

Рябова Ирина Юрьевна,

аспирант, кафедра английского языка, методики и переводоведения, Уральский государственный педагогический университет; 620017, г. Екатеринбург, пр-т Космонавтов, д. 26, к. 459; e-mail: i.y.ryabova_3012@mail.ru

К ВОПРОСУ О МАКСИМАЛЬНОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДА

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: лексема; дифференциальная сема; компонентный анализ; лексическая дистрибуция; максимальность; периферийные зоны контекста.

АННОТАЦИЯ. В статье рассматриваются условия создания максимального перевода, особенно когда перед студентом отделения перевода или профессиональным переводчиком стоит вопрос о выборе слова из нескольких синонимов. Важную роль при обучении студентов переводу в вузовских курсах играет компонентный анализ. С помощью компонентного анализа нами рассмотрен пример перевода одного отрывка из романа Л. Н. Толстого «Анна Каренина», представленного в четырех разных интерпретациях. Цель данного практического исследования – показать значимость каждой дифференциальной семы в контексте. Вопрос о максимальнойности перевода затрагивает несколько аспектов: во-первых, необходимость сохранения индивидуальности пера автора оригинала, во-вторых, создание образности и экспрессивности, не противоречащей ближайшему контексту и периферийным зонам произведения, в-третьих, в качестве ориентира при выборе лексемы из синонимического ряда выступают текстоцентрическая семантика и лексическая дистрибуция, в-четвертых, следование первым трем условиям приводит к созданию адекватного (максимального) перевода – единственно верного и исключаящего все другие. В статье внимание уделено важности обучения основам компонентного анализа в некоторых вузовских дисциплинах – лексикологии, теории и практике перевода, филологическом анализе.

Ryabova Irina Yurievna,

Post-graduate Student of Department of English, Teaching Methods and Translation Theory, Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg Russia.

TO THE ISSUE OF MAXIMUM TRANSLATION

KEYWORDS: lexeme; differential seme; componential analysis; lexical distribution; maximum; peripheral context zones.

ABSTRACT. The article considers ways of creating maximally approximated translation especially when a student of Translation Studies or a professional Translator has to choose a lexeme among its synonyms. Componential analysis plays a significant role in teaching translation to students in higher school courses. The article studies four variants of translation of one and the same extract from Leo Tolstoy's novel «Anna Karenina» with the help of componential analysis. The main aim of research is to show the significance of every differential seme in the context. The issue of maximally approximated translation includes several aspects: firstly, the necessity to preserve the individuality of the author of the novel; secondly, creation of expressiveness of translation, not contradicting the nearest context and the peripheral zones of narration; thirdly, text-centered lexicon and lexical distribution serve as cues in the process of choosing a lexeme among its synonyms; fourthly, compliance with the three above mentioned conditions unavoidably leads to the so-called adequate (maximally approximated) translation – the only one that is correct and excludes the existence of any other variant. The article also pays attention to the importance of teaching foundations of componential analysis in some higher school disciplines – lexicology, theory and practice of translation and philological analysis.

Translation as an activity has existed from time immemorial. It is quite a complicated thing itself. In reality a translator has to deal with some plights that make the process of interpretation even more intricate. In the article we focus on one of the major difficulties, arising in the fiction translation, – choosing the lexeme in the synonymic range of words – and we dwell upon the certain ways of solving such problems in the theoretical and practical translation studying.

Proceeding from the postulate that along with the connotative and denotative meanings of the word, there is a sensual-visual image of the object, that is called empirical by Katsnelson, a translator should be aware of

those associations and symbolic senses that the lexeme has gained in the culture in question [9, p. 35-51]. Thus, it turns out to be not enough to have a clear notion only of the core semes, directly actualized in the word itself, but it does become essential to investigate and explore the provincial semes of the meaning of every single lexeme among the synonyms which end up not accidentally being naturally coherent to the context and finally realized in various word formations [16, p. 72-73]. This method will produce grounds to actualize the necessary semes, create the figurativeness and expressiveness in the context. The necessity to address different contexts, not only dictionaries, is caused by the fact that the meaning of the

word, represented in the latter, is usually minimized as being created according to the principles of reduction; that is why a translator's attention should be paid to text-centered semantics (term given by E. Y. Mednikova) [13, p. 5-12]. If to speak about the courses of theoretical and practical translation studying, the path between a student and a professional translator lies through the deepest and most thorough investigation of numerous fiction works with the aim of exploring peculiarities of usage of certain lexemes. It should be mentioned that it is a great deal easier task to choose a lexeme if this lexeme is a part of a metaphor. The point is, there is already a definite image in the metaphor, on the basis of which an indication is plucked out [16, p. 129-137].

