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Introduction. The issues of theory and practice of translation studies, functioning at the intersection of several humanitarian disciplines, have long been in the focus of attention of researchers studying the processes of interpretation and translation. Previous generations of foreign scientists M. Halliday, P. Newmark, E. Nida, M. Snell-Hornby et al. and Ukrainian researchers V. Karaban, V. Kopitlov, I. Korunets et al. (Halliday, 1964; Newmark, 1981; Nida, 1991; Snell-Hornby, 1988; Карaban, 2003; Копилюв, 1982; Корунець, 2003) have developed a huge informational virgin land, and it subsequently gave impetus to the emergence and development of fruitful theories of translation (theory of regular correspondences, theory of transformations, informational theory, situational theory, theory of inconsistencies, etc.). A modern concise overview of the main theories that have been recognized and disseminated in the XX-th century is presented in the article by T. Vorova (Ворова, 2021). The aim of the present work, which does not pretend to be a universal and comprehensive coverage of all modern achievements of translation studies, is to analyze the general informational platform of translation studies in order to focus the attention of a novice in translation on the creative possibilities of translation science and thus contribute to the expansion of the translator’s creative potential at the preparatory stage of his further practical activity.

Research methods and methodology. To solve the stated goal, there have been used the general scientific methods and techniques based on the analysis and synthesis of existing publications on translation studies, as well as the method of explication, including elements of comparison and generalization in the examples of the linguistic material.

Results and discussions. Nowadays there have been quantitative and qualitative changes that have largely influenced both the very nature of activity in translation and the requirements for translation and translators. The profession of translator is in demand as a result of the informational explosion – a dramatic increase in informational exchange, accompanied by a translation explosion and a corresponding increase in the scale of activities in translation. Not only professional translators, but also other specialists with knowledge of foreign languages (diplomats, engineers, teachers, etc.) began to be engaged in translation. There was a need to train a large number of translators. A qualitative change of the activity in translation also played a big role in attracting linguists’ attention to the problems of translation.

The task of the translator is to convey the content of the original text in a holistic and accurate manner, preserving its stylistic and expressive features. The integrity of translation should be understood as the unity of form and content on a new linguistic platform. If the criterion of accuracy in translation is the identity of the information presented on the basis of two foreign languages, a translation, that transmits this information by equivalent means, can be recognized as adequate. Consequently, a translation must show not only the semantic content of the original text, but also its form. This requirement applies both to a particular segment and to a text as a whole. In this context, special attention should be paid to the equivalence of sense and to the translation tools.

For the theory of translation, the comparative study of languages is of great importance: in general, this study concerns certain fundamental aspects of the language system (grammatical structure, vocabulary, stylistics). Bearing in mind that the complex nature of the translation process requires a comprehensive comparison, one can say with a reasonable degree of certainty that the
results of the comparative analysis will probably serve as material for highlighting certain features in theory of translation. What is important for a translator is the comparison of not individual grammatical forms or syntactic structures, but of structural and semantic blocks that constitute a single conceptual core. A grammatical structure devoid of lexical content is as ineffective for a translator as a rough frame of a building without modern conveniences. Consequently, the most weighty and significant part of theory of translation is concentrated in its core, which is based on a set of semantic and grammatical comparisons (and, naturally, includes a number of expressive stylistic nuances often considered in a particular theory of translation).

It is generally accepted that the categories of a general theory of translation are based on the generalization of data from a particular theory (i.e. a theory pertaining to a particular pair of languages), as well as on a logical semantic basis that is common to languages of the same level of development. Thus, the theoretical platform should help to establish certain parameters (within which the choices of kind of translation can be made) and in this way to uncover general patterns of the translation process based on the functional dependence. This becomes possible due to the influence of the same factors of logical and semantic level in conveying the same semantic content in the translation process.

