

---

---

## CONTEXT AND CONTEXTUAL SUBSTITUTION IN TRANSLATION

---

BUI MY HANH

### Abstract

Translation is a process of rendering a text, written piece or a speech in other languages. What differentiates translation from retelling or other kinds of text transfer is that translation is a process of creating an original unity out of the contexts and forms of the original. Of major importance is the semantic identification of a translation with its source text (ST). The presumption of semantic identity between ST and target text (TT) is based on the various degrees of equivalence of their meanings. The translator usually tries to produce in target language (TL) the closest possible equivalent to ST.

However, words or other units of translation (UT) in a source language (SL) have neither a direct nor permanent equivalent in the TL, due to grammatical, semantic and socio-cultural differences between the SL and TL. The meaning(s) that a word or a ST unit refers to in most cases can only be understood through its context of use. To solve the problems of variable equivalence and non-equivalence in different contexts, the translator creates an occasional equivalent or contextual substitution by using one or more translation methods. Since equivalence is established between only two units of translation in a language pair, a ST unit has its equivalent(s) in one TL, but may have no equivalents in other TL. Furthermore, a ST unit can be translated into different languages by using the same or, more often, different translation devices. Using examples of translation across three languages from English to Russian and Vietnamese, this article discusses six of the most frequently used semantic transformations: concretization, generalization, modulation, antonymic translation, full rearrangement and compensation.

### Introduction

The role of translation as a means of interlingual communication has become of paramount importance in our rapidly changing world of increasingly expanding and intensifying exchanges of culture, knowledge and international communication. Although the activity of translation has a long-standing tradition and has been widely practiced throughout history, there are different understandings of basic concepts in translation theory. This paper, in the first part, briefly reviews some basic theoretical concepts of translation, equivalence, context and contextual substitutions, translation transformation and semantic transformation. In the second part, it gives a description of frequently used semantic transformations in creating contextual substitutions (concretization, generalization, modulation, antonymic translation, full rearrangement and compensation), illustrated with examples of translation from English into Russian and Vietnamese. Then, based on analysis of these examples, the paper tries to make a comparison of using the devices in these three typologically different languages.

## 1. Some Basic Concepts in Translation Theory

### 1.1. Translation

As a term and notion, translation is of polysemantic nature: its common and most general meaning being mostly associated with the action or process of rendering, transferring and expressing the meaning and content of a source language (SL) message (text) in the target language (TL). Translation may be viewed as an interlingual communicative act in which at least three participants are involved: the sender or source (the author of the SL message), the translator who acts in dual capacity – as the receptor of the SL message and as the sender of the equivalent TL message), and the receptor of the TL message (translation). Translation as such consists in producing a text (message) in the TL, equivalent to the original text (message) in the SL. [Wiki]

### 1.2. Equivalence

The aim of any translation is maximum parallelism of structure which would make it possible to relate each segment (word, word-group, sentence, paragraph) of the translation to the respective part of the original. It is presumed that any breach of parallelism is not arbitrary but dictated by the need for precision in conveying the meaning of the original. In other words, the translation has the same meaning as the original text. The comparison of texts in different languages inevitably involved a theory of equivalence aimed at studying semantic relationships between original or source text (ST) and target text (TT). According to Kruger and Wallmach [1997:276], translation theorists such as Catford, Nida, Reiss, Wilss and Neubert, under the influence of Chomsky's transformational generative grammar, thought that by adopting the notion of equivalence and accuracy "good" translations could be ensured. In the context of transformational generative grammar, equivalence was seen as the replacement of a word in one language by a word in another language.

Because the TT can never be equivalent to the ST at all levels, researchers have distinguished different types of equivalence. Nida suggests formal and dynamic or functional equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. It requires that the message in the TL should match as closely as possible the different elements in the SL. Dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect, where the relationship between the receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message [Nida, 1964]. Newmark makes a distinction between communicative and semantic translation. Like Nida's dynamic equivalence, communicative translation also tries to create the effect on the TT reader, which is the same as that received by readers of the SL text [Newmark, 1988]. Koller proposes denotative, connotative, pragmatic, textual, formal and aesthetic equivalence. Munday describes these five different types of equivalence as: denotative equivalence which is related to equivalence of the extralinguistic content of a text; connotative equivalence which is related to the lexical choices, especially between near-synonyms; text-normative equivalence which is related to text types, with texts behaving in different ways; pragmatic equivalence, or "communicative equivalence", which is oriented towards the receiver of the text or message; and formal equivalence is related to the form and aesthetics of the text, includes word plays and the individual stylistic features of the ST [Munday, 2001:47]. Komissarov defines equivalence as a measure of semantic community of a ST and its translation on various levels and introduces five types of hierarchical equivalence: equivalence of the aim of communication, equivalence in the identification of the situation, equivalence maintaining method of situation description, equivalence in maintaining the meaning of the syntactic structures and equivalence in maintaining meanings of lexical units [Komissarov, 1990]. Furthermore, he distinguishes "potential reachable equivalence", by which he means the maximum level of common contents of two etrolingual texts through knowledge of the differences between the languages in which the two texts are coded, and "translational equivalence", the actual closeness of sense of the texts in the original and translation, achieved by the translator in the translation process [Komissarov, 1990:51]. Shveitser, according to language categories, classifies three groups of equivalence: grammatical, textual and pragmatical equivalence [Shveister, 1988]. Baker explores the notion

of equivalence at different levels (word and above word level) in relation to the translation process, including all different aspects of translation [Baker, 1992]. Thus, the notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. This article considers some techniques available to the translator to maintain equivalence as closely as possible while also maintaining both sense and style in the TL.

### 1.3. Variable equivalence and non-equivalence. Context and contextual substitution

The structural similarity of ST and TT implies that relationships of equivalence are established between correlated units in the two texts. Some of the SL units have permanent equivalents in TL, that is to say, there is a one-to-one correspondence between such units and their equivalents. Thus *London* in Russian and Vietnamese is *Лондон, Luân Đôn*, *hydrogen* is always rendered as *водород* and *hydrô*; *Industrial revolution* – as *Промышленная революция, cách mạng Công nghiệp*. Other SL units may have several equivalents each. Such one-to-many correspondence between SL and TL units is characteristic of most regular equivalents, for instance, the English word *attitude*, is translated as *отношение, позиция, политука; quan điểm, thái độ, tư thế, dáng dấp, vị trí...* depending on the variant the Russian and Vietnamese languages prefer in a particular situation. The existence of a number of non-permanent (or variable) equivalents to a SL units implies the necessity of selecting one of them in each particular case, taking into account the way the unit is used in ST and the points of difference between the semantics of its equivalents in TL. The choice of the equivalent will depend on the relative importance of a particular semantic element in the act of communication.

Even if a SL unit has a regular equivalent in TL, this equivalent cannot be used in TT whenever the unit is found in ST. An equivalent is but a potential substitution, for the translator's choice is, to a large extent, dependent on the context in which the SL unit is placed in ST. There are two types of context: linguistic and situational (extra-linguistic). The linguistic context is made up by the other SL units in ST, while the situational context includes the temporal, spatial and other circumstances under which ST was produced as well as all facts which the receptor is expected to know so that he could adequately interpret the message. According to Komissarov [1990], the linguistic context is further divided into narrow/close context (micro-context) and wide context (macro-context). Micro-context refers to the boundaries of a word-group or a sentence, which are usually confined to the immediate environment of a unit of translation. Macro-context (textual context) refers to the boundaries of a text, which cannot be exactly defined because they exceed the limits of the immediate environment, stretching into a group of sentences, a paragraph, a chapter or even the whole book.

