Contents

Preface

> Translating from one language into another is a mathematical task
> Wittgenstein, *Zettel* 698

Every translation is an act of creation. Translation creates new entities, linguistic and semiotic, which makes it a crucial communicative activity. Little wonder that contemporary translation studies have a very wide scope and interface with disciplines as varied as linguistics, literary and culture studies, semiotics, communication studies, information and computer science, and philosophy.

This volume investigates the various ways to translation and translation studies. **Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk** provides a comprehensive overview of meaning theories, and concentrates on the issues of equivalence and indeterminacy of translation (also within a historical perspective). The author considers translation in cognitivist terms, i.e. as re-conceptualization of a source language message in the totality of its contexts and situations, and puts forward a typology of equivalence at language levels. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk demonstrates that, similarly to the whole field of translation studies, the scope of equivalence is getting more and more extended at present times.

Jacek Waliński focuses on units of translation and translation procedures. He distinguishes direct translation procedures (such as borrowing, calque, and literal translation), and oblique procedures (transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation). Waliński concludes that a careful analysis of possible taxonomies of translation procedures encourages one to look beyond simple structural alterations between source language and target language, and to see the role of the translator as a creative intermediary between the original author and the target audience in the process of translation-mediated communication.

The next two chapters are devoted to barriers in translating. **Janusz Wróblewski** first discusses the linguistic barriers, next the cultural ones, noting

though, that it is not always possible to differentiate between the two. He comments on the difficulties involved in translating word play and puns, and analyses different strategies and procedures applied by translators when confronted with such barriers. Since translation involves more than just linguistic operations, translators often face cultural barriers. Wróblewski focuses on the 'cultural turn' in Translation Studies, he discusses different aspects of linguistic and cultural transfer, and provides an interesting classification of culture-specific words and phrases and appropriate translation procedures.

Various theoretical perspectives have been applied to analysing translation processes and procedures. One of the most successful approaches has been proposed within Cognitive Linguistics. **Mikołaj Deckert** provides in his chapter an overview of selected cognitive models of translation analysis. He first lists the major features characterizing Cognitive Linguistics, and next discusses the Cognitive Linguistics approach to poetics of translation, referring to issues such as perspective, salience, and metaphor. Also this chapter mentions reconceptualization and the complex processes in which the source language message is reconceptualised in a number of cycles before it is expressed in the target language.

Contemporary Translation Studies pay close attention not only to linguistic theories, but also different methodologies, finding corpus linguistic methodology very promising. **Łukasz Grabowski** presents the scope of possible applications of language corpora and corpus linguistics methodology in empirical research on translation. He explicates the difference between quantitative and qualitative research methods offered by corpus linguistics, and discusses the three basic types of corpora (parallel, comparable, and monolingual comparable) extensively used in descriptive Translation Studies.

Communication has its multimodal dimension, and hence **Łukasz Bogucki** devotes his chapter to multidimensional translation, especially in audiovisual contexts. He observes that audiovisual translation is a dynamic genre whose main feature is the coexistence of visual and verbal communication, where the visual element is a feature distinguishing audiovisual translation from translation in the traditional sense. Bogucki discusses various aspects of multimodality in translation research and methodological issues involved in this research (such as multimodal analysis and transcription). Additionally, this chapter shows the importance of terminological issues and adequate nomenclature in all domains of Translation Studies.

Adam Bednarek and **Joanna Drożdż** tackle the issue of translation in the digital age and within digital space. They focus on different aspects of machine translation (with some historical context), computer tools employed in the process of translation, and on the important issue of localization. Localization ac-

counts for socio-cultural, linguistic and technical distinctions within appropriate markets, it involves the adjustment of the product and creation of new terminology, and hence provides very interesting challenges for both practitioners and theoretically oriented researchers. The authors discuss current trends in localization (such as website, software, and video game localization), and parameters of assessment.

Undoubtedly, it is literary translation which is considered as translation par excellence. **Jerzy Jarniewicz** observes that what makes literary translation different is, by definition, the kind of texts which it deals with, and that literary texts possess characteristic properties which determine the way they are read, disseminated, evaluated, interpreted and rendered into another language. Jarniewicz illustrates his discussion with examples of poetry translation, and shows the complexity of literary translation, also its possible multimodality and yet another dimension of the localization process (with translations considered an integral part of local literatures). Also this chapter stresses the creative aspect of translation and the author focuses on the open meaning of literary texts, which accounts, among other things, for the need of "new" translations of "old" texts.