In written translation the preliminary reading and analysis of the original text allow to determine in advance the nature of the content, ideological setting and stylistic features of some information in order to have a criterion for the choice of linguistic tools in the process of translation. Sometimes in the process of textual analysis, some (not very numerous) translation units (which can be manifested in the form of separate words, word combinations, parts of a sentence) are identified, for which there are permanent immutable equivalents in a particular language due to the existing tradition. Much more numerous is the group of linguistic units, for the translation of which it is necessary to choose the correspondences from a rich arsenal of linguistic meanings, but even this choice is not arbitrary and is not limited to the indications of a bilingual dictionary.

It is an obvious fact that a dictionary cannot foresee the variety of contextual meanings used in speech, just as it cannot cover all the variety of combinations of words. Therefore, the theory of translation can only establish the functional correspondences that take into consideration the dependence of the transfer of certain semantic categories in the interaction of various factors. This principle is relevant in determining the contextual meanings, as well as in carrying out various lexical transformations.

The contextual meanings are often determined by interpolating the vocabulary meanings. The transformations are subject to the logical and semantic principle, taking into account the stylistic and expressive factors. Generally, three categories of correspondences are built up in the process of translation: (a) equivalents established due to the identity of the denoted objects or due to the established traditional linguistic contacts; (b) variability of contextual correspondence; (c) different translation transformations. It is important to note the fundamental difference that exists among three aforementioned categories of correspondences: the equivalents belong to the field of language, while the variability and transformations are related to the field of speech. The equivalents are characterized by their constancy and relative independence in the situation when the speech processing happens in accordance with the norms of the target language. If a traditional equivalence has been established between two languages, the translator is actually deprived of a choice. In some special cases the refusal to use an equivalent may be justified by the specific conditions of the context or situation.

It is very important to determine the right attitude to the correct choice of the criterion of adequacy in translation. It is usually considered that the criterion of adequacy can be a correspondence to the realities of life described in the original text, so the equivalence of linguistic tools is determined either by identity or absolute approximation to the productive effect of the original text. The analysis of any translation made at a high level of translator’s skill shows that the basis for establishing the equivalence of linguistic sense can be determined only at the functional level. The diverse factors involved in the complex process of translation lead to the undesirable correspondences. It is clear that the same linguistic form can fulfill different functions depending on the combination of various linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Therefore, in order to correctly
reflect thoughts, feelings and objects from the original text, the translator has to resort to the help of literary studies, psychology and logic, trying to find the functional correspondences to the source text.

It is well known that the number of factors that form the basis of functional correspondences cannot be a constant value for the translated material. It can be available only the general logical and semantic framework that defines the processes of analysis and synthesis influencing the translation techniques. A significant help in determining the criterion of adequacy in translation can be the technique of penetration into reality, because the translator’s duty is to reproduce precisely the reality from the original text. Consequently, the translator’s degree of awareness in the field of the original material is undeniably one of the factors that determines the functional basis of linguistic equivalents.

In the theory and practice of translation, an equivalent is understood as either (a) any correspondence to a word or phrase in the original text in a specific context, any correctly found correspondence to a micro-unit of translation, or (b) a constant equivalent correspondence that does not depend on the context. The equivalents are a kind of catalysts in the translation process. Their role is difficult to overestimate, especially in the process of interpretation. It is precisely the micro-units of translation with a constant correspondence in the native language that, first of all, should become clear in the translator’s mind, helping him to understand the meaning of the context surrounding the semantic core and the entire statement as a whole. The examples of categories of words and phrases that have only one equivalent correspondence in the other language can be geographical names, proper names, terms of any branches of knowledge (for example: Alaska – Аляска, Cape of Good Hope – мис Доброї Надії, New South Wales – Новий Півдennyй Уельс. absolutism – абсолютизм; absent-mindedness – неуважність, etc.).