The major function of context consists in solving the problem concerning polisemanticity of linguistic units. Based on the context, the translator excludes all but one sense from the choice of all the polysemic unit. That is to say, the translator chooses one out of all potential equivalents of this unit of translation. [Barhudarov, 1975]. In determining the meanings of words, the role of context is maximized and the role of any focal element is minimized, which means that the context actually provides more distinctiveness of meaning than conceptual meaning of words. In other words, it is the context that determines how a word is to be understood. The role of a context is hard to overestimate when translating a word which undergoes great contextual semantic changes when it is impossible to use a dictionary correspondence, e.g. *In an atomic war women and children will be the first hostages. Женщины и дети будут первыми жертвами в атомной войне. / Trong chiến tranh hạt nhân, phụ nữ và trẻ em sẽ là những nạn nhân đầu tiên* (in both translations, 'victims'). Thus in the following sentences the linguistic context will enable the translator to make a correct choice among the Russian and Vietnamese equivalents to the English noun *attitude*:

- (1) *I don't like your attitude to your work.*
- (2) *There is no sign of any change in the attitudes of the two sides.*
- (3) *He stood there in a threatening attitude.*

It is obvious that in the first sentence it should be the Russian ‘отношение (к работе)’ and in Vietnamese ‘thái độ’, in the second sentence – ‘позиции (обеих сторон)’, ‘quan điểm’, and in the third sentence – ‘поза (угрожающая)’, ‘tư thế’.

A large number of SL units have no regular equivalents in TL. The so-called “non-equivalents” are the words of the SL which either do not have equivalents in the TL or do not have equivalent denotatum in the target culture. Such words may be divided into two groups. The first group consists of the so-called realia-words denoting things, objects, features of national life, customs, habits, etc., e.g. *House of Commons,thane, coroner, teach-in, drive-in, cricket*, etc. The second group embraces words, which for some linguistic reason have no equivalent in the TL, e.g. *conservationist, readership, glimpse*, etc [Shveitser, 1988]. However, there are quite a number of “ordinary” words for which TL may not have equivalent lexical units: *fluid, bidder, qualifier*, etc. Some grammar forms and categories may also be non-equivalents. (Cf. the English gerund, article or continuous tense which have no counterparts in Russian and Vietnamese.)

The absence of regular equivalents does not imply that the meaning of a non-equivalent SL unit cannot be rendered in translation or that its translation must be less accurate. As can be seen from above, words with regular equivalents are not infrequently translated with the help of occasional equivalents (correspondences) or contextual substitutes. Similarly, the translator, coming across a non-equivalent word, resorts to occasional equivalents which can be created in one of the following ways:

(1) Using loan-words: *London – Лондон / Luân Đôn, picnic – пикник / pích-ních, Wall Street – Уолл-стрит...*

(2) Using calque, where the SL expression is literally transferred to the TL: *backbencher – заднекамеечник, nghị viên ngồi hàng ghế sau; Wall Street – phố Uôn; brain-drain – утечка мозгов, chảy máu chất xám; landslide – thắng phiếu lớn, tribalism – трайбализм, impeachment – импичмент...*

(3) Using analogues (approximate substitutes), that is, TL words with similar meaning which is extended to convey additional information (if necessary, with the help of footnotes), e.g. *drugstore – аптека / hiệu thuốc, witchhunter – мракобес, afternoon – вечер*. The translations *аптека, hiệu thuốc* is not exactly a *drugstore* where they also sell such items as magazines, soft drinks, ice-cream, etc., but in some cases this approximate equivalent can well be used.

(4) Using all kinds of lexical (semantic) transformations to modify the meaning of the SL word, e.g. *He died of exposure* may be rendered into Russian as *Он умер от простуды or Он погиб от солнечного удара / Nó bị chết vì giãм mưa or Nó bị chết vì nắng*.

(5) Using an explanation (description) to convey the meaning of the SL unit, e.g. *coroner – следователь, проводящий дознание в случае насильственной или скоропостижной смерти / nhân viên điều tra những vụ chết bất thường, supper – bữa ăn dậm thêm buổi tối, landslide – победа на выборах подавляющим большинством голосов, brinkmanship – искусство проведения политики на грани войны / thuật (thủ đoạn) theo đuổi một chính sách nguy hiểm tới giới hạn của an toàn, thí dụ tới bên miệng hố chiến tranh*, etc.

#### 1.4. Transformations, Semantic transformations, Semantic replacements (substitutions)

Any attempt at word-for-word (literal) translation (apart from very simple and short sentences) is doomed to failure. In the course of translation, it is always necessary to perform various grammatical and lexical changes of transformations to achieve translational equivalence. These transformations can be divided into four types: (1) transpositions; (2) replacements; (3) additions and (4) omissions [Shveitser, 1988].

Translation transformations are defined by Barhudarov [1975] as numerous and varied in their quality interlingual changes which are made to achieve adequacy in translation in spite of discrepancies in the formal and semantic systems of a SL and a TL. In Langeveld’s definition, lexical changes are TL renderings of SL words or word groups which are not their normal ‘equivalents’ found in dictionaries [Langeveld, 1988]. A

lexical/semantic change is called for when a literal translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, but one that is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward [Louw, 1967]

Substitutions or replacements are made on various levels: lexical, stylistic, and grammatical (morphological and syntactic). Barhudarov distinguishes grammatical and lexical as two groups of replacements, and further divides lexical replacements into five types: concretization, generalization, cause-effect replacement, antonymic translation and compensation. Shveitser also subdivides semantic transformations into five types but with differences: concretization, generalization, antonymic translation, metonymic translation (instead of Barhudarov's cause-effect replacement), and paraphrasing (rendering of the meaning of some idiomatic phrase in the SL by a phrase in the TL consisting of non-correlated lexical units). According to Retsker, there are seven types of semantic transformations: differentiation, concretization, generalization, antonymic translation, modulation, compensation, and full rearrangement [Retsker, 1973]. In fact, there are many different types or different names for one or other type. Moreover, the classifications are, to a great extent, arbitrary and that in practice it is hardly possible to find these elementary transformations in their "pure form", as in most cases they are combined with one another, so that we observe is a combined use of more than one type of transformation [Shveitser, 1988]. Concerning the terms, as we can see from above, that there are several terms used for the same thing: semantic/lexical transformations/ replacements/substitutions/substitutes/ changes. Transformation and replacement are used as a procedure (strategy) or device name, the other are often used for a phenomenon. Among the semantic transformations used to create contextual substitutes the most frequent types are concretization, generalization, modulation, antonymic translation, compensation, and full rearrangement, which will be discussed in this paper.

## 2. Semantic Transformations used to create occasional equivalents (contextual substitutions)

### 2.1. Concretization

Concretization is a translation transformation (device) in which a SL word or word combination with a more abstract, general or wider meaning is replaced by a TL word or word combination with a more concrete, specific or narrower meaning. As a result of this substitution, the created correspondence and initial lexical unit appear in the logical relations of inclusion: unit of SL expresses a general concept, which includes the specific concept unit of TL.

Concretization is also called specification [Louw, 1967; Kubackova, 2008]. As Louw puts it, "[s]pecification is a transformation in which a TL lexeme stands in a hyponymical relationship to the SL lexeme it renders, or to put it more correctly, a transformation in which the TL lexeme stands in a hyponymical relationship to the 'literal translation' (the standard rendering) of an SL lexeme" [Louw, 1967]. In any language there are words with more general or with more concrete meanings, also called generic and specific words. These express family or specific concepts: the word *dog* names a larger class of objects than the word *bulldog*, *to move* includes all types of motion – *to go*, *to walk*, *to run*, *to fly*, *to swim*, *to crawl*, etc. Generic words are words that are grouped in a language and given a class name [Larson, 1984]. For example, *bird* is generic word for *eagles*, *hawks*, and *sparrows*. Whilst, specific words are those words, which have additional components of meaning [Larson, 1984]. For example, *pen* is more specific than *stationery* because the word *stationery* is used to define *pen*; that is, *pen is stationery*, which has certain specific characteristics. At the same time correlation of such words in different languages and their use does not often coincide, that causes a need for transformations in translation. According to Komissarov [1999], application of concretization appears expedient in two basic cases.

In the first case, a word with a general meaning in the SL can have some corresponding words in the TL with more particular meanings. The English word *meal*, depending on the context, will be translated into Vietnamese by one among these words, *bữa ăn*, *thức ăn* or *món ăn*. In Russian, the level of concretization is even higher. Just as *bữa ăn* in Vietnamese, the translator must choose one among *завтрак*, *обед*, *ужин*

(‘breakfast’, ‘lunch’, ‘dinner’). Analogically, in translating the Russian verb *плавать* and the Vietnamese *bơi* into English the translator must understand ‘who swims’ and ‘how (s)he swims’ in order to choose the most appropriate verb among *swim, sail, float, drift* with more concrete meaning.