The next two chapters are devoted to specialized translation. Within this field especially two areas require closer attention: legal translation and medical translation. Legal translation is often considered exceptionally challenging and demanding. **Łucja Biel** and **Stanisław Goźdź-Roszkowski** discuss the most important features of this genre, and point to such issues as legal effects of legal texts and discourse, questions of interpretation, and strict requirements on fidelity of translation. They also elucidate the concept of legal language, highlight the importance of legal terminology and phraseology, and stress that legal terms are unique to a legal system and do not easily transcend its boundaries. Further on, Biel and Goźdź-Roszkowski provide an overview of legal translation strategies and techniques; also this chapter includes discussion of equivalence, within the scope of specialized texts.

Medical translation, discussed by **Wioleta Karwacka**, brings its own challenges, connected with a very wide area of highly specialized knowledge. Additionally, medical texts include different genres, such as textbooks for medical students, popular texts on medicine, but also research papers, conference proceedings, case studies and case histories, reports and a variety of simple texts for patients (information leaflets, consent forms, brochures). Karwacka discusses properties of medical language (such as Latin and Greek terminology, frequent use of eponyms, acronyms and abbreviations), and briefly outlines the history of medical translation. She also mentions translation of medical texts for lay readers, where the criterion of user-friendliness adds yet another dimension to translation assessment (in both intralingual contexts and interlingual communication).

The chapter convincingly demonstrates that multi-disciplinary approach is most useful in medical translation practice and research.

Interpreting is the earliest form of translation, and still omnipresent. **Adam Bednarek** and **Paulina Pietrzak** provide a useful classification of interpreting types, divided according to the social context involved (such as community, conference, escort, media interpreting) and the manner of delivery (especially simultaneous, consecutive and whispered interpreting). Each type has its own important features, and poses interesting tasks for practice, teaching, and research. The authors also mention crucial differences between interpretation and "typical" translation, pointing to methodological consequences of these differences, and point to the necessary mental skills (such as concentration, mnemonic capacity) which contribute to a good performance by the professional interpreter.

Paulina Pietrzak investigates translation competence, stressing from the outset the elusiveness of the notion. The relevant components contributing to an appropriate level of competence include, among others, skills as complex and divergent as linguistic competence in the languages involved, cultural competence, factual competence in specialized fields and subfields, and technical competence. Pietrzak distinguishes process-oriented translation competence from product-oriented translator competence and discusses the consequences of this distinction for translator education.

Jerzy Tomaszczyk discusses borrowing from English and possible implications and challenges of the Anglicization of lexis for translators and translator training. He provides data illustrating the presence of English lexical items in new additions to Polish vocabulary as found in the Polish press, in different texts and in conversational Polish.

There exist numerous metaphors of translation (as diversified as, for instance bridge-building, border crossing, opening doors, changing clothes); in the opening quote Wittgenstein compares translating from one language into another to a mathematical task. This comparison points to the creative aspect of the process on the one hand, and to certain rigorous constraints on the other. Contributors to the present volume stress the creative aspect of translation, but also focus on different constraints, standards and challenges to translation practice.

Linguists from the Institute of English Studies at the University of Łódź contributed to a volume titled *Ways to Language* (Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, ed. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1988, new edition published as *New Ways to Language*, Łódź, 2010), a comprehensive introduction to contemporary linguistics and language studies. The current volume is inspired by this earlier handbook, both as far as the title is concerned, and also as a case of team work.

Piotr Stalmaszczyk

Equivalence

Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk

University of Łódź

blt@uni.lodz.pl

Abstract: The chapter is an extensive survey of main topics, concepts and definitions in the field of translational equivalence. The first sections present issues reflecting the relationship between linguistic theories of meaning and equivalence in terms of a comparison between formal, behavioural and cognitive approaches to meaning and translation. Touching upon the concept of *indeterminacy* in translation and the cognitive notion of language *commensurability* and translation units, the chapter presents a *theory of reconceptualization* as a theory of translation (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010). Further sections discuss different types of equivalent structures in languages and the chapter concludes with a presentation of a classification of qualitative and quantitative equivalence types drawn from authentic language corpus data.