An interesting fact is that the book phrases and the complex words have equivalent correspondences more often than the simple words. The vast majority of words have multiple meanings in the English language. The words with a transparent internal form often receive one fixed meaning in a language and more often acquire a single correspondence. The equivalents can be complete and partial, absolute and relative, differing from each other in stylistic and expressive coloring. For example: watch (годинник) represents the full equivalent, since only this meaning refers to the specific item. Other meanings of the word are represented by partial equivalents (неспання, пильність, вартя). The tradition of interlingual correspondences is so persistent that any other translation would be erroneous. Some polysemic words can be represented by full equivalents. For example, the English noun lion is represented by a full Ukrainian equivalent, covering the meanings of the English word: лев (a predatory animal); світський лев. The partial equivalence is observed, for example, in the noun pot (the main meaning is горщик): напій, купол, велика сума, тягель.

It makes sense to trace the formation of equivalents using the example of the translation of neologisms. When a new word appears in the English language, the translators usually look up the best and, if possible, the only Ukrainian correspondence for it (for example, motel – мотель, the not-wanted – небажані, sugar-coated – у цукровій оболонці, nationhood – державність). It is especially important to establish an equivalent in the field of terms (e.g.: recession – рецесія, overdraft – overdraft, billboard – білборд, frustration – фрустрація), which initially can have, as a rule, a translation made by means of tracing or on the basis of transliteration, but without transmission of the true equivalent of the meaning in the target language.

The names of newspapers and magazines are also not translated, but they are transmitted in transcription: New-York Times (Нью-Йорк Таїмс), The Guardian (Гардіан), Labour Monthly (Лейбор Менсі), although the names of scientific journals are usually accompanied by an explanatory translation: Iron Age (Айрон Ейдж, a journal of ferrous metallurgy).

The absence of an equivalent, i.e. a constant and equivalent correspondence, does not interfere with the adequate transmission of the content of the statement in any other way, because the discrepancy between individual lexical units does not exclude the possibility of adequate transmission of any thought when translated into any language. In this case, the translation process may include
certain “steps” based on the transfer of lexical units and grammatical forms, and sometimes — a transition from one language level to the other. Such transitions can be equated to the translation transformations due to the fact that the translation itself is carried out in the sphere of speech, and a prerequisite for the equivalence of translation is the correlation with the same element of reality. This position can be noted in the work by J. Catford (Catford, 1965).

It should also be fixed a small note that the translator’s responsibility is to convey not only what is said in the original text, but also how it is said: it inevitably leads to the need for an analytical stage in the translation process. If we proceed only from the general context, then it is impossible to assert the equivalence of each linguistic means chosen by the translator in order to convey the content, expressive and stylistic features of the original text. Without detailed analysis of the linguistic tools of the original text, there is no chance of full recreating the unity of content and form in translation; in turn, this entails the need for attention to equivalent and variable lexical correspondences.

The variable correspondences are established between words in the case when there are several words to convey the same meaning of the original word in the target language. The word nation has the following correspondences in the Ukrainian language: 1) народ, нація, народність; 2) нація, держава, країна. The specified meanings of nation show that in English this word is used both in a concrete and abstract sense and that its meaning is much broader than the meaning of the Ukrainian word нація. It would be a mistake to assume on this basis that the word nation is polysemic. Even in those quite numerous cases when some Ukrainian correspondences are not synonymous, it does not always provide grounds for recognizing the polysemy of the corresponding English word. Essentially, many lexical units of the two languages are undifferentiated, i.e. they denote a broad concept that is not covered by one word in the Ukrainian language. Such English words mostly fall into the category of abstract concepts.

Contextual meanings depend on the environment or context, and a distinction is made between usual (repetitive) and occasional (random) contextual meanings. Occasional contextual meanings may appear as a result of the subjective use of words by a particular author; whereas among the usual contextual meanings there is a tendency to move into the category of variable correspondences, which, quite possibly, can lead to the manifestation of the phenomenon of polysemy of the word. The use of a word in a meaning that is unusual for it can occur due to associative ideas, the desire for expressiveness and, possibly, the desire to achieve a comic effect. The reasons prompting the unusual use of the word must be, without a doubt, taken into account by a translator.

