

# NON-EQUIVALENT VOCABULARY IN THE PROFESSIONAL TRANSLATIONAL TERMINOLOGY

Demidova G.V.

International Market Institute, Samara

## **Abstract**

The article aims at finding lacunas in the Russian terminological systems of translation studies. Finding lacunas on the ground of the structure, semantics and pragmatics of a term in the English and Russian languages is becoming relevant for the theory of translation in relation to the comparative analysis of the English and Russian terminological systems of translation studies. The terms of the English-speaking countries as well as the terms of other European countries translated into English and therefore accepted and used worldwide are considered in the article. The necessity of forming the English-Russian translational dictionary based on the conceptual importance of the translational terms of the Russian and English-speaking translational schools can be explained by the growing interest towards the developing discipline, its problems as well as the difficulties encountered by the Russian students while reading the books on Translation Studies in English.

**Key words:** lacune, term, equivalent, terminology, translation studies, theory of translation.

Nowadays the monolingual defining translational dictionaries which have been recently published are widely famous. Among the dictionaries published in English there is the Dictionary of Translation Studies by Shuttleworth M. and Cowie M. [7] and Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies edited by Mona Baker [6]. Among the Russian dictionaries the one by L.L.Nelyubin [4] is rather well-known. Due to the lack of English-Russian or Russian-English dictionary of the terms of translation studies it is difficult to choose the right equivalent of the term of the professional lexis of the theorists of translation studies.

Teaching the Theory and Practice of Translation to the students of the Faculty of Linguistics we find it difficult to explain the definition of some terms due to the lack of the English-Russian bilingual translational dictionaries. Moreover working on the formation of such a dictionary and making the comparative analysis of the English and Russian terminological systems of translation studies some discrepancies have been found, i.e. lack of the term in one language while this term can exist in the other one. In this context we deal with the phenomenon of lacunarity which does not have the unequivocal definition in our Russian linguistics. It should be pointed out that the Russian term *лакуна* is a transposition of the French term *lacune*. This term was introduced by the French

linguists J.-P. Vinay и J. Darbelnet at the end of the 1950-s – the beginning of the 1960-s [6].

In this particular case we come across the situation which can hardly be explained. The scientific discipline explaining how it is necessary to overcome the barriers of misunderstanding in practice may itself lead to misunderstanding among its specialists.

Let us have a look at some examples from the English-speaking books on the theory of translation. One of the terms in the English-speaking translation studies terminology not having the equivalent in the Russian language is *Skopos theory*. This is an approach to translation which was developed in Germany at the end of the 1970-s. It reflects the general transition from the mainly linguistic and rather formal theory of translation to the more functionally and socially oriented conception of translation. Apart from Hans Vermeer, the founder of *Skopos theory*, this issue has been also considered by other scientists such as (Margret Ammann) (1989/1990), Hans Honig and Paul Kussmaul (1982), Sigrid Kupsch-Losereit (1986), Christiane Nord (1988) and Heidrun Witte (1987a) [6].

According to the abovementioned theory translation was considered not as a process of recoding, but as a certain form of human activity. Translation as any human activity has its aim, and the word *skopos* borrowed from the Greek language is used as a technical term to define the aim of translation. The followers of this theory find it necessary to define the *skopos* before the beginning of translation. Since *Skopos theory* proposed a target-culture oriented definition it has completely changed the translators' point of view existed before. Defining *skopos* this theory has the prospective position in relation to translation opposed to the retrospective position accepted in the theories based on the issues received from the text of translation. The translator, as presented within the *Skopos theorie* is "no longer guided in his activity by the ST, but by the function of the TT in the target culture" [5].

The Russian linguistic school does not use this term. The linguistic *lacune* in the Russian term system for *Skopos theory* can be explained by the lack of the given theory in our domestic scholars' practical experience.

Using the main distinguishing feature of the functional linguistics (text analysis is carried out at the level of language, register and genre) Juliane House describes two strategies: *overt translation* and *covert translation*.

It was first offered to define the difference between these kinds of translation as a result of critical assessment of the approaches which were trying to explain the different types of functional equivalence with the help of typology of the original text. According to the name itself an overt translation is likely to be a kind of an open translation, not the second original. That is why there is no direct appeal to the receivers of translation (target audience). "In an overt translation, the original is tied in a specific way to the culture enveloping it; it has independent status in the source culture,

and is both culture specific and pointing beyond the source culture because the original text — independent of its source language origin — is also of potential general human interest. In a word: it also evidences 'universality'" [3].