Keywords: Cognitive Linguistics, commensurability, conceptualization, construal, equivalence, frames, frequency of use, Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs), intertextuality, language corpora, mental spaces, re-conceptualization, semantic prosody, semantics, sociolect, speech acts, *tertium comparationis*, translation strategies, universals

1. Translation and Equivalence

Translation is broadly defined as the *rendering of a message* or *information* from one language (Source Language) into another language (Target Language). In other words, it is the establishing of the semantic – or meaning – equivalence between a *SL text*, or more precisely, *discourse*, and a *TL discourse*. Translation is *not* the substitution of one TL word/phrase/sentence for one SL word/phrase/sentence. It is the *re-creation of a whole SL discourse* in a (similar or comparable) TL context, and uttered/written with a *similar function* and *a similar communicative intention*. Translation, as any other communicative content, invariably involves the *re-conceptualization* of the original SL information into the TL context- and addressee-mediated message.

The concept of *equivalence* depends to a large extent on the definitions of *semantics* and *meaning* within a given model of language. The equivalence *practice* depends on the *type of text* translated (e.g., translation of a media or legal text requires a different approach than the translation of a poetic text) and *the function* of the message (e.g. film translation requires fulfilling a number of technical conditions and constraints, absent in the translation of fiction). Interpreting too, with all its specificity, permits, in some contexts e.g. community interpreting, more relaxed strategies with respect to the SL constraints and can get closer to what can be considered a more liberal form of rendition – a *paraphrase* – in which a SL text is a source of inspiration for the translator rather than a strictly constraining point of reference.

1.1. Meaning theories and equivalence

There are basically two approaches to linguistic meaning[1]. One says that the relation between man and reality is objective, i.e., human beings perform mental categorization of objectively existing things and phenomena within their contexts, which leads directly to the hypothesis of the *stability* of linguistic meaning and its *universality*.

An alternative semantic approach sees the origin of linguistic meaning in the human subject. Linguistic senses are rooted in the human mind and mediated by cognitive processes shared by all mankind. They are, however, *shaped by culture specific social conditions*, which make *semantic structures language-bound* and *not universal patterns*.

And yet, for translation to be possible, semantic approaches require a certain stable universal entity which can be regarded as a point of reference – *tertium comparationis* – between a SL and a TL utterance (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1999). The first, *objectivist*, approach to meaning, perceives the text as a stable pattern with one optimal ("best") semantic interpretation. In the latter approach – cognitively oriented – the text is considered dynamic and less stable, lending itself to diverse numerous interpretations. In the first approach thus, a privileged position is occupied by the notion of the context-free *best translation*. The second philosophy assumes that the text is constantly subject to creative interpretation through listening, reading and, indeed, translation. Therefore, the concept of the *best translation* loses much of its sense, while what requires a more stable

[1] The present chapter is based on Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010, 2012, 2013. Cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2004 for a thorough study of the relationship between semantics and translation.

value are rather human cognitive abilities and mental operations of universal character. Most of the contemporary theories of meaning, particularly those cognitively based, address the question of SL – TL equivalence from this perspective.

The preservation of the original SL meaning in the TL is implemented in terms of achieving the *optimal resemblance* (comparability) between the SL and TL texts. As meaning is portrayed not only in the semantic content of the message but also resides in its *form*, cases where it is not semantic *content* but the *way* the message is expressed is given priority include instances of the 'phonemic translation' of poetry (Lefevere 1975). In such cases it is the sound, syntax, rhythm, melody or rhymes of the verse that are taken to be components of its 'literal meaning' rather than the semantic representation. This can be observed in the translation of children's poetry e.g., the title *The Cat in the Hat* by Dr Seuss (Theodor Seuss Geisel), is translated by Stanisław Barańczak to retain the rhythm and rhyme as Polish. *Kot Prot.* Equally important, particularly in children's literature, are *paratextual elements* in translation (visual form of the text, typographic details, illustrations, see Oittinen 2000).

Faithfulness in semantic representation may also be disregarded in favour of other factors such as constraints resulting from rhymes, puns or other play on words (Gutt 1991:131).

Cognitively based approaches to language assume a *holistic* approach to meaning, represented in terms of *Idealized Cognitive Models* (ICMs) (Fillmore 1982, Lakoff 1987), which include the representation of linguistic senses in the context of cognitive knowledge frames (e.g., the word *cauliflower* is considered a flower in the *BOTANY* knowledge frame and a vegetable in terms of *CUISINE*.) The approach to meaning proposed by the linguistic theory of *Relevance* (Sperber and Wilson 1986) on the other hand and its application to translation theory (Gutt 1991, Bogucki 2004), assumes that it is not only the semantic content and the way a message is represented that is of importance but also a (similar) degree *of mental processing effort* related to the message that is considered a parameter in establishing the closest possible equivalents across the languages.