Contextual meanings are not introduced from the outside, but they are the realization of meanings potentially inherent in a word. Determining the lexical meaning of a word (through its semantic structure) as a system of two-sided minimal lexical units allows us to take into account the following factors: (a) systemic contexts of the word use; (b) the word’s belonging to a certain semantic or lexical and grammatical category of words; (c) specific lexical connections with other words based on the semantic compatibility of verbal signs; (d) semantic relationships of the word with synonyms or words with similar meanings (indicating the need for a broad understanding of synonymy to fully disclose the semantic structure of the word). In general, the characteristics of the word as a basic unit of language and a minimal unit of speech are revealed. Revealing the contextual meaning of a word often depends on a broad context, including even the content of an entire paragraph. On the whole the following dependence is revealed: if synonymous words with different degrees of intensity are found in neighboring sentences, the translator solves the problem of maintaining the same relationship between Ukrainian synonyms. Therefore, the practical experience and the translation literacy serve as the best measure for this type of translation.

One of the problems of translation studies is the establishment of a translation unit, which, in particular, was closely studied by J. Vinay and J. Darbelnet (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1965). They sought to prove that the word cannot be considered the unit of translation because of the possible blurring of its boundaries (an example would be the complex words with or without hyphen) and because of the effect of merging words in oral speech. On the basis of this, a unit of sense (in fact, a phrase) was put forward as the basic unit of translation. In general, the allocation of translation units is
undoubtedly of great importance for simultaneous and consecutive interpreting.

Understanding the translation unit is very important when analyzing machine translation capabilities; at the same time the fact that the translation unit highly depends on the pair of languages that are involved in the translation is especially emphasized: what is a unit when translating from Ukrainian into English may not be a unit when translating into Spanish. Thus, the translation unit is distinguished as a segment of the original text in relation to the text of translation. In addition, a single morpheme can be the unit of translation if it helps to express the meaning of the modality. Currently, when it comes to a machine translation, the unit of translation is considered to be a multi-level formation, the support of which is a word or various combinations of words. In practice, in the process of machine translation the translation unit can be a word, a phrase, a syntagm, a whole sentence, a paragraph, or the entire text that is translated.

When working on a literary text, the translation of each word, exclamation, sentence depends on the ideological and artistic intent of the author, on the characteristics of his individual style, intonation and speech characteristics of the characters. Some of the listed components of translation are also inherent in working on a journalistic text. Taken together, this confronts the translator with the need to proceed from the content, style and ideological and artistic orientation of the entire translated text as a whole. Sometimes even the translation of a single word depends on the entire content. Therefore, before starting translation one has to re-read the original text from beginning to end more than once and, in the process of work, return to the already translated parts in order to convey the semantic nuances and shades of the text as well and accurately as possible.

And yet, in practice, difficulties often arise precisely when conveying the meanings of individual words, and most translation problems are solved within the framework of a sentence (it should be noted that neither the problematic word nor the sentence in which it is found can be considered an independent translation unit). Such a close relationship between the part and the entire text during translation is also observed in the translation of scientific and technical text. In the process of describing the innovations, the specific words and expressions may be encountered, the meanings of which should be conveyed on the basis of the content of the entire text, as well as with the help of reference books, special literature on this issue and consultations with experts. When the meaning of the whole statement becomes clear, the stage of switching to the native language begins. This switching occurs differently for different translators. Sometimes the translators are forced initially to translate a complex text word for word, which runs the risk of descending to the level of syntactic literalism and, consequently, gross distortion of the sense. Obviously, in this case the semantic unity of the entire sentence must be considered as the unit of translation.