Concretization is a most frequent device in translation from English or Vietnamese into Russian. There is a large group of English words of wide semantic volume. These words belong to different parts of speech: nouns (*thing, point, stuff, affair*), adjectives (*good, nice, fine, bad*), verbs (*to say, to go, to get, to involve*). As the meaning of such words is relatively vague they can be used in different contents, and their valency is therefore extremely broad [Shveitser, 1988]. Hence a context is necessary to determine their meaning:

- (1) *He was at the ceremony.* – Anh ta có mặt tại buổi lễ. / Он присутствовал на церемонии.  
 (2) *He came in sight of the lodge, a long, low, frowning thing of red brick.* – Он увидел домик привратника, длинное, низкое, хмурое здание из красного кирпича.  
 (3) *It was quite a large hole, the sort of thing an animal about the size of a fox might have made.* / Cái hang khá to, cỡ cái hang của một con vật cỡ chừng con cáo đào nên.

In the first and second examples, the desemantized word *thing* was concretized and translated by a word of full meaning – *здание* ‘house’, *hang* ‘hole’. In the last example, the English word was translated by Vietnamese and Russian verbs with a concrete meaning of ‘present’. The role of the context in translating words with broad meanings is very important. Owing to the context, such words are used in very different lexical combinations. For example, the English word *thing* is concretized when translating it into Vietnamese or Russian in different contexts:

- (4) a. *'You poor old thing', she said.* (tội nghiệp / бедняжка)  
 b. *I want to look into the thing myself.* (sự việc / дело)  
 c. *Things look promising.* (tình hình / положение)  
 d. *How are things?* (đời sống / уснеху)

Verbs also require concretization. Unlike the Russian verbs of motion, English verbs *go, come, leave* and the Vietnamese verbs *đi, đến, rời* do not contain the semantic component indicating the method of movement; therefore, when translating them into Russian in different contexts, the translator uses words with more concrete meanings: *go, đi – идти (ходить), ехать, плыть, лететь...; come, đến – прибывать, приходиться, приезжать, прилетать...; leave, rời – уходить, уезжать, улетать, вылетать, покидать, оставлять...*

- (5) *At the by-election victory went to the Labour candidate.* – Trong đợt bầu cử sung, ứng viên Đảng Lao động đã giành được chiến thắng. / На дополнительных выборах победу одержал лейборист. (In both translations, lit. ‘win’)  
 (6) *The rain came in torrents.* – Mưa như trút nước. / Полил сильный дождь. (in both translations, lit. ‘pour’)

Furthermore, the English verbs of speech *to say, to tell* can be translated into Vietnamese and Russian not only as *nói, bảo; говорить, сказать*, but also as *hỏi, khuyên, ra lệnh/yêu cầu...; промолвить, повторить, заметить, утверждать, сообщать, просить, возразить, велеть...* with more concrete, specific meanings.

- (7) *“So what?” I said.* – Vậy thì sao? – Tôi hỏi. / Ну и что? – спросил я. (both translations, lit. ‘asked’)  
 (8) *He told me I should always obey my father.* – Ông khuyên bảo tôi nên luôn luôn nghe lời cha. / Он посоветовал мне всегда слушаться моего отца. (both translations lit. ‘advised’)  
 (9) *The boss told me to come at once.* – Ông chủ lệnh cho tôi phải đến ngay lập tức. / Хозяин велел мне прийти сейчас же. (In both translations lit. ‘commanded’)

In a more radical example (11) below, the concretizing addition *воды, nước* is indispensable here, because the verb *выпить, uống* without an object can denote the consumption of alcohol. Thus, the translation

of the sentence into Vietnamese and Russian is impossible without concretization.

- (10) *Some of the Gondor food they ate, and wafers of the waybread of the Elves, and they drank a little.*  
 – Họ ăn một chút đồ ăn Gondor, một chút bánh Elves và uống một chút **nước**. / Они поели пицци Гондора и эльфийского хлеба путников и выпили немного **воды**.

Thus, in the above cases of both nouns and verbs, concretization is necessary to exclude misunderstandings.

In the second case of concretization, the use of TL words with the same general meanings as in the SL is unacceptable due to the situational context, as in the example below:

- (11) *My mother had left her chair in agitation and gone behind it in the corner.*

Here, the English verbs with a general meaning *to leave* and *to go* cannot be translated by the proper Russian verbs *оставить* and *пойти*. In such so concrete, emotional situation, the equivalence of translation requires the specification of the indicated verbs: *Взволнованная матушка вскочила со своего кресла и забилась в угол позади его*. A similar kind of concretization is used for stylistic reasons:

- (12) *Dinny waited in a corridor which smelled of disinfectant. Dinny đợi ở hành lang sực mùi thuốc khử trùng.* – Динни ждала в коридоре, пропахшем **карболкой**.

The Russian word combination *дезинфицирующее средство* corresponds with the English word *disinfectant*, however, it is stylistically acceptable only in an official-scientific context, and not in the translation of a literary text. In another example of optional concretization for stylistic reasons:

- (13) *I continued my caress, and when I prepared to go home, the animal evinced a disposition to accompany me.* – Я всё время **гладил** кота, а когда собрался домой, он явно пожелал идти со мною. / Tôi tiếp tục **vuốt ve** nó, và khi tôi chuẩn bị ra về, thì con vật tỏ ý muốn đi theo tôi.

The word in ST ‘caress’ is translated by the TT verbs with a narrower meaning ‘to stroke’. Furthermore, ‘animal’ in the English sentence is replaced with ‘cat’ in the Russian one.

## 2.2. Generalization

Generalization is used when something in the TL is usually expressed using concepts with broader meanings or when preserving the original concepts with narrower meanings would result in an awkward translation. It is replacement of a SL unit with a concrete, narrow, specific meaning by a TL unit, which has an abstract and general meaning. The created accordance expresses a “family” concept, including initial specific [Barhudarov, 1975]. In other words, generalization is “a transformation in which a TL lexeme stands in a hyperonymical relationship to the SL lexeme which it renders, or to put it more correctly, a transformation in which the TL lexeme stands in a hyperonymical relationship to the standard rendering of a SL lexeme” [Louw, 1967]. Hence, this device is the reverse of concretization. As in the use of concretization, generalization may be either compulsory or optional.

Compulsory generalization is used as the only way to translate when in TL there are no words with concrete meanings. For example, Vietnamese words *anh, chị* (containing semantic component ‘elder’), when translating into English or Russian, are replaced by *brother, sister; брат, сестра* with a broader meaning. Vietnamese has equivalents of most of the kinship terms that are available in English and Russian. It also has many terms for which English and Russian do not have equivalents, such as *cô* ‘younger paternal sister’, *dì* ‘younger maternal sister’, *chú* ‘younger paternal brother’, *cậu* ‘younger maternal brother’, *đượng* ‘younger maternal sister’s husband’... In translating these terms into English or Russian as *aunt, uncle; тетя, дядя* translators make use of generalization. Similarly, distinctions between Vietnamese *mẹ vợ, mẹ chồng* and Russians *теща, свекровь* are generalized in English by substituting with *mother-in-law* (except the situations when word combinations *wife’s mother, husband’s mother* are used). Other examples of using generalization in rendering non-equivalents: *summary court* is changed for *дисциплинарный суд* (a *summary court* is not only a *disciplinary court* but the least formal one, consisting of one officer, etc.).

Another example of translating non-equivalents:

(14) *But for a while they could still feel, and indeed the senses of their feet and fingers at first seemed sharpened almost painfully. – Но некоторое время они еще не теряли способности чувствовать; в первые минуты осязание даже обострилось почти до боли.*

Here generalization is caused by the fact that there is no way to render fully the meaning of the word-group *the senses of their feet and fingers* into Russian save the descriptive translation, which is obviously out of place. The word *осязание* in the Russian variant is quite adequate in this context. In another example,

(15) *He visits me every weekend. – Anh đi thăm tôi mỗi tuầ n. / Он ездит ко мне каждую неделю.*

*weekend* is rendered as *tuầ n* and *неделю* with a broader meaning ‘week’. In these cases, translators might be tempted to follow the line of least resistance, and if they cannot find a precise equivalent in the TL, they will select a word with a more general meaning [Klaudy, 2003].

