-cycle degree programme, synthesizes the prerequisites for undergraduates' knowledge and skills acquired in linguistic (morphology, syntax, lexicology) and cultural subjects (Introduction to the US and UK studies, Culture of the Anglophone countries 1 and 2, Intercultural communication) and provides preconditions for a successful completion of translation-oriented courses within the MA cycle (Literary Translation, Specialized Translation, Stylistics and so forth). The innovations outlined in section 3 of this chapter are planned to be achieved within the KEGA 008PU-4/2021 research grant project, the implementation of which, however, depends on the final evaluation by a grant committee. The overarching aim of the submitted project is to support a translational profile of the undergraduates of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme, considering their theoretical preparation. A top-notch education in TS could increase the competitiveness of the undergraduates to assert themselves on the translation market, creating a strong connection between academia and the nascent language industry.

2. Current state of the art: a review

The subject Introduction to Translation Theory and Practice is part of the inventory of courses making up the "translational core" of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme (along with subjects such as Introduction to the theory and practice of interpretation, Specialized translation, and Literary translation). Although the undergraduates' profile of the study programme under discussion suggests that they gain far more than a rudimentary knowledge of history and culture of the Anglophone countries in close connection with literary science and linguistics, building their intercultural competencies cannot proceed without taking up translation-oriented courses.

A distinctive specificity of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme is a due emphasis on the use of English in the function of the principal communication code, also with regard to translation theory (in sharp contrast to the translation and interpretation study programmes). Just as, at present with the advent of globalization, the use of English in the function of a *lingua franca* strengthens the position of inverse translation, i.e., L2 translation, a strong preference of English as the main language of instruction has always been a distinctive feature of the said study programme. For this reason, it becomes apparent why the textbooks on translation in the Slovak language, which are available in our academic space (e.g., Gromová 2000, 2009; Müglová 2009; Ehtagangová and Keniž 1999; Šimon 2005; Hrehovčík 2006; Kvetko 2015 or Djovčoš and Šveda et al. 2018) do not fully cover the undergraduates' needs. The cons of the other textbooks in the Slovak academia are related to their nature of a compilation of study materials by other authors (Biloveský and Djovčoš 2010; Biloveský and Djovčoš 2013), a dominant practical orientation (Kvetko 2009) or a one-sided focus on specialized discourse (Hrehovčík and Bázlik 2014). This means that as far as Slovak TS are concerned, there is to date no textbook which would be suitable for undergraduates of the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme with a view to their theoretical background and the space devoted to TS within their entire studies.

Desk-based research into foreign literature has revealed that the niche for quality reference sources has partially been filled by oldish textbooks (Newmark 1981, 1988; Baker 1992; Nord 2005). In addition, it would be manifestly unjust and unfair not to give credit to Munday's comprehensive TS bestseller *Introducing Translation Studies* (2016). Its multispectral focus, scholarly rigour, and wealth of interactive material in the current fourth edition, however, go beyond the horizon of basic needs of the target group.

For the reasons spelled out above, the intended translation textbook project aspires to fill the gap in the exigent need for students of Anglophone cultures to make use of a reference source written from a discourse-analytical standpoint, drawing on a functional-semiotic paradigm of language with inter- and transdisciplinary overlaps. Based on its specific conception, the textbook on translation in preparation should not only be beneficial to the intended readership, but through its language implementation it should be applicable to a wider national as well as a supranational Anglophone practice. Its accompanying e-exercise book, transformed into the progressive electronic environment of Moodle, would be fully in compliance with the current trends of e-learning in translation didactics.

3. Research design and methods

By preparing a modern textbook for the discussed translation course, the project contributes to TS research in the Slovak setting of English studies. The conception of the course reflects current trends in translation didactics drawing on Hallidayan systemic-functional and discoursal-analytical approaches to language, as already applied in TS by Baker (1992), House (1997, 2015), Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) and Munday (2016), and the blended learning conception. The tangible project outcomes, i.e., the textbook and e-exercise book, shall comprise basic principles, methods, strategies of translation and special translation tasks, on the basis of which the undergraduates will have acquired the necessary knowledge, skills and translator's competencies. While the textbook represents a theoretical-methodological apparatus of the subject, the accompanying exercise book provides its textual basis. With the transformation of the translation exercise book into the electronic environment of Moodle, a fusion of traditional (i.e., in-class) and e-learning forms of teaching within the blended learning concept is achieved.