In addition to the above mentioned, we believe it obligatory to consider the risks of literal translation in more detail. There is no doubt that the literal translation is implemented at a lower level than it is necessary to convey the meaning and content while observing the norms of the target language, because a unit of any level of language can be taken as a translation unit. Practically and factually, a translation is carried out in the sphere of speech, as a result, the sentence should be considered the minimal unit of translation. And the transliteration as the translation literalism is applicable for a limited range of graphemes related to a verbal form (for example, petrodollars – нафтодолари, miniskirt – міні-спідниця). Different languages have different preferences regarding the transmission of the formal side of a word: some languages gravitate towards their written or graphic form, the others – towards their oral or phonetic form. In the modern Ukrainian tradition, if a European name or a title need to be conveyed into the Ukrainian language, it is customary to rely on the phonetic form of the word, i.e. to convey it as closely as possible in the sound transcription. However, if common nouns are borrowed, they can be partially transmitted on the basis of the transcription principle (for example, cashback – кешбек, internet – інтернет, like – лайк, link – лінк), and partly – on the principle of transliteration (for example, distributor – дистриб’ютор, merchandising – мерчендайзинг, manager – менеджер).

At the same time, neither transcription nor transliteration can be considered a truly literal translation, because they represent such a use of a foreign word that can be adopted by the target language and become a borrowing. Let us consider the types of literalism. The first, more primitive
type is observed among the novice translators who try to translate the foreign and Ukrainian words on the basis of their external similarity, as well as their graphic or phonetic similarity. External similarity does not always mean identity or even closeness of meaning; the words that are similar in spelling or sound are usually called “false friends of the translator” (for example, compositor – складальник у друкарні. element – стиків). The second type of literalism consists of using the most common meaning of a word instead of the contextual one or translating an idiom based on the individual meanings of its components (for example, meditation – first of all, it is роздум, розмірковування and then – медитація; speculation – міркування, припущення and then – спекуляція; rotation – чергування, періодичне повторення and then – поворот, обертання). It is obvious that both types of literalism lead to an inevitable distortion of the meaning in translation.

Another common method of translation is based on the thesis that the content of all linguistic units ultimately reflects some objects of reality, which are usually called denotations. All languages reflect the surrounding reality, and denotations unite them, which is why it has been established the name of method as the denotative one. Sometimes the role of denotations is played by situations that are understood as a set of denotations, and this gave rise to another name for this method of translation as the situational one.

It should be recognized that the reality surrounding us is the same for all humanity. The commonality of biological structure, industrial or vital processes, the routin world – regardless of their linguistic affiliation – leads to the fact that all people exchange thoughts, mainly about the same phenomena of reality. In principle, any situation can be described with equal success on the basis of modern language.

Taking into account the fact that the main content of any message is to reflect some extra-linguistic situation, the situational method in translation is quite logically based on the linguistic description of the same situation that is used in the original text. At the same time, when perceiving the original text, the translator identifies the units from the text with the linguistic units known to him and, interpreting their meaning in the context, he finds out what situation of reality describes the original text. And then, the translator describes this situation in the target language.

Thus, the translation process is carried out step by step as follows: original text – reality – text of translation. In some cases, the same process is simplified if the interpretation of the text has been carried out in advance, and the translator is well aware of certain units (in the source language and target language) indicating the same objects, phenomena or relations of reality. In this case, he can directly replace the original units with the corresponding translation units, and the appeal to reality is carried out beyond the act of translation. The translation retains its basic orientation: explaining the components of the translated information with help of addressing the described situation.

It should be especially emphasized that it is not a matter of having to interpret the meaning of linguistic elements in the original text when referring to the view of the processing of the material, because in this case both linguistic and situational contexts are taken into consideration. As it has already been noted, without correlation with reality it is impossible to understand even the simplest speech statement. The English sentence *The table is on page 55* is interpreted as Таблиця знаходиться на сторінці 55, because our knowledge of reality suggests that of the two meanings of the word table – стібк and таблиця – the latter is realized, since it is well known that tables are not installed on pages.

Addressing the reality within the framework of the situational method helps not only to clarify the content of the original text, but also the process of translation, the implementation of which contributes to the creation of the text of translation. Thus, the reality, reflected in the total content of the original text, serves as the extra-linguistic basis of translation. It is assumed that the translator describes this fragment of reality by means of the target language in the same way as he would describe this fragment, if he recognized it, say, with the help of his senses.