In the second case, generalization is optional: although there is an equivalent in the TL at the some level of abstraction, generalization may be desirable for purely stylistic reasons:

(16) *Since the shooting of Robert Kenney five days ago, about 90 Americans have been shot dead. – За те пять дней, которые прошли после убийства Роберта Кеннеди, около 90 американцев погибло от огнестрельного оружия. / Chỉ trong vòng năm ngày sau vụ ám sát Robert Kennedy đã có đến gần 90 người Mỹ bị thiệt mạng vì súng đạn.*

In the example above, English *shooting* is translated into Vietnamese by a more general word *vụ ám sát* instead of the equivalent *vụ bắn chê t* due to the style. In Russian version, the translator uses *убийства* with the same reason. In another example of optional generalization, English typical use of precise numbers when describing a person’s height and weigh is partly generalized when translated into Vietnamese and Russian, where numbers breaches stylistic norms. One can compare:

(17) *I saw a young man 6 feet 2 inches tall. – Tôi trông thấy một thanh niên cao trên mét tám. (lit. ‘over 1m 80 tall’) / Я увидел высокого парня. (lit. ‘tall’)*

Generalization is quite often caused by a pragmatic factor. In the below examples, the concrete name of some object adds little in translation, or is simply irrelevant in context:

(18) *Jane used to drive to market with her mother in their La Sane convertible. – Джейн ездила со своей матерью на рынок в их машине. / Jane đến chợ cùng mẹ trên chiếc xe hơi của họ.*

(19) *He showed us his old beat-up Navaho blanket. – Он нам показал свое потрепанное индейское одеяло. / Ông cho chúng tôi xem cái mền Anhđiêng đã sờn của mình.*

In translations, generalization will be more frequent than specification if we exclude instances of obligatory specification, non-equivalence due to differences in language typology and instances that can be accounted for by stylistic conventions. The tendency to generalize will be observed in different translations of an identical original. When compared to the original, a given passage of a translation will display more instances of semantic loss (generalization) than of semantic specification. These instances will not be directly relatable to typological differences between the languages in question or the influence of TL stylistic conventions. According to Kubackova [2008], who made a comparison of two translations of one novel, generalization seems to be largely dependent on the translator’s idiolect and ambitions as well as on the social context. In translation research, the position of generalization and specification is a rather marginal one. Lexical generalization is sometimes understood as a feature of simplification [Blum-Kulka – Levenston, in Halverson, 2003; Klaudy, 2003], while concretization is often seen as an aspect of explicitation [Leuwentzart, 1989; Klaudy, 2003; Baker, 1998].

### 2.3. Modulation

Modulation is a change of viewpoint or substantial conceptual concept in the translation. It occurs when the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL text in conformity with the current norms of the TL, since the SL and the TL may appear dissimilar in terms of perspective [Newmark, 1988:88].



Modulation is “[a] translation method consisting of changing a point of view, an evocation, and often a category of thought” [Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995]. In Russian linguists’ translation theory, modulation is defined as sense development: replacement of word or combination of words of SL by unit of TL, the value of which logically hatches from the value of the SL unit [Barhudarov, 1975; Komissarov, 1990; Retsker, 1973]. Modulation translation can be divided into metonymic and metaphorical translations.

### 2.3.1. Metonymic translation

Metonymic translation is a lexical transformation based on the substitution of contiguous concepts. It is translation, for instance, using the name of a category for a specific member of the category, using a part for the whole (and vice versa), cause for effect (and vice versa), active for passive, etc.

#### 2.3.1.1. Using the cause for the effect and vice versa

A translation of cause and effect is a transformation whereby the TL rendering does not reflect exactly the same situation as the ST, but rather a situation which logically precedes the situation or results from it. A SL word is replaced by a TL word that denotes notions connected with each other through cause-result links. Such links are usually connected with an action, of which there are basic six varieties of transformations: result – cause; result – action; action – result; action – cause; cause – result; cause – action.

Translation of cause and effect and vice versa is the most often used among modulations. Consider the following example.

(20) *Scrubbing makes me bad-tempered.* – *От мытья полов у меня настроение портится.* / *Tôi cảm thấy bực bội khi phải lau sàn.*

The translations contain the same general notions as the original. This means that the translations are a semantic paraphrase of the original, preserving its basic semes and allowing their free reordering in the sentence. The common semes are easily discovered in the comparative analysis of the translations of this group. Both in the translations and in the original, the situation is described as a cause-effect event with a different pattern of identical semes. In the original: A (scrubbing) causes B (I) to have C (temper) characterized by the property D (bad). In the Russian translation: C (temper) belonging to B (I) acquires the property D (bad) because of A (scrubbing); and in the Vietnamese translation: B (I) became/felt (C) to (D) because of (A).

Other examples of cause-effect change:

(21) *I don't blame them.* – *Я их понимаю.* (The result is replaced by the cause: я их не виню потому, что я их понимаю ‘I don't blame them because I understand them’).

(22) *He's dead now.* *Anh ta đã chết.* – *Он умер.*

(23) *He always made you say everything twice.* – *Nó thường xuyên hỏi đi hỏi lại.* *Он всегда переспрашивал.* (Lit. in both translations: ‘He is always asks and asks again’)

In using modulation, the cause-effect relation of two units in the SL and TL can have a broader character, but the logical connection between the two units is always preserved:

(24) *Manson slung his bag up and climbed into the battered gig behind a tall, angular black horse.* (A. Cronin) – *Мэнсон поставил свой чемодан и влез в расхлябанную двуколку, запряженную крупной костлявой черной лошастью.*

In example (24), contextual replacement is obviously necessary, especially in translation of such a combination like *behind a horse*, as it is impossible to say in Russian: *Он сел в телегу позади лошади*. Translating *slung his bag up* by *поставил свой чемодан*, *behind a horse* by *запряженную лошастью* and *angular* by *костлявая* can be done with modulation, although it is hard to define the kinds of connection between the proper concepts in the SL and TL.

(25) *I noticed that she had left her glass full of wine.* *Tôi thấy cô ta để lại ly rượu còn đầy nguyên.* – *Я заметил, что она не прикоснулась к вину.*

Here, in the Russian text, the consequence is changed to the reason: the glass is full because ‘she did

not touch it'. This change occurred because literal translation 'она оставила свой бокал полным вина' cannot be accepted due to stylistic reason. The reverse change 'effect-cause' can be found in the below examples:

- (26) 'Have a seat there, boy', old Spencer said. He **meant** the bed. – Садись вон туда, мальчик, – сказал старый Спенсер. Он **показал** на кровать. (Показал 'point', because he meant it.)
- (27) He was the kind of guy that **hates to answer you** right away. Такие, как он, сразу **не отвечают**. (He отвечают 'don't answer', because don't like doing that)
- (28) *Paler indeed than the moon ailing in some slow eclipse was the light of it now, wavering and blowing like a noisome exhalation of decay, a corpse-light, a light that illuminated nothing.* – Слабее, чем **недужный полусвет** лунного затмения, этот отблеск раскачивался и клубился, как зловонные испарения, – мертвый свет, не освещающий ничего.

In the last example, the process is replaced by its effect (*moon ailing* – недужный полусвет), but the meaning and the expressive colouring of the phrase are retained. Some elements of the English sentence are left out of the translation to make it easier for perception and to fit it into the natural Russian structure.

- (29) *Jupiter opened the door, and a large Newfoundland, belonging to Legrand, rushed in, leaped upon my shoulders, and loaded me with caresses; for I had shown him much attention during previous visits.* – Юпитер распахнул дверь и огромный ньюфаундленд Леграна ворвался в комнату и бурно меня **приветствовал, положив свои лапы мне на плечи**; я подружился с ним ещё в прежние посещения.

The direct translation 'он прыгнул мне на плечи, осыпав меня ласками' is stylistically inadequate; therefore the translator transforms this part as follows: *он бурно меня приветствовал, положив свои лапы мне на плечи*. Here the process is replaced with the effect. Using effect (*я споткнулся*) for action (*кинулся вперёд*) can also be found in the following example, where a literal translation 'кот кинулся головой вперёд' of English *nearly throwing me headlong* is not acceptable for the same stylistic reason. The same translation is in the Vietnamese version.