Stepwise, the project implementation consists of three stages. The outcome of the inventory stage (stage 1) will be a theoretical sum of knowledge gained through a careful study of secondary sources, discussions with experts and attending relevant TS workshops and conferences. This will eventuate in thematic chapters of the textbook (see Table 1), setting the scene for the preparatory stage (stage 2) the outcome of which will also be a preparation of an e-exercise book in cooperation with project team members. The execution stage (stage 3) will focus on testing the tangible project outcomes in a teaching process.

Table 1: A tentative outline of the textbook's chapters

1.	An outline of translation (studies) history and theories
2.	Central concepts of TS
3.	Translation as meta-communication
4.	Text and discourse as a translator's point of departure
5.	Translation methods, strategies, techniques and procedures
6.	Translation shifts analysis

7.	The translator's skills, competencies and position in the transcultural and digital age
8.	Contemporary translation tools (software, CAT-tools, corpora, databases, translation memories, etc.)
9.	Translation praxeology (communication with clients, establishing licensed trade, preparing an invoice, survival on the translation market)
10.	Essentials of literary translation (translating prose, drama, and poetry)
11.	Essentials of non-literary translation (translating technical, medical, administrative, legal, institutional, and economic texts)
12.	New directions in TS (corpus-based TS, software and website localization, audiovisual translation, crowdsourcing, etc.)

In sum, the methodological steps during the project implementation are as follows:

1. Analysis of existing secondary literature and its critical evaluation;
2. Elaboration of thematic sections of the textbook;
3. Determination of didactic principles for the selection of translation texts and exercises;
4. Preparation and finalization of materials for the textbook and exercise book;
5. Transformation of the exercise book into an electronic medium (Moodle);
6. Verification of the textbook and e-exercise book in a teaching process.

4. Implications and contribution to knowledge

By preparing the course textbook, the quality of the profile of the undergraduates participating in the English Language and Anglophone Cultures study programme will be enhanced by providing a basis for teaching translation theory and its praxeology. The textbook as a principal aim of the project under preparation will contribute to making higher education topical and high quality based on its theoretical-methodological conception within the accredited study programme. The planned textbook can also be used in other English departments both at a national as well as a supranational level. The transformation of the translation exercise book into the Moodle electronic environment is compliant with the current trend of digitalization of didactic tools and contributes to the development of

applied didactics. In this manner, the e-exercise book will significantly update the teaching of the TS discipline and increase its flexibility. Based on the project outcomes, students will have acquired the latest theoretical and practical knowledge, skills and competencies which should increase their competitiveness on the translation market.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, the employment of systemic-functional and discourse-analytical approaches coupled with blended learning seems to be a possible stream of innovations in contemporary translation didactics. The chapter tacitly points to the need for a closer collaboration between TS and applied didactics, ensuring links between academia and undergraduates' preparation for the translation market. However, it should be emphasized that the implementation of the proposed conceptual and methodological steps depends largely on the approval of the project by the Slovak research grant agency. Therefore, it can only be humbly hoped that the author's ruminations will be given a fair chance to move from a chapter in this book to the execution stage in the best-case scenario of the research grant funding.

Bibliography

1. Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
2. Bednárová-Gibová, Klaudia. 2018a. "More Recent Avenues of Research in Contemporary Translation Studies." In *Translation Studies across the Boundaries*, edited by Lucyna Harmon and Dorota Osuchowska, 15-30. Berlin: Peter Lang.
3. Bednárová-Gibová, Klaudia. 2018b. "Changing Stereotypes in Teaching Translation." In *Vybrané aspekty pedagogickej profesie*, edited by Martina Kosturková et al., 6-17. Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej univerzity.
4. Biloveský, Vladimír, and Martin Djovčoš. 2010. *Vybrané kapitoly z translatológie I*. Banská Bystrica: UMB.
5. Biloveský, Vladimír, and Martin Djovčoš. 2013. *Vybrané kapitoly z translatológie II*. Banská Bystrica: UMB.
6. Ehrgangová, Elena, and Alojz Keníž. 1999. *Kapitoly z prekladu a tlmočenia: učebnica*. Bratislava: Ekonóm.
7. Djovčoš, Martin, and Pavol. 2018. *Šveda et al. Didaktika prekladu a tlmočenia na Slovensku*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.