The definition of *covert translation* is quite a different thing. This is a kind of translation for which the status of the original in the accepting culture is really important. A *covert translation* is a kind of translation the original of which in terms of its universality is not particularly bound to the cultural traditions of the target language nation. "An original and its covert translation are — one might say — 'universal' in the sense that they differ 'only' accidentally in their respective languages. The original is not culture specific, but rather of potentially equal concern for members of different cultures" [3].

Unfortunately we cannot find the Russian equivalents of these notions in the domestic translation studies dictionaries.

In the English-speaking translation studies there are two more translation strategies not having the equivalents in the Russian language. They are *direct translation* and *oblique translation* which have been introduced into the science by the linguists J.-P. Vinay и J. Darbelnet. The classification offered by the French translation studies theorists can be considered to be quite a detailed one. These two strategies include seven methods, namely, the notion *direct translation* includes:

borrowing (заимствование),

calque (калькирование),

literal translation (дословный, буквальный перевод).

Oblique translation consists of:

transposition (транспозиция),

modulation (модуляция),

equivalence (эквивалентность),

adaptation (адаптация).

For the term *direct translation* the authors suggest to use its synonym (*literary*). As for the term *oblique translation* according to the authors' opinion it does not have the equal meaning with *free translation*.

As for the presence of the term *oblique translation* in the Russian term system of translation studies, here we come across the lexical gap, i.e. the only meaning which can be found for the word combination *oblique translation* in the Russian language relates to the field of mathematics and the meaning («наклонный перенос») has nothing to do with the theory of translation. In the English-Russian dictionaries the terminological word combination has not been included yet.

It should be noted that the significant contribution into the theory of translation has been

made by J. Holmes. His system of thought was afterwards introduced by Gideon Toury, one of the leading Israeli translation scholars. In accordance with J.Holmes the goals of “pure” field of research are:

Translation phenomena description (descriptive translation theory);

Development of general principles which are necessary to explain and forecast the abovementioned phenomena (translation theory).

The ‘pure’ field of research was introduced by J. Holmes with the help of two approaches: theoretical and descriptive. The theoretical branch was divided into *general* and *partial* theories. The general theory deals with the works describing the translation of any kind as well as translation as a whole. The partial theory of translation has some restrictions in accordance with the below mentioned parameters:

*medium-restricted theories;*

*area-restricted theories;*

*rank-restricted theories;*

*text-type restricted theories;*

*time-restricted theories;*

*problem-restricted theories* [2].

It should be pointed out that the names of the abovementioned theories have not been included into the translational dictionary by L.L.Nelyubin [4].

These examples prove that in the English-speaking translational term system there are the terms which have not been accepted in the Russian translational term system. The usage of the same terms in English and Russian languages not taking into consideration the peculiarities of the cultural traditions of the nation may lead to some discrepancies which in their turn result in misunderstanding of the translational term by the specialists in the field of translation studies.

In conclusion it should be noted that the significant contribution into the development of translation studies is made by solving the problem of the right equivalent. Finding *lacunes* based on structure, semantics and pragmatics of the term in English and Russian languages is becoming relevant for the theory of translation in respect of the comparative analysis of the English and Russian term systems of the translation studies. The forming of the English-Russian translational dictionary based on the conceptual importance of the translational terms of the Russian and English-speaking translational schools will allow to:

make sure that bilingual communication of the specialists in the field of theory and practice of translation is quite adequate;

universalize the metalanguage of translation studies;

introduce a rich developing world reference point to translation methodology and

development education alike;

let the Russian students understand the definition of the English terms of translation studies;

let the English-speaking specialists have an access to the achievements of the Russian translational school.

#### References

1. Hatim B., Munday J. Translation. An advanced resource book. - Routledge. New York, 2004 – 373 p.
2. Holmes, James S. Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies (Approaches to Translation Studies ).- Editions Rodopi, 1988.– 117 p.
3. House, J. Universality versus culture specificity in translation /Alessandra Riccardi //Translation studies:perspectives on an emerging discipline. – UK, 2002. – c. 92-110
4. Nelyubin L. Tolkovy perevodovedchesky slovar. – M:Flinta: Nauka, 2003. – 320p.
5. Riccardi, A. Translation and interpretation /Alessandra Riccardi //Translation studies:perspectives on an emerging discipline. UK, 2002. – c. 75-91
6. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. – London, New York: Routledge, 1997. – 691 p.
7. Shuttleworth M., Cowie M. Dictionary of Translation Studies. - Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997