- (30) *The cat followed me down the steep stairs and, nearly throwing me headlong, exasperated me to madness.* – Кот увязался за мной вниз по крутой лестнице, **я споткнулся, едва не свернув себе шею** и обезумел от бешенства. / Con mèo theo tôi xuống bậc cầu thang và **làm tôi xuyt nữa nhào đầu xuống**, tôi giận như điên lên.

There are also examples of using the process for its cause:

- (31) *Earth, air and water all seem accursed. But so our path is laid.* – Земля, воздух, вода – на всем, кажется, лежит проклятье. Но путь наш проходит именно здесь.

In the English sentence, the doer of the action is not mentioned, and the translator considers it preferable to change the sentence in the passive voice, making it active by turning the object into the subject, developing the meaning of the predicate and inserting the word *именно*.

#### 2.3.1.2. Using a part for the whole and vice versa

- (32) *About this wall a dense crowd were collected, and many persons seemed to be examining a particular portion of it with very minute and eager attention.* – Подле неё собралась большая толпа, множество **глаз пристально и жадно всматривались все в одно место**.

The whole 'person' is replaced by its part 'eye' in the above sentences.

2.3.1.3. Another type of metonymic translation is using the name of a category for a specific member of the category. The following examples illustrate replacement:

- (33) *The advantages of sound have nowhere been better understood or utilized than on the Third Programme.* – Преимущества **радио** особенно хорошо использовались Третьей Программой Би-Би-Си. (радио – 'radio')
- (34) *On Capitol Hill residents have been assaulted on their porches – in their garages or while waiting*

*for a bus, sometimes within full view of other citizens too frightened to move.* – В районе Капитолия на жителей напали у входа в дом, в их гаражах или на **остановке** автобуса, иногда на глазах у других граждан, слишком напуганных, чтобы хоть пальцем пошевелить. (остановке – ‘bus stand’)

(35) *He's the best **player** in the recent table tennis contest.* – Anh ta là **cây vợt** xuất sắc nhất trong giải bóng bàn gần đây. (cây vợt – ‘(tennis) racquet’)

### 2.3.2. Metaphorical translation

(36) *There is something behind the throne greater than the King himself.*

The literal translation of this sentence *За треном скрывается что-то такое, что сильнее самого короля* is impossible: a clearer interpretation of the phrase is required. In another version *За треном скрывается сила, которая сильнее самого короля*, ‘сила сильнее’ is stylistically incorrect. In the end *something greater* is translated as *личность могущественнее* (*За треном скрывается личность могущественнее самого короля*).

(37) *The hurricane has left tens of thousands of people **homeless**.* – cơn bão làm cho hàng chục ngàn người lâm vào **cánh màn trời chiếu đất**.

(38) *In many Western societies, marriage has become **a panda bear** of a social institution.* – Ở nhiều xã hội phương Tây, hôn nhân là một tập tục **đang suy tàn**.

(39) *If she **played her cards right**, she would be head of the London office.* – Nếu cô ta **đi đúng nước cờ**, cô ta sẽ lên chức trưởng văn phòng ở Luân Đôn.

In all of the examples above adequate translation has been achieved by means of metaphoric transformations.

In some research, modulation is named for all types of lexical changes, including antonymic translation, converse translation, translation of cause and effect and vice versa, specification, generalization, modification and cultural counterpart [Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995]. By the term ‘modulation’ Vinay and Darbelnet mean all kinds of lexical changes. Modulation, according to Vinay and Darbelnet is a semantic-pragmatic procedure that changes the category of thought, the focus, the point of view and the whole conceptualization. They distinguish two types: “recorded modulation”, also called “standard modulation”, and “free modulation”, which is further broken down into eleven categories. The first type, “recorded modulation” is an established convention used in bilingual dictionaries, and is considered by many to be a ready-made procedure. Concerning the second type, “free modulation” is considered to be more practical in cases where “the TL rejects literal translation” [Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995:11].

### 2.4. Antonymic translation

An antonymic translation is a transformation in which a SL element is rendered by its TL antonym plus a negation [Louw, 1967]. It represents a way of rendering when an affirmative in a language unit (word, word-group or sentence) is conveyed via a negative in sense or structure but identical in content to the language unit, or vice versa: a negative in sense or structure sense unit is translated via an affirmative sense unit. Antonymic translation is employed for the sake of achieving faithfulness in conveying content or the necessary expressiveness of sense units. Like generalization, antonymic translation may be obligatory or optional.

2.4.1. As a unique device, antonymic translation is employed in the following cases:

2.4.1.1. when there is no direct equivalent in the TL for the sense unit of the SL:

(40) *Keep off the grass!* – **He** ходите по газонам! **Không** dẫm lên cỏ!

(41) *Authorized personnel only.* – Посторонним вход **воспрещен**. **Cấm** người ngoài. (In both TL lit. ‘Strangers are forbidden’)

(42) *Take it easy.* – **He** волнуйтесь (lit. ‘Don’t worry’).

(43) *Hurry up.* – Только **не** копайся!

(44) *Hang on, please!* – *Xin chờ máy.* (lit. ‘wait’) / *He кладите трубку!* (lit. ‘don’t put down’)

(45) *to sit up, thức khuya* – *долго не ложиться спать*

English has many understatements that have to be translated antonymically into other languages:

(46) *Do you mind this?* – *Вы не против?* / *Anh không phiền chú?*

(47) *For the thousandth time I've told you to keep your nose out of the business.* – *Tôi đã nói với anh hàng ngàn lần rồi là đừng có can thiệp vào việc này* (lit. ‘do not take part in’).

(48) *Mind your own business.* – *Không phải việc của anh* (lit. ‘(It’s) not your business’).

(49) *I guess he thought it was all right to do because it was only me that was in the room.* – *Наверно, он думал, что это можно, потому что, кроме меня, никого тут не было.*

2.4.1.2. Antonymic translation can be the sole possibility of correct transmission of idea, when to a literal translation results in absurdity.

(50) *Gollum, crawling on the ground like a frightened animal, was already vanishing into the gloom.* – *Голлама, который полз по земле, как испуганный зверь, уже почти не было видно.*

The direct translation ‘уже исчезал в темноте’ is impossible in Russian. The antonymic translation is a typical Russian impersonal sentence. Similar cases are not uncommon in practice. Many English sentences of the same structure are easily translated into Russian with the help of this device.

(51) *There's something still alive in that place, something with eyes, or a seeing mind, if you take me; and the longer we stay in one spot, the sooner it will get on to us.* – *Здесь есть еще кто-то, кто может видеть – не знаю, глазами или как-нибудь еще; надеюсь, вы меня понимаете. Надо отсюда уходить, пока он до нас не добрался.*

The absurdity of the translation ‘чем дольше мы здесь пробудем, тем быстрее он до нас доберется’ is clear. In all the above examples, antonymic translation requires an obligatory substitution of an affirmative in sense and structure SL unit for a semantically corresponding negative in structure sense unit of the TL. The reverse substitution can be seen in the following examples:

(52) *No man is wise at all times.* – *На всякого мудреца довольно простоты.*

(53) *Nothing changed in my hometown.* – *Все осталось прежним в моем родном городе.*

2.4.1.3. when the sense unit of the SL has two negations of its own which create an affirmation in TL. Cf:

(54) *not infrequently* – *часто / thường* (‘often’)

(55) *Нет лиха без добра* – *Every dark cloud has a silver lining. Hết mưa trời lại nắng.*

(56) *She is not unworthy of your attention.* – *Cô ấy hoàn toàn đáng được anh để ý đến. Она вполне заслуживает вашего внимания.*

Antonymic translation, therefore, is the only solution in translating many English litotes (affirmative statements in negative form) into Russian or Vietnamese. Litotes are very popular in English because there is a large amount of negative prefixes in this language. Literal translation of English litotes into Vietnamese or Russian is rarely possible: in Vietnamese there are relatively fewer negative words (particles); and in Russian words with negative prefix не- rarely combines with negative particle не because of their coincidence.