Thus, the process of choosing a lexeme initiates the problem of the so-called maximum or adequate translation – they are tightly connected; this idea is supported by M. L. Lozinsky: «Transmit the air, not the letter of the original» [5, p. 22-24]. In other words, the interpretation should produce the same impression as an original version, have the same emotional effects on the reader. It stands to reason that choosing a lexeme in the synonymic range depends on a set of differential semes that will enable us to say that one of the translations is maximum – that same one excluding others.

While analyzing contexts, containing lexemes of the synonymic range, it is extremely important not to squander the issue of preserving the individual inner structure of the original work. In short, the main target (apart from the ones, focused on above) is not only to explicit the ideological and content likeness of the original version, but to present in another language form the author's writing skills, the outstanding features of his style [17, p. 94-101]. In comparison with the content, the stylistic peculiarities can be grasped precisely due to special linguistic analysis of the whole original work. So, before getting down to interpretation itself, students of the institute of translation must define the uniqueness of the work in question.

Summing up everything we dwelt upon above, in the theoretical and practical translation studying the lexeme must be analyzed from the following angles:

- from the point of view of the image and its relevance to the nearest context and provincial zones of the whole work;
- from the angle of maximum translation;
- from the point of view of preserving the individual peculiarities of the original work.

Following these steps in exploring the lexical meanings in translation is connected with extraction and analysis of differential semes in synonyms. Such a method is provided by componential analysis. By the way, there have been a plethora of linguistic researches recently where componential analysis plays an indispensable role on the material of different foreign languages [1; 2; 18; 10, p. 75-97]. Besides, the sphere of the usage of componential analysis is extending – it is a core element in university studying: in philological analysis, theoretical and practical translation, lexicology.

In the practical part of our article with the help of componential analysis we will focus on the example of comparative analysis of one context from Leo Tolstoy's novel «Anna Karenina» represented in four translations. The aim is to follow adequateness and relevance of choosing a lexeme from the angle of creating a certain image, maximum translation and preserving Tolstoy's individual features. A lot of critics and writers are interested in Leo Tolstoy's masterpieces; one of them is E. G. Babaev. His idea of eight concepts in the novel «Anna Karenina» – every chapter is centered around one of the concepts: confusion, abyss, vagueness, secret communication and others – finds its reflection in componential analysis as well [3, p. 115-124]. There is an example from the second chapter where major concepts are fire (as a conflagration), shine and light. The interpretations run as follow:

– R. Peaver and L. Volohonsky – «For a moment her **face fell** and the mocking **spark** in her eye **went out**; but the word “love” again made her indignant» [15, p. 147].

– A. and L. Maude – «For an instant her **head had drooped** and the mocking **spark** in her eyes had **died away**, but the word “love” aroused her again» [12, p. 144];

– C. Garnett – «For an instant her **face fell**, and the mocking **gleam** in her eyes **died away**; but the word love threw her into revolt again» [7, p. 259];

– N. Dole – «A slight frown passed over Anna's face and the mocking **fire disappeared** from her eyes; but the word “love” irritated her» [6, p. 159].

Synonymic in these sentences and simultaneously producing some different minimal contexts are the lexemes: *fall, droop; spark, gleam, fire* (in her eyes); *go out, die away, disappear*. In our analysis we will also address the Russian version of this episode (but it seems impossible to represent it here).

Looking up the lexeme *fall* (Fall – 1) move from a higher to a lower level, typically rapidly and without control (OxD); 2) show dismay or disappointment by appearing to droop (OxD). Dismay – 1) concern and distress (OxD); 2) a strong feeling of fear, worry, or sadness (OxD))