Most of the contemporary approaches to meaning permit to incorporate not only a strictly semantic layer of meaning but also what is conventionally assumed to be the *pragmatic* realm of language, i.e., the speaker/author-intended meaning in their frameworks, vital for the interpretation of the original text and its translation into receptor language.

2. Historical approaches to equivalence

The beginning of the twentieth century witnessed the first scholarly attempts at capturing the nature of translation. In the thirties the outlook on translation was inspired by German *field-theories* (Trier 1931) and later in the sixties – by Chomsky's Transformational-Generative (TG) theory of language (Chomsky1964). They were formal approaches, based mainly on a system of *necessary and sufficient conditions* of word meanings such as e.g., a feature matrix for the word *boy* is proposed to include the components (+animate, +human, +male, +young).

Eugene Nida (1964) adopted a part of the formal theory dealing with the TG deep and surface structures and extended a formal, linguistic concept of *equivalence* towards the functioning of linguistic signs in the socio-cultural context in terms of what he labels the "functional definition of meaning" and "functional equivalence" between SL and TL texts. The concepts of formal correspondences and literal meaning, characteristic of traditional investigation thus gave way to the notions of *dynamic meaning* and *dynamic equivalence*. For example, besides the literal equivalents between Polish and English as in: A: *proszę* B: *dziękuję* and their *literal* English counterparts (?)A: *please*. B: *thank you*, a functionally more adequate dynamically equivalent exchange should be proposed: A: *here you are* B: *thank you* A: *you're welcome.*

Early seventies bring a new interest in Translation Studies (TS) treated as an independent empirical discipline which developed in the literary circles partly as a reaction to the universalist tendencies in the rigorously formalised TG trend. TS scholars are interested more in translation as a process than translation as a product. The older semantic queries concerning equivalence, identity, reference, and the like, are replaced by questions of the relationship between the SL and TL in the framework of the inventory of meaning conventions characteristic of SL and TL cultures.

With the rise of Speech-Act (SAT)-based theories of meaning (Searle 1979), there appear new trends in translation theory, this time – based on speech acts. The SL speech-act, with its locution, illocutionary force, and intended *perlocutionary effects*, is performed under certain social and interactional conditions. The translated speech act is rarely strictly identical to the original SL speech act. The task of the translator is to fill the gap to the extent possible in the TL. In the SL oriented translation the locutions in the TL may be similar or even identical to those of the SL, so most of the original message form has a chance to be preserved in the translation, but the illocutionary force and thus, perlocutionary effects may be entirely or partly different. The translation then may not reach the

audience intended by the original author, or if it does, it can generate effects entirely different from the original ones. In the TL oriented translation, *the intended meaning* is more important and in order to efficiently communicate it, the translator has to resort to remodelling of the original locution and the original message and make them subordinate to the intended communicative effect. In consequence then, the source-centered translation may contribute towards sustaining the original message but provide some limitations on the intelligibility of the original by the TL reader, while the target-oriented translation may be more communicatively efficient with the TL readership, but at the price of losing the (structural) identity of the original message. The incompatibility of those two objectives is best seen in the translation of literature, and more specifically, poetic texts. All "sweetness and harmony" of poetry, to use Dante Alighieri's wording, is gone when poetry is translated from one language to another. As the unique SL- or TL-orientation does not seem sufficient to account for translation theory of meaning, there arise models which aim at including both linguistic and pragmatic correlates in theory of translation and translation quality assessment (House 1981). Parallel to these issues, new ideas of translation in terms of the "polysystem" theory, embracing and/or making reference to other literary systems, are proposed (cf. Toury 1995) and they foreground the role of the translated texts in a double function, creating the new, and establishing the old systems.

Pragmatically oriented theories of meaning offering an alternative to the truth-based theories are attempts to understand meaning in terms of a combination of the speaker's intentions and beliefs as well as regularities or conventions in the linguistic behaviour of members of the same population (Lewis 1969). The concepts of intentionality and purposiveness of a linguistic utterance find their way into a *Skopos* thory of translation (Reiss and Vermeer 1984), whose central tenet is that a translation must depend on the individual function of the translated text. The literary tradition is vivid in the activities of the Leipzig school of translation. *Think-aloud protocols* (cf. Loerscher 1991), the *Skopos theory* (Textgattungen) and an I*ntegrated Approach to translation* (Snell-Hornby 2006) are the theories either originated or developed in the German tradition, which started with Goethe's Romantic attitude to translation and which acknowledges the specificity of SL and TL systems. The latter trend, a holistic theory of translation, shows a clear influence of new cognitive theories of meaning. They do not assume a universalist level for linguistic syntax, semantics, lexis, or even cognitive structures, but reach to the level of common prelinguistic structures (Lakoff 1987) to guarantee *tertium comparationis* of language commensurability, understanding and, consequently, translation.