(57) *Moreover, the attempt was not unsuccessful.* – *Нон nữa, nỗ lực này đã thành công. / Причем, это старание было успешным.* (In both TT lit. ‘successful’)

(58) *She's not the friendliest person I know.* *Cô ấy chẳng phải là người thân thiện cho lắm.* – *Она не приветливая.* (lit. ‘She's an unfriendly person’)

2.4.2. Antonymic translation is also an option even when there is a semantic equivalent sense structure between the SL and TL. Hence, a reverse transformation of negative-structured sense unit in the SL becomes an affirmative-structured sense unit in the TL, and vice versa. Compare:

(59) *Can't I have a little peace?* – *Оставьте меня в покое. / Hãy để tôi yên.*

(60) *The United States did not enter the war until April 1917.* – *Соединенные Штаты вступили в войну только в апреле 1917 г.* – *Cho đến tận tháng Tư năm 1917, Hoa Kỳ mới tham chiến.* (in

both TT lit. ‘The United States entered the war only since April 1917’)

(61) *Nobody was ever sorry to see him.* – Mọi người gặp nó đều thích thú.

(62) *Her arrival took them by surprise. They hadn't been expecting her for at least another hour.* – Cô ta đến làm họ ngạc nhiên. Họ cứ ngỡ ít nhất một giờ nữa cô ta mới đến.

(63) *I did not believe it until I saw with my own eyes. Tôi không tin điều đó cho đến khi được nhìn thấy tận mắt.* – Я поверил этому только, когда увидел это своими глазами (lit. ‘I believe it only when I saw...’).

In (63) the negative structure in English with the conjunction until and in Vietnamese with the word combination *cho đến khi* is translated into Russian by an affirmative sentence. In fact, there is also a version with the verb in the negative form ‘Я не верил этому до тех пор, пока не увидел это собственными глазами’, but it is much longer.

(64) *If you want to cross the street remember to look at the traffic lights first. Nếu muốn sang đường thì trước hết phải nhớ nhìn đèn giao thông.* – Если хочешь пересечь улицу, не забудь сначала посмотреть на светофор.

In this example, an affirmative sentence in English and Vietnamese is changed to a negative one in Russian because of the grammatical features of the Russian language: the verb *помнить* cannot combine with an infinitive. In this case, the translator uses the verb *забыть*, an antonym of *помнить* instead. The affirmative structure with the verb *помнить* ‘... помни о том, чтобы посмотреть на светофор’ is not possible for stylistic reasons – such a heavy, strange structure cannot be accepted.

There are many cases when both antonymic and literal translations are possible. Then the question of preferability should be approached from the stylistic point of view.

(65) *Care was certainly needed.* – Без осторожности здесь действительно было не обойтись.

The variant ‘Несомненно, осторожность была необходима’ is also possible, but the antonymic translation is preferable.

(66) “...If he's false, he's false.” “All the same, I'd rather have him under my eyes”, said Sam. – “Если он нас обманывает, ничего не поделаешь”. “Все равно, я бы предпочел не упускать его из виду” – сказал Сэм.

The possible translation Я бы предпочел держать его под наблюдением cannot appear in the given context.

Within the framework of antonymic translation, a unit of SL can be replaced not only by direct opposite unit of TL but also by other words and combinations, that express an opposite idea.

(67) *The rail-road unions excluded negroes from their membership.*

The literal translation ‘Профсоюзы железнодорожников исключали негров из своих рядов’ is quite illogical: in fact, excluding a man from an organization is possible only when he is a member. It is impossible to suppose that a trade union accepted a negro only in order to exclude him immediately. But ‘exclude’ means ‘not to include’, or in other words, ‘not to accept’ (‘не принимать’). Thus, the adequate translation will be the following:

Профсоюзы железнодорожников не принимали негров в свои ряды.

Another type of semantic variation consists in the change of direction of relations between signs. A situation can be described from a different point of view with the use of lexical converse:

(68) *How I was sold in New Ark. Tôi đã bị bán ở New Ark thế nào* – Как меня купили (lit. ‘How I was bought’)

This type of antonymic translation is called reverse translation by some researchers [Louw, 1967]

Antonymic translation is quite often combined with other transformations (lexical or grammatical):

(69) *Their house had no screen doors.* – Двери у них были сплошные. (substituting of negative form by affirmative is accompanied by the modulation of combination *screen doors*.)

(70) *The people are **not slow** in learning the truth.* – *Люди **быстро** узнают правду* (antonymic translation is accompanied by replacement to part of speech – adjective on an adverb).

Due to this feature of antonymic translation, Komissarov classifies it as a complex lexico-grammatical transformation. [Komissarov, 1990].

## 2.5. Full rearrangement

Full rearrangement is a transformation of the internal form of both a separate speech turn and the whole sentence. This kind of transformation is carried out not on elements, but integrally. So, if in Russian, upon the departure of a subway train it is acceptable to say:

(70) *Осторожно, двери закрываются!*

then in English, due to the rules of grammar, this phrase would be literally translated as: *Careful! The doors are closed.*

However, the acceptable English expression is:

*Watch the doors, please.*

And Vietnamese has the same expression:

*Xin chú ý cửa.*

Strictly speaking, it is a situationally adequate translation. In another example:

(71) *Осторожно. Окрашено!*

The literal English translation of this expression ‘*Careful! It’s painted here*’ is unacceptable. Although this translation is grammatically correct, in a similar situation a native speaker will say *Caution. Wet paint.* And *Chú ý sơn ướt* is an adequate translation in Vietnamese. Examples of using full rearrangement can be easily found in literary translation. The examples below are taken from *The Lord of the Ring*. The simplest case of using this device can be illustrated by identifying the contextual meaning of the elliptical phrase *Not yet!* which, depending on the context, can be translated as *Пока еще нет!* (‘not yet’), *Еще рано!* (‘still early’) or *Подожди* (‘wait’); *Chưa đâu* (‘not yet’), *Chờ đã* (‘wait’)...:

(72) *Tugging at Frodo’s sleeve, he /Gollum/ pointed towards the path: but Frodo would not move. “Not yet”, he said, “not yet”.* – *Он тянул Фродо за рукав, указывая на тропинку. Но Фродо не двинулся с места. “Подожди, – сказал он. – Подожди”. / Gollum giật mạnh tay áo Frodo, chỉ về phía con đường, nhưng Frodo chẳng hề động đậy. “Chưa đâu”, anh nói, “chờ đã”.*

Here are two examples of more complicated cases:

(73) *“I don’t like anything here at all”, said Frodo, “step or stone, breath or bone”.* – *“Мне здесь все не нравится, – сказал Фродо, – камни и скалы, башни и провалы”.*

The lexical components are fully rearranged because of the necessity to retain the rhyme.

(74) *I make no mistake: I don’t doubt he’d hand me over to Orcs as gladly as kiss his hand.* – *Нечего и рядить: я уверен, выдать меня оркам ему все равно что раз плюнуть.*

Full rearrangement is needed because the word-for-word translation would be clumsy and obscure. At the same time, *раз плюнуть* compensates the double negation in the sentence, and therefore partially loses its clumsiness.

Full rearrangement is a widespread lexical transformation device in translation of publication.

(75) *Even the most perfunctory account of the plain facts would blow the myths sky-high.* – *Даже беглое рассмотрение фактов не ставит камня на камне от созданного историками мифа.*

(76) *The other tasks of the revolution in the South could be left to work themselves out.* – *Выполнение других задач революции на юге можно было пустить на самотек. / Những nhiệm vụ còn lại của cuộc cách mạng ở miền Nam có thể để lại cho họ tự giải quyết.*

(77) *North Carolina was thrown back into the lap of its former master in 1870, when the President refused to send Federal troops to suppress the K.K.K.* – *Северная Каролина была отдана на*

*откуп* прежним хозяевам в 1870 году, когда президент отказался послать туда федеральные войска для **подавления мятежа куклускланцев**. / Năm 1970, Bắc Carolina lại bị bỏ mặc cho những người chủ cũ khi Tổng thống từ chối đưa quân Liên bang đến dẹp loạn quân 3K.