8. Gromová, Edita. 2000. *Kapitoly z úvodu do prekladateľstva*. Nitra: FF UKF.
9. Gromová, Edita. 2009. *Úvod do translatológie*. Nitra: FF UKF.
10. Hatim, Basel, and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman.
11. Hatim, Basel, and Ian Mason. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge.
12. House, Juliane. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
13. House, Juliane. 2015. *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London/New York: Routledge.
14. Hrehovčík, Teodor. 2006. *Prekladateľské minimum*. Bratislava: Iris.
15. Hrehovčík, Teodor, and Miroslav Bázlik. 2014. *Súdny preklad a tlmočenie*. 2nd ed. Bratislava: Iura edition.
16. Kvetko, Pavol. 2009. *An Introduction to Translation Studies. A Practical Course*. Trnava: UCM.
17. Kvetko, Pavol. 2015. *Úvod do prekladateľských štúdií*. Trnava: UCM.
18. Munday, Jeremy. 2016. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. 4th ed. London: Routledge.
19. Müglová, Daniela. 2009. *Komunikácia, tlmočenie, preklad alebo prečo spadla Babylonská veža?* Bratislava: Enigma.
20. Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
21. Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook on Translation*. New York/London: Prentice Hall.
22. Nord, Christiane. 2005. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
23. Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies. New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
24. Šimon, Ladislav. 2005. *Úvod do teórie a praxe prekladu (nielen) pre nemčinárov*. Prešov: Náuka.

TOWARDS EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE TOOLKITS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

LIANA GEORGIANA OPREA (MOGA)
UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA, CRAIOVA, ROMANIA

Introduction

The increasing interest in reading and translating foreign literature has determined that the worldwide readership questions the quality of literary translations in terms of accuracy and stylistic compliance. Currently, embarking upon literary translation underpins the communicative relationship between the source language text and target language text and dynamic equivalence shapes the process.

In the translation evaluation process norms play a significant role since they are aimed at securing both correctness and appropriateness, linguistically and culturally. Efficiency and effectiveness should be related to the rendering of the intended meaning in context, based on descriptive, functional, and normative criteria. Literary translation requires complex translation skills, integrating cultural knowledge, linguistic competence, and decision-making skills. Hence, the literary translator is a mediator and an active participant in the process.

1. Theorizing literary translation

1.1. Literary Translation – *les belles infidèles*?

There are many academic debates in the field of Translation Studies, whether translation is an art or a craft, whether it is source text-oriented or target text-oriented, or whether it is faithful or not. The notion of *faithfulness* refers to the methods and procedures adopted by the translator in order to make a precise reproduction of the original text, whereas *freedom* refers to the aesthetic methods used to achieve the beauty of an original work of art. Other debates refer to word-for-word or sense-for-sense translation.

Up until the second half of the twentieth century, translation theory seemed locked in what Steiner (1998, 319) calls a sterile debate over the triad of literal, free and faithful translation. (Munday 2001, 19)

The choice between them is formulated as a choice between *fidelity* and *fluency*.

Fidelity and fluency, for millennia, have been regarded as competing ideals for translators. (Baker 2000, 440)

Theorists, including Lefevere (1992), Toury (1995) and Simon (1995), have interrogated the notions of *accuracy*, *equivalence*, and *fidelity* with respect to literary translation, arguing that

any assessment of these criteria is inevitably determined by a variety of cultural, political and economic factors. (Wittman 2012, 441)

Firstly, translation is a form of reading, a responsible activity, the translator being aware of other translations of the same texts. It is a form of reading through someone else's eyes because the translator is above all a reader. Translators read the original texts, decode the message contained in the text and reformulate or encode it into their own language. Subsequently, the message contained in the translated text is decoded by the reader of the translation. Thus, the translator experiences multiple positionings "as addressee and sender, as reader and author" (House 2014, 149).

Secondly, translation is a form of rewriting the original text and involves the translator's skills and capacity for innovation. We may consider translation as the expression of the translator's creative style and identify his/her personal contribution to the structure, and even content, of the new text. Being in a permanent relation to its source text, translation is defined as oscillating between faithfulness and freedom.

Thirdly, translation means the manipulation of language, transfer of words, recontextualization and cultural interference. Seen in this light, translation is an act of communication between languages and cultures, "a cross-cultural phenomenon" (Boase-Beier 2014, 15), a work of art which requires in-depth cultural and linguistic knowledge for both translators and the intended readership.

1.2. Literary translator's competence and agency

Literary translation, being process-oriented, involves a host of factors such as norms, the relationship between the source-language text and target-