in Oxford Dictionary and Collin's Cobuild, its components can be given in the following way: CLS (CLS = Classeme) (action) – movement, DS (DS = Differential seme)¹ (direction) – from the very top downwards, DS₂ (type of action) – fast, uncontrollably, DS₃ (cause) – fear, confusion. *Droop* (Droop – 1) hang or lean downwards with no strength or firmness (OxD); 2) sag down from or as if from weariness or dejection (OxD). *Sag* – sink, subside, or bulge downwards under pressure or through lack of strength (OxD). *Sink* – 1) go down below the surface of something (OxD); 2) cause (a ship) to sink (OxD)) has got slightly different semes: CLS (action) – movement, DS₁ (direction) – downwards, DS₂ (cause) – pressure, weight, DS₃ (result) – position in water, DS₄ (consequence) – movement towards the bottom. What is more, in Richard Peaver and Larisa Volohonsky's as well as in Constance Garnett's translations lexeme face is not just a part of the face but an embodiment of personality with its own moral standards. Anna's «falling» is explained by her fear in front of Karenin, on the one hand, and on the other, – occurs notwithstanding her will and absolutely uncontrollably. In Aylmer and Luisa Maude's version sea metaphor by Leo Tolstoy's is apparent (In his original version the core ones are sea metaphor, star metaphor, circle-round metaphor, opening metaphor and etc.) [3, p. 143; 8, p. 307; 19, p. 7-23]. The whole situation is described as a dramatic situation in the sea element with lexeme *head* (Head – the bows of a ship (OxD). Bows – the front end of a ship (OxD)) in the meaning of the front part of a ship, having drowned because of the lack of strength of the captain. From the point of view of the nearest contexts and its provincial zones both lexemes (*fall* and *droop*) cover the necessary content of Tolstoy's work, but collocation *her head had drooped* manages to preserve unique Leo Tolstoy's style.

In lexeme *spark* (Spark – 1) a small flash of light produced by a sudden disruptive electrical discharge through the air (OxD); 2) a sense of liveliness and excitement (OxD). Discharge – a flow of electricity through air or other gas, especially when accompanied by emission of light (OxD)) we have singled out the following components: CLS (object) – flash, DS₁ (cause) – discharge, DS₂ (quality) – electric, DS₃ (characteristic) – sudden, DS₄ (result) – emission of light, DS₅ (consequence) – liveliness. In A. and L. Maude's and R. Peaver and L. Volohonsky's translations electricity is Anna's vital energy, the beginning of showing her courage towards her husband. *Gleam* (Gleam – 1) a faint or brief light (OxD); 2) an expression of an emotion or quality in a person's eyes (OxD); 3) If your eyes gleam, they look bright and show that you are excited

or happy (CoCo). Bright – 1) intelligent and quick-witted (OxD); 2) cheerful and lively (OxD). Lively – 1) (of a boat) rising lightly to the waves (OxD); 2) full of life and energy (OxD). Wave – a long body of water curling into an arched form and breaking on the shore (OxD)) contains the semes: CLS (object) – light, DS₁ (characteristic) – short and poor, DS₂ (cause) – happiness and joy, DS₃ (consequence) – lively eyes. The most vivid here becomes the sea metaphor by Leo Tolstoy – movement on the waves that is interpreted in our article as the initial point of confusion and disturbance in Anna's soul (*wave* – breaking on the shore), on the one hand, and on the other, – happiness from meeting Vronsky. Lexeme *fire* (Fire – 1) a burning sensation (OxD); 2) a destructive burning of something (OxD). Sensation – 1) a physical feeling or perception resulting from something that happens to or comes into contact with the body (OxD); 2) an inexplicable awareness or impression (OxD)) has got the components: CLS (feeling) – physical sense, DS₁ (characteristic) – burning, DS₂ (cause) – touching, DS₃ (result) – destruction by fire. In N. Dole's interpretation there is a destructive power of fire in the main character's eyes. It seems logical to characterize the lexemes using the equivalents: spark – flash, gleam – dim light, fire – conflagration. Lexical distribution here is also of great importance. By Lexical distribution we mean correlation of words within the phrase. Thus, taking into consideration adjective *mocking* nearby and turning to the lexical meaning in the Russian version, we come to the conclusion that the first variant is maximum here and the differential semes prove its adequate nature.

Now let's contemplate about verbs: *go out*, *die away* and *disappear*. Lexeme *go out* (Go out – 1) leave (CoCo); 2) If a light goes out, it stops shining (CoCo). Stop – come to an end (OxD). End – 1) a person's death (OxD); 2) most extreme part of something (OxD). Extreme – reaching a high or the highest degree (OxD)) is made up of the components: CLS (action) – leaving the place, DS₁ (result) – stop shining, DS₂ (consequence) – death. In R. Peaver and L. Volohonsky's version culmination of Karenin's marriage life is represented implicitly in the word «death». As for *die away* (Die away – 1) become weaker or fainter and finally disappears completely (CoCo); 2) (about plants and human beings) stop living (OxD); 3) (about light or fire) stop burning (OxD); 4) become extinct (OxD)), it is frequent in plant, tree and flower descriptions in fiction literature. Its semes are: CLS (action) – not live, DS₁ (type of action) – gradual change, DS₂ (result) – stop existing forever. Two collocations are tightly connected with this lexeme: *the spark died away* and *the gleam died away*.