In these last two examples a lot of vivid expressions, requiring integral replacement, are replaced with corresponding traditional Russians and Vietnamese expressions. In some works, full rearrangement is considered a variety of semantic development. This device can be briefly defined as transformation of a separate word, a segment, or the whole suggestion. Thus transformation takes place not on elements, but integrally. As it is observed in other lexical transformations, a long tradition and history of linguistic contact between languages results in the full rearrangement of frequent lexical units which are fixed as dictionary equivalents – permanent and variable. In particular, there are many such equivalents in colloquial language expressions. For example:

(78) *How do you do?* – *Chào. Здравствуйте.*

(79) *Never mind.* *Ничего, не беспокойтесь, не обращайтесь внимания.* *Không sao cả.*

(80) *Forget it.* – *Quên đi. Không cần đâu.* *Не стоит говорить об этом.*

(81) *Shut up!* – *Câm đi! Заткнись.*

(82) *Well done!* – *Giỏi quá! Cừ thật! Bravo! Молодец!*

All examples show that these colloquial equivalents do not have general semantic components; they possess a different internal form and simultaneously transfer the same notion by the facilities of different languages. The specificities of colloquial speech frequently requires such an integral transformation in translation. Translation of the combination *forget it!* in the above example is done by using of sense development device (s. also 4.): Russian and Vietnamese equivalents replace the sense for a word of action (*забудьте об этом, quên đi*) with its reason (*не стоит об этом говорить* (lit. worthless to say about it'), *không cần đâu* (lit. 'No need')). It would be more precise to define this device as antonymic translation. However, the absence of general (common) components between English expression and its Russian and Vietnamese equivalents gives a reason to consider it a product of full rearrangement. The above saying can explain why integral transformation serves as the universal means of translation of proverbs and idioms.

(83) *Birds of a feather flock together.* *Рыбак рыбака видит из далека* (lit. A fisher sees a fisher from the distance'). *Ngưu tầm ngưu, mã tầm mã* (lit. Buffalos look for buffalos, horses look for horses).

(84) *to know it like the back of your hand* – *rõ như lòng bàn tay; знать как свои пять пальцев;*

The English version evokes the image of a back of someone's hand; in Vietnamese the hand becomes a palm, but more general, without indicating whose palm; in Russian the image is of one's own five fingers (*свои пять пальцев*).

## 2.6. Compensation

Compensation is a translation procedure whereby the translator solves the problem of aspects of the source text that cannot take the same form in the target language by replacing these aspects with other elements or forms in the source text [Wiki]. Compensation is a technique which involves making up for the loss of a ST effect by recreating a similar effect in the TT through means that are specific to the TL and/or TT. Compensation occurs when loss of meaning in one part of a sentence is compensated in another part or making up for the loss of something in the ST, by adding something else in the TT [Newmark, 1988:90]. It is true that some marginal elements of information may be lost in translation. However, some of them may be compensated for by the use of different devices, sometimes in a different portion of the message. For instance, the Russian vernacular

(85) *Но ваше дело рисковое* (M. Sholohov)

may be translated as *but your job is damned risky* thus the use of a low colloquial lexical item *damned* compensates for the nonstandard morphological form *рисковое*. In the phrase *подкинуть идею* a derogatory connotation is expressed by the suffix *-ку*. In the English phrase *to sell the idea* the noun is neutral

but the derogatory connotation is shifted to the verb.

Quite often, a text or utterance that is considered to be “untranslatable” is actually a lacuna, or lexical gap, that is to say that there is no one-to-one equivalence between the word, expression or turn of phrase in the source language and another word, expression or turn of phrase in the target language. A translator, however, can resort to a number of translation procedures to compensate. For example, to translate a text from one of the languages that have two forms of the second person pronoun: an informal form and a formal form (e.g. the Russian *ты* and *вы* the German *du* and *Sie*), to [HYPERLINK "http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Untranslatability\\_-\\_Available\\_translation\\_procedures/id/2018903#"](http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Untranslatability_-_Available_translation_procedures/id/2018903#)English, the translator may have to compensate by using a first name or nickname, or by using syntactic phrasing that are viewed as informal in English (I'm, you're, gonna, dontcha, etc.), or by using English words of the formal and informal register, to preserve the level of formality [Wiki].

The two areas which most nearly approach total untranslatability are poetry and puns. Poetry is difficult to translate because of its reliance on the sounds, such as rhymes, and rhythms of the source language. Puns and other similar semantic wordplay are difficult because of how tightly they are tied to the original [HYPERLINK “http://www.experiencefestival.com/untranslatability\\_-\\_compensation#”](http://www.experiencefestival.com/untranslatability_-_compensation#)language. That being said, many of the translation procedures discussed here can be used in these cases. Compensation may be considered the best way to translate language special and original features of poetry and puns. For example:

(85) *Sam laughed grimly. “Cobwebs!” he said. “Is that all? Cobwebs! But what a spider! Have at ‘em, down with ‘em!” – Сэм мрачно засмеялся. “Паутина!” воскликнул он. “И только-то? Паутина! Ну и паучок! А ну-ка, сорвем ее!”*

Colloquial Russian phrases *И только-то?* and *Ну и паучок!* compensate for the impossibility of translating adequately the colloquial English form of the pronoun ‘em. Hatim and Mason conclude that “[t]he translators abandon the attempt to relay the puns as such and, instead, compensate by inserting English puns of their own which are not part of the source text. But equivalence of intention has been maintained” [Hatim, 2004]. Here, the same linguistic device is employed in both source and target texts to achieve a similar humorous effect.

Compensation can be of two types: (1) semantic compensation, which is used as a means to compensate for sense losses especially while translating culture-bound and nationally specific units (*five-and-ten-cent store trade Warren – дешёвые*); (2) stylistic compensation which is employed to compensate for stylistic losses, such as *пятихатник – 500 roubles*.

### 2.6.1. Semantic compensation

Semantic compensation is often used for filling in of blanks caused by non-equivalences. It is denotation of realities (realii), characteristic for the country of the SL and alien to the TL and reality of the TL culture and reality. In many cases, if these details do not have a principal value, then their omitting in translation will not be a loss for the receptor. For example:

(86) *That kind of stuff. The old bull. – Словом, наворачивал как надо.*

(87) *It's awful. – Страшное дело.*

(87) *I've brought a Christmas present for Dad. – Это папе новогодний подарок.*

Semantic compensation can be used to serve a purpose achieved in Russian by the means which are different from the ones in English, such as in the transmission of alliteration, contamination speech and calembours. In such cases, purpose justifies such means, because maintaining information may be of lesser value than the effect of the utterance. When an author intentionally employs non-sense words to underline parody or absurdity, the text's translation cannot generally use dictionary accordances with the original. In this case it is possible to talk about continuous compensation. Thus, compensation is used for the transmission of elements of sense, lost in translation, and it is carried out by other methods, or at later points in other



places in the text.

(88) *I'm lucky, though.* – *Все-таки у меня это хорошо выходит.*

(89) *It's boring to do that every two minutes.* – *Вот еще, охота была поминутно нагибаться.*

(90) *I also say "Boy!" quite a lot. Partly because I have a lousy vocabulary and partly because I act quite young for my age sometimes.* – *Это тоже привычка – говорить "Эх!" или "Ух ты!", отчасти потому, что у меня не хватает слов, а отчасти потому, то я иногда веду себя совсем не по возрасту.*

In the following example, violation of linguistic norm in the English text, inexpressible in translation, is compensated by other non-standard forms in Russian:

(91) [Elisa:] *"I'm nothing to you – not so much as them slippers". Хиггинс направляет ее: "those slippers".* – *"Я для вас ничто, хуже вот этих туфлей", а Хиггинс поправит ее: "туфель".*

It is difficult to transfer the difference between them and those into Russian. But this "loss" can be easily compensated with incorrect case form of the word as in the example above.

In many cases, the translator has to use TL units which have no equivalents in the SL:

(92) *You could tell he was very ashamed of his parents and all, because they said "he don't" and "she don't" and stuff like that.* – *Было видно, что он стесняется своих родителей, потому что они говорили "хочут" и "хочете" и все в таком роде.*

(93) *"No sweethearts, I b'lieve?" "Sweetmeats did you say, Mr. Barkis?"* – *"А нет ли у нее дружочка?" "Пирожочка, мистер Баркис?"*

In the last example, the error in the ST seems natural, as the beginnings of both words coincide. This commonality can be saved in translation only by changing the words, because in the Russian words *sweethearts* 'beloved' and *sweetmeats* 'candy' have nothing in common.