The situational nature of translation has significant explanatory power. It adequately describes the translation process, when in order to create an equivalent text – from the point of view of communication – in the target language, it is enough to point to the same situation that is described in the original text. In other words, when using this method, the equivalence can be
achieved at the level of situational identification. Our conclusion coincides with the results of a research of the Ukrainian scientist O. Hurko (Гурко, 2021), who carefully studied the specific aspects of the practical use of this type of equivalence. In general, we note that the situational method manifests itself the most effectively (a) when translating non-equivalent vocabulary, (b) in the case when the situation described in the original text unambiguously determines the choice of translation option, (c) in the case when translation of the original text is impossible without explaining those specific aspects of the described situation that are not included in the meanings of the linguistic units used in the original text.

Since non-equivalent units of the original text do not have ready-made correspondences, any method of creating an occasional correspondence for such units involves turning to the situation described with their help in the original text. Even if the correspondences – created by transcribing and/or tracing – relate directly to the translated word or phrase, they can be selected only on the basis of a correct understanding of the entire situation (for example, *There is many a slip between the cup and the lip* – *Не кажи «Гоп!», поки не перескочиш*).

Sometimes, in the target language there is only one way to describe a certain situation, regardless of how it is described in the original text. The translator can establish that in this case he is dealing with the situational equivalence of this kind only by turning to reality: if the original English text indicates *Staff only*, in the Ukrainian translation this situation will be described using a warning *Стороннім вхід заборонено*.

It is quite possible that the described situation does not unambiguously determine the choice of option of translation, since in most cases it can be described in different ways. In such cases, a detailed clarification of the real situation, that the original text describes, does not give the translator any instructions on what features of this situation should be reflected when creating a translation of the message or when choosing the lexical basis of the statement in the translation. The translator has to select independently both a way to describe the situation and a set of language units that can help to express additional meaning (for example, *The Arabian Nights* – Тисяча і одна ніч, but пот Арабські ночі; *It’s no use crying over spilt milk* – Марно сумувати над тим, що вже сталося, but пот Плакати над пролитим молоком).

It is obvious that the content of statements describing the same situation can differ significantly. To select correctly an option of translation, it is not enough to describe only the reality reflected in the original text using the means of the target language. In addition to this, it is necessary to reproduce the other parts of the content of the source text using the equivalent tools of describing this reality.

Consequently, the situational method of translation correctly reflects the right approach to a possible explanation of those features of the choice of options in translation that are associated with the translator’s appeal to reality and its subsequent description by means of the target language. The situational method adequately reproduces the reality in cases where (for implementation of the reality) it is enough to understand the situation described in the original text and convey it by means of the target language.

As a rule, the translator proceeds from the fact that both languages have names for the same phenomena in the surrounding world. But in practice it turns out that in one language there is a designation for something that is not designated in any way in the other, i.e. we are dealing with a certain discrepancy in the linguistic picture of the world (for example, *A stitch in time saves nine* – *Гарна ложка до обіду; A trouble shared is a trouble halved* – *Поділитися проблемою означає зменшити її*). The disadvantage of the denotative method is the lack of justification in the process of choosing between several options of translation, if they are possible; however, this method is effective in translating the proverbs and colloquial clichés.