Gradual change is quite characteristic of the second phrase as in the first one it is opposed to the nature of the flash itself which is in reality momentous. *Disappear* (Disappear – 1) cease to be visible (OxD); 2) cease to exist (OxD). Cease – 1) stop (OxD); 2) come to an end (OxD)) contains the following semes: CLS (action) – stop existing in the place, DS1 (type of action) – sudden, DS2 (cause) – death. In collocation with *fire* it obtains the meaning of emptiness on the destroyed territory, also accentuating the theme of death.

Taking into account everything above and the fact that lexemes *gleam* and *fire* were not accepted as maximum ones, we have all the grounds to conclude that uniqueness of Leo Tolstoy's style is best preserved in the first part of C. Garnett's translation – «For an instant her **head had drooped...**» and in the second part of R. Peaver and L. Volokhonsky's version – «...and the **mocking spark** in her eye **went out**».

To sum it up, the analysis of the example in four interpretations turns out to be a good proof of the facts:

– firstly, a student or a linguist, while dealing with translation of fiction works, should pay special attention to provincial semes of the lexical meaning of a word (in our case – lexeme head as a front part of a ship);

– secondly, text-centered semantics and lexical distribution are of great importance (the meaning of *head* in our case is subordinated to *droop*);

– thirdly, it becomes essential to treat individuality of the author's style seriously in order to grasp the idea of creating images, not contradicting the whole work.

All these conditions of making the translation maximum and adequate can't but result in the fact that componential analysis, being an indispensable part of text investigation, is a vital element in lexicology, theoretical and practical translation, philological analysis studying of a would-be translator.

REFERENCES

1. Apresyan Y. D. Distributivnyy analiz znacheniy i strukturnye semanticheskie polya // Leksikograficheskiy sbornik. № 5. M., 1962. P. 52-72.
2. Ahmanova O. S. Osnovy komponentnogo analiza. M. : Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1969. 608 p.
3. Babaev E. G. «Anna Karenina» L. N. Tolstogo. M. : Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1978. 155 p.
4. Collin's Cobuild Dictionary ABBYY Lingvo 6.
5. Dmitrenko V. A. Maksimal'nost' v perevode // Tetradi perevodchika (№ 11) : nauchno-teoreticheskiy sbornik / pod red. L. S. Barhudarov. M. : Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1974. P. 22-24.
6. Dole N. Anna Karenina. New York : Thomas Y. Crowell & CO. Publishers, 2015.
7. Garnett C. Anna Karenina. USA. Planet eBook, 1901.
8. Gustafson R. F. Inhabitant and stranger. Theology and Leo Tolstoy's art. St.P. : Academic project, 2003. 476 p.
9. Katsnelson S. D. Language typology and speech thinking. L. : Science. Leningrad formation, 1972. 216 p.
10. Lyons J. Language, Meaning and Context. Bangay, 1981. 398 p.
11. Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. Oxford : Macmillan Education, 2002.
12. Maude A., Maude L. Anna Karenina. London : Wordsworth Classics, 1918.
13. Mednikova E. M. Znachenie slova i metody ego opisaniya. M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1974. 204 p.
14. Oxford Dictionary ABBYY Lingvo 6.
15. Peaver R., Volokhonsky L. Anna Karenina. London : Penguin Classics, 2000.
16. Popova Z. D. Leksicheskaya sistema yazyka: vnutrennyaya organizatsiya, kategorial'nyy apparat i priemy opisaniya. M. : Lenand, 2014. 176 p.
17. Pocheptsov G. G. O sokhranении individual'nogo svoeobraziya podlinnika pri perevode // Tetradi perevodchika (№ 4) : nauchno-teoreticheskiy sbornik / pod. red. L. S. Barhudarova. M. : Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1967. P. 94-101.
18. Shmelev N. D. Problemy semanticheskogo analiza leksiki. M. : Vysshaya shkola, 1973. 280 p.
19. Tolstoy L. N. Anna Karenina. M. : EKSMO, 2014. 958 p.

Статью рекомендует д-р пед. наук, проф. С. А. Минюрова.