3. *Gavagai* – Indeterminacy of translation

The absence of one – well-defined – linguistic level of comparison can lead to the assumption that people using different linguistic systems *cannot* communicate because the common level of equivalence between these systems is *indeterminate.* Extending this reasoning to translation, the conclusion can be reached that translation (and communication) *are not possible.*

The thesis of the *indeterminacy*, or more strongly *impossibility of translation* can be defended either on philosophical systemic or on conceptual grounds. Either languages of the world have such disparate systems that they do not fit one another, or human conceptual categories are so diverse that they cannot be 'calibrated' so a foreign speaker can never be certain about the correspondences between the native interlocutor's and his own interpretations of the perceived reality. W. V. Quine's celebrated thesis of the *indeterminacy of translation* is an instance of such scepticism. To expose his thesis Quine (1964:460-61) gives an example of radical translation, i.e. translation of the language of a hitherto unknown people. No sentence in such cases, Quine claims, even the one whose context is shared by a native and a foreign language user, can be determined with any degree of certainty. The expression *gavagai* Quine created in the unknown language can be rendered as "a rabbit", "rabbit parts attached to each other" or even, as in more sophisticated proposals of Quine's "undetached rabbit part", "there is rabbitting now", or "Lo, rabbithood again". The ultimate correctness of such translations cannot be determined even though we have to do with an observational sentence with a rabbit in front of the language users. This example is to provide an even stronger argument that language users of different communities cut the outer reality according to a specific, non-universalist mode. Conceptual indeterminacy, rooted in the lack of discrete boundaries between the categories, has its consequences in translation and translation theory.

Opposing the radical relativist tradition are those semantic approaches which operate within different types of the *universalist assumption*. They accept the existence of a universal system of language-independent entities (*semantic primitives/primes*, *universal conceptual categories* or *universal pre-linguistic structures*) or the existence of *universal cognitive abilities* shared by all human beings. Some universalist hypotheses contributed to the postulates first proposed in the fifties of the twentieth century and put forward explicitly by Katz (first in 1971, reiterated in 1978), which express the principle of *effability* in natural language:

Effability Hypothesis

> "Each proposition can be expressed by some sentence in any natural language" (Katz 1978:209).

The thesis has been discussed in numerous publications reaching the conclusion that as a rule, there is no one-to-one correspondence between thought and its linguistic realization, making it sensitive to background knowledge as well as to the ultimate goal of the interaction. The speaker, to quote Sperber and Wilson (1986), *aims at optimal relevance, not at literal truth*.

What this signifies is a concession to some form of sociolinguistic Relativity Theory, which can be phrased in terms of a weak Effability hypothesis as proposed by Keenan (1978):

Weak Effability Hypothesis

> "Anything that can be thought can be expressed with enough precision for efficient communication".

A contemporary instantiation of this stance is Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's *Theory of Re-conceptualization* (2010) as a theory of communication and a theory of translation.

4. Cognitive approach, translation and understanding

Translation, as is the case with Quine's *gavagai*, has always been one of the major tests for any version of the Relativity thesis. However, there is a need at this point to discriminate between the impossibility of translation and the (im)possibility of understanding a text or a linguistic utterance. Lakoff (1987) argues that *even if translation is impossible, it does not follow that understanding is impossible.* Understanding is an ability to conceptualize on the basis of verbal and/or nonverbal clues and to match these conceptualizations to the person's own experience. Translation involves one additional dimension – it requires matching these mental products to expressions of the TL. *Understanding of SL and TL texts does not necessarily entail the ability to translate*. Similarly, translation is possible – without an in-depth expert understanding of the original text – particularly a text within a restricted (scientific or technological) domain.

The content of SL text does not have to be, and most frequently is not, in a one-to-one correspondence with the content of a TL text. The semantic content of SL concepts may partly overlap with that of TL in translated texts but cases of using the lexical forms which have wider or narrower scope than the original ones are numerous. In the case of TL conceptual or lexical gaps, translators search for comparable concepts from domains different than in the original to achieve a similar effect. The translator uses for that purpose either sets of conventional translational correspondences between SL and TL or proposes more creative TL forms.