### 2.6.2. Stylistic compensation

Stylistic compensation enables the maintenance of ST when TL norms make it impossible to save the particular weight-bearing word which carries the phrase's meaning in the original. "Compensation is a transformation whereby a TL stylistic element is introduced into the target text at a place where it does not occur in the source text, because a functional rendering of an SL stylistic element could not be realized at the same place" [Louw, 1967:73]. Following Harvey [1995:82-4], compensation occurs where the TT includes stylistic features that aim to naturalize the text for the target reader and that aim to achieve a comparable number and quality of effects, without these being tied to any specific instances of ST loss. The example below is the most typical example of the use of stylistic compensation in translating from English into Russian:

(94) *"Why don't you write a good thrilling detective story?" she asked. "Me?" exclaimed Mrs Albert Forrester...* (S. Maugham, *The Creative Impulse*) – *"А почему бы вам не написать детективный роман, такой, чтобы дух захватывало?" "Чего?" воскликнула миссис Форрестер...*

As we see, in the SL elliptical sentence the heroine uses the objective case form of pronoun *me* in place of *I*, that is the custom in colloquial English. However in Russian, such nuance in the order of the personal pronouns does not happen. Therefore in this case the translator applies the method of compensation, in the process of which replaces a literary form *что* on familiar *чего*. Semantic maintenance of the fragment does not change as a result, even though changing the personal pronoun in the original to the interrogative in translation is rather significant. Another example of using stylistic compensation is shown below:

(95) *This policy could lead the economy into the waste of mass unemployment.* – *В результате такой экономической политики в стране появилась бы массовая безработица, т.е. резервы экономики расточались бы непроизводительно.*

Considering the examples, one has a clear sense that compensation is justified in cases where it is necessary to transfer exact pragmatic values and characteristic features of SL speech, specific dialectal expres-

sions, different word-plays, puns, jargon etc. It is also acceptable in cases where it is impossible to choose the exact accordance to an element of the text. Thus, stylistic compensation is used mainly in translating folk speech, proverbs, saying, idioms and other expressions, having specific colouring features which are lost in translation.

(97) *Paddle your own canoe.* – *В чужую лодку не залезай.*

(98) *...He made a speech that lasted about ten hours.* – *...Он отгрохал речь часов на десять.*

(99) *If there is one thing I hate, it's the movies.* – *Если я что ненавижу, так это кино.*

(100) *...She had on those damn falsies that point all over the place... – ... У нее... в лифчик что-то подложено, чтоб торчало во все стороны...*

Thus, using compensation and full rearrangement (integral transformation) is an objective example (evidence) that the equivalence of translation can be achieved at the level of the text, but not by translation of separate fragments of text (for example: words or word-groups). In other words, there are details which are impossible to translate, but there is always a way to transmit their sense in the translation of the whole text.

As equivalence is established between two definite units of translation, due to the linguistic (typological, grammatical, lexical) and cultural differences, a unit of translation can have its equivalent in one TL but may not have it in other TLs, or it appears to have equivalents of different levels in different TLs. Therefore, when translating a ST into different TLs, the translators may have to use different devices; for instance, the device used in translating the English expression in example (44) *Hang on, please!* into Vietnamese uses modulation: *Xin chờ máy.* (lit. 'wait'), while into Russian *Не кладите трубку!* (lit. 'don't put down') is an antonymic translation; in some cases a SL unit is translated into different TLs by using the same device but with different levels, as shown in example (17) *I saw a young man 6 feet 2 inches tall.* – *Tôi trông thấy một thanh niên cao trên mét tám.* (lit. 'over 1m 80 tall') / *Я увидел высокого парня.* (lit. 'tall').

### Conclusion

In the process of translating a text from one language to another, the translator often meets problems of variable equivalence and non-equivalence, due to the structural and semantic differences between the two languages, as well as differences of the two cultures in which the languages are rooted. Semantic transformation (replacement) is one useful and effective strategy to solve the non-equivalence problem, by creating occasional equivalents based on linguistic and situational (extra-linguistic) contexts. Among the various types of semantic transformations the most frequent are: concretization, generalization, modulation (sense development), antonymic translation, full rearrangement, and compensation. Each of these devices is used specifically in translating a definite category of words or word-groups, sentences or paragraphs, or even the whole text, depending on the characteristics of the units of translation. Thus, concretization is a frequent device in translation from English into Vietnamese from English or Vietnamese into Russian, due to the existence of a large group of English words of wide semantic volume. Generalization, on the contrary, is used in translating the Vietnamese kinship terms into Russian and English. Modulation, especially metonymic cause-effect change, is popular in literary translation to maintain the specific stylistic features of ST units. Antonymic translation is used in translating the double negatives structures. Full rearrangement is a widespread device used in translating publicity materials, proverbs and idioms. Compensation is the universal device to translate poetry, puns and word plays, in order to transfer stylistic characteristic features. Each of these semantic transformations can be use in their "pure" form or in combination with one or more other translation techniques.

## References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*, London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications. In Baker, M., Francis, G., Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds), *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 233-250.
- Blum-Kulka, S. – Levenston, E. (1983). Universals of lexical simplification. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, 119-139.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay on Applied Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold: London.
- Halverson, S. (1997). "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies: Much Ado About Something", in *Target* 9:2. 207-233.
- Harvey, K. (1995). A Descriptive Framework for Compensation. *The Translator* 1(1): 65-86.
- Hatim B. and Munday J. (2004). *Translation – an Advanced Resource Book*. NY: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Klaudy, K. (2003). *Languages in Translation. Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation*. Budapest: Scholastica, 321-327.
- Koller, Werner (1995) 'The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies', *Target* 7(2):191-222.
- Kruger, A. & Wallmach, K. 1997. Research methodology for the description of a source text and its translation(s) – a South African perspective. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 17(4):119-126.
- Kubackova, J. (2008). *Keeping Czech in check: A corpus-based study of generalization in translation*. Available from: HYPERLINK "<http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/>" [http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTI04/pdf\\_doc/03.pdf](http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTI04/pdf_doc/03.pdf)
- Langeveld A. (1988). "Compensation". *Translation. Our Future*. Ed. P. Nekemann. Maastricht. 82-84.
- Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Leuwen-Zwart, Kitty M., van (1989). Translation and Original. Similarities and Dissimilarities I, II. *Target* 1: 2, 151-183; 2: 1, 69-95.
- Louw T., van der (1967). *Transformations in the Septuagint Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Available from: HYPERLINK "[https://openaccess](https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/1887/4282/1/Proefschrift.pdf)" <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/1887/4282/1/Proefschrift.pdf>
- Munday J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. NY: Routledge.
- Neubert, S. (1997). "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies: Much Ado About Something", in *Target* 9:2. 207-233.
- Newmark P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. UK: Prentice Hall International.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. and Taber C. (1969/1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment. In Chesterman, A. (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 105-15). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Vinay, J. and Darbelnet J. (1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation*, translated by J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wills, W. (1982) *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- [Barhudarov] Бархударов, Л.С. (1975). *Язык и перевод (Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода)*. М., Международные отношения. – 240с.

- [Breus] Бреус, Е.В. (2000). *Основы теории и практики перевода с русского языка на английский*. Учебное пособие. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Изд-во УРАО – 208с.
- [Kazakova] Казакова, Т.А. (2001). *Практические основы перевода. English ↔ Russian*. Серия: Изучаем иностранные языки.– СПб.: Издательство Союз.
- [Komissarov 1990] Комиссаров, В.Н. (1990). *Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты)*: учебник для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – М.: Высшая школа.
- [Komissarov 1999] Комиссаров, В. Н. (1999). *Современное переводоведение. Курс лекций*. – М.: ЭТС, 1999. – 192 с.
- [Retsker] Рецкер, Я.И. (1973). *Учебное пособие по переводу с английского языка на русский*. – М.: Международные отношения.
- [Shveitser] Швейцер, А.Д. (1988). *Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты*. – М.: Наука.
- [Wiki] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translation>