**Conclusion.** To sum up, it should be emphasized as an indisputable fact that lexical and grammatical difficulties in translation are present in all texts, and a translator needs to train in overcoming these difficulties. The problems in translation are determined by the differences in the meanings of linguistic units of two languages, in their functioning, in the methods of constructing the speech statements and texts. As a result, the requirements for accuracy in translation have increased.
Art and skills of translation are the flexible categories that grow simultaneously with practical activity. The translator constantly has to decide which elements of the original text can be sacrificed in order to fully reproduce different, more communicatively significant parts of it. In this regard, the importance of equivalence in translation increases significantly; it also denotes the relative commonality of the content, meaning, semantics, style of translation and the original text, if their identity is absent. In most cases, the structure of the Ukrainian sentence in translation is completely different from the structure of the English sentence. In a number of cases, the parts of speech, that express the components of an English sentence, are conveyed by other Ukrainian parts of speech. The conciseness of expression, possible in the English language due to the presence of a number of grammatical structures and forms, often requires the introduction of additional words and even sentences during the process of translation. All this explains the widespread use of transformations in translation. In general, it can be argued that many scientists have focused their attention on the theory and practice of translation, so in the near future we should expect an undoubted evolution of translation studies.
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КОРОТКИЙ ОГЛЯД ДЕЯКИХ КОНЦЕПЦІЙ І МЕТОДІВ У ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВІ

Анотація

Постановка проблеми. Особливістю розвитку перекладознавства початку ХХІ ст. слід визнати творче поєднання науки про переклад, розширення її інформаційного потенціалу та вдосконалення практичного етапу підготовки перекладачів. Питання теорії та практики перекладознавства, що функціонує на стику кількох гуманітарних дисциплін, давно знаходяться у фокусі уваги багатьох дослідників, які вивчають процеси усного та письового перекладу. Однак новим поколінням перекладачів буває важко швидко зорієнтуватися у великому масиві теоретичної та практичної інформації, тому що у них відсутня добре відпрацьована стратегія для перекладу тексту та вибір кваліфікованого рівня перекладача.

Метою нашої роботи є аналіз загальної інформаційної платформи перекладознавства для концентрації уваги перекладача-початківця на великих можливостях науки про переклад і на розширенні творчого потенціалу перекладача ще на підготовчому етапі його практичної діяльності.

Методи дослідження. Для вирішення поставленої мети використано загальнонаукові методи та прийоми, що базуються на аналізі та синтезі існуючих публікацій про переклад, а також метод експлікації, що включає елементи зіставлення та узагальнення у прикладах мовного матеріалу.

Основні результати дослідження. Завдання перекладача — цілісно і точно передати засобами іншої мови зміст оригіналу, зберігаючи його стилістичні та експресивні особливості. Якщо критерієм точності перекладу є тотожність інформації, поданої на основі двох іноземних мов, то повноцінним можна визнати переклад, у якому ця інформація передається рівноцінними засобами. Отже, переклад має передавати зміст тексту-оригіналу його форму.

Словник не може передбачити всю різноманітність контекстуальних значень, що реалізуються в мовленневому потоці, так само, як він не може охопити всю різноманітність комбінацій слів. Тому теорія перекладу може встановлювати лише функціональні відповідності, що враховують залежність передачі певних значень у контексті від різних факторів. Цей принцип актуальний щодо контекстуальних значень і навіть до різних лексичних трансформацій.

Критерієм адекватності може бути відповідність реаліям дійсності, описаним у тексті-оригіналі, тому рівноцінність перекла́денських засобів визначається або тотожністю, або максималним наближенням до результативного впливу оригіналу. Аналіз будь-якого перекладу, виконаного на високому рівні майстерності перекладача, показує, що
основа рівноцінності мовних засобів може бути визначена лише на функціональному рівні. Еквіваленти є свого роду каталізаторами в процесі перекладу. Еквіваленти характеризуються постійністю та відносною незалежністю від ситуації під час перероблення мовленневого потоку відповідно до норм мови перекладу. Там, де між мовами встановилася традиційна еквівалентна відповідність, перекладач фактично позбавлений можливості вибору.

Звернення до реальності в рамках ситуативного методу перекладу допомагає не тільки прояснити зміст оригіналу, а й сам процес перекладу, реалізації якого сприяє створення тексту перекладу. Таким чином, реальна дійсність, відображена в сукупному змісті тексту-оригіналу, є позамовною основою перекладу. Ситуативність перекладу має значну пояснювальну силу.