4.1. Cognitive universals

Propositional universals in the form of universal semantic structures as well as lexical semantic primes of the universal character are postulated either by realist theorists of language (Katz 1991) or by some cognitivists (e.g. Wierzbicka 1992). The majority of cognitively oriented linguists, however, propose in their place non-propositional prelinguistic image-schematic representations and basic level categories (Langacker 1987), shaped and developed by the human cognitive system via universal mental processes such as metaphorization and metonymy. *Image-schemas* are the first sensorimotor representations that develop in the newly born infants and serve as the basis for the development of more complex representations, universal across languages and cultures, they function as the 'anchoring point' or a cognitive tertium comparationis between pairs of languages. Image-schemas are proposed to be units which structure both our experience of space and all our experience as well as cognition, i.e., concepts both of physical and natural kind, as well as – by metaphorization processes – those which belong to abstract domains. Both our cognition and abstract reasoning are taken to be rooted in our physical bodily experience. Conceptualizations of abstract objects, but also conceptualizations of phenomena which, although physically or physiologically grounded, are not accessible to direct perception (emotions, sensations), are based on directly accessible meanings and construed by conceptualizing the less known object or phenomenon in terms of better known ones via *metaphoric* links.

Each mental model is a structure based on image-schemas which can have a dual character. One type of cognitive models are the models based on the decompositional or 'building-block' structure, familiar from the classical theories of meaning. The other kind represents *Gestalt* – holistic – structures, where elements do not exist as independent units and whose meaning is not a function of the meanings of the parts. Lakoff (1987: 284) gives here the example of the

CONTAINER schema, which has parts such as an INTERIOR, EXTERIOR, and BOUNDARY, which, however, do not exist independently of the CONTAINER schema.

4.2. Commensurability and translation

In cognitive models semantic universals then tend not to be of a strictly linguistic nature, but uncover their more basic cognitive origin. On the other hand, languages vary and to render a SL message in TL is the task which presupposes not only the tertium comparationis level but also the roots and paths of linguistic diversification. Differences between human conceptual systems and structures prove to be more varied from a typological point of view than those observed by Benjamin Lee Whorf (1996). Linguistic systems correspond to one another in different degrees. Their *commensurability* then is a dynamic notion. Lakoff (1987) proposes four kinds of commensurability criteria: (1) truth-conditional criteria (classical translatability), (2) criteria of use, (3) framing criteria (Idealized Cognitive Models), (4) conceptual organization criteria. Criteria (3) and (4) are related to the cognitive concept of *construal of the scene*, which presents the content of the scene as portrayed by a relevant syntactic structure. The systems which would conform to all four kinds, which is an idealized case, would be optimally commensurable and it would be sufficient to simply replace a lexical form in TL for that in SL. Systems which can be only partly "calibrated", a typical cross language situation, are less commensurable and here the translator's task is to find such TL equivalents which would bridge the incommensurability between the two systems. The languages that would have none of the criteria satisfied, are incommensurable to the highest degree, again an extreme case of the *gavagai* type.

In contemporary cognitive linguistic models of language, the common level of reference – the required tertium comparationis between languages, needed *inter alia* in translation – is not assumed to be of the linguistic character. The universal basis of human communication is the fact that we are all human – so *the basic biological and psycho-physiological processes are shared in the human race.* We can rely on them, refer to them and take them as the point of reference in our – most frequently embodied – thoughts and languages.

5. Translation units and equivalence types

Languages are segmented into units such as discourses, utterances, words and sounds and the units can *refer to objects in the outside reality* or *in the mental world*. As demonstrated in the sections above languages are not mutually calibrated to express *exactly the same set of relationships in the two realities*. Therefore, the number of equivalences possible – which are based on resemblance rather than identity, and embrace the aspects of the (perlocutionary) effects on the SL and TL users as well as aspects of mental access and processing of the units – is large and not fully symmetric. The responsibility for the labour share to capture aspects of the resemblance rests either with the phonetic, lexical or syntactic level or else with different configurations of these.

The notion of equivalence, the crucial notion for any theory as well as practice of translation, lends itself to a number of possible interpretations. The historically earliest – ST-oriented theories – assume '*faithfulness to the original*' to be the main parameter of translational equivalence. This programmatic criterion, seldom practiced, has been replaced in contemporary translation theory by a requirement of *TL-oriented equivalence* (Even-Zohar 1990). Some theorists evoke a more dynamic concept of the language-oriented equivalence, such that covers the interlanguage space between the SL and TL texts in the form of 'the third language' (Duff 1981), the interlanguage translational equivalence (