Висновки і перспективи. Майстерність перекладу – це мобільна категорія, що зростає паралельно з практичною діяльністю. Перекладачеві постійно доводиться вирішувати задачі, якими елементами оригіналу можна пожертвувати, щоб повноцінно відтворити значнійші його частини. Лексичні та граматичні труднощі перекладу є у всіх текстах, і перекладачеві постійно тренуватися у подоланні цих труднощів. Отже, у процесі перекладу багато залежить від індивідуальних здібностей перекладача, його знань щодо проблематики перекладу, мов та тематики спеціалізації. Як результат, посилюються вимоги до точності перекладу та значно підвищується значення еквівалентності перекладу, що концентрує увагу на відносній спільністі змісту, сенсу, семантики, стилю перекладу та тексту-оригіналу за відсутності їх тотожності.

Ключові слова: перекладознавство, перекладацькі труднощі, варіативність та еквівалентність у перекладі, майстерність перекладача.

Abstract

Background. A feature of the development of translation studies at the beginning of the 21st century is the creative combination of science of translation, the expansion of its informational potential, and the improvement of the practical stage of training the translators. The issues of the theory and practice of translation studies, which operate at the intersection of several humanitarian disciplines, have long been the focus of attention for many researchers studying the processes of translation and interpretation. However, it is difficult for the new generations of translators to find quickly their way in a huge array of theoretical and practical information because they lack a well-developed strategy for translating a text and the necessary level of translation skills.

The purpose. The purpose of our work is to analyze the general informational platform of translation studies in order to focus the attention of a novice-translator on the great possibilities of the science of translation and to expand the creative potential of a translator at the preparatory stage of his practical work.

Methods. To achieve the purpose, there have been used the general scientific methods and techniques based on the analysis and synthesis of existing publications on translation, as well as the explication method, which includes the elements of comparison and generalization in the examples of language material.

Results. The task of a translator is to accurately convey the sense of the original text by means of the other language, preserving its stylistic and expressive features. If the criterion for accuracy in translation is the identity of information presented in two foreign languages, then a translation, that conveys this information by equivalent tools, can be considered complete. Thus, a translation must convey the meaning of the source text and its form.

A dictionary cannot foresee the variety of contextual meanings realized in a speech, just as it cannot cover the variety of combinatorics of words. Therefore, the theory of translation can only establish the functional correspondences that take into account the dependence of the transmission of certain meaning categories in the interaction of various factors. This principle is actual for contextual meanings and even for the implementation of various lexical transformations.

The criterion of adequacy can be the correspondence to the reality described in the original
text, therefore the equivalence of the translation means is determined either by identity or by the maximal approximation to the effective impact of the original text. An analysis of any translation performed at a high level of translator’s skill shows that the basis for establishing the equivalence of linguistic means can be determined only at the functional level.

Equivalents are a kind of catalysts in the translation process. Equivalents are characterized by constancy and relative independence from the situation in which the field of speech is processed in accordance with the standards of the target language. If a traditional equivalent correspondence has been established between two languages, the translator is practically deprived of the possibility of choice.

Appeal to reality within the framework of the situational method of translation helps to clarify not only the content of the original text, but also the process of translation, the implementation of which is facilitated by the creation of the target text. Thus, the reality, reflected in the total content of the source text, serves as the extra-linguistic basis of translation. The situational nature of translation has significant explanatory power.

Discussion. Art and skills of translation are a flexible category that grows simultaneously with practical activity. The translator constantly has to decide which elements of the original text can be sacrificed in order to fully reproduce different, more communicatively significant parts of it. The lexical and grammatical difficulties in translation are present in all texts, and the translator needs to train in overcoming these difficulties. Consequently, in the translation process a great deal depends on the individual abilities of the translator, his knowledge of issues, languages and areas of specialization. As a result, the requirements for accuracy in translation are strengthened and the importance of translation equivalence increases significantly; the attention is focused on the relative commonality of content, meaning, semantics, translation style and the original text even if their identity is absent.

Keywords: translation studies, translation difficulties, variability and equivalence in translation, translator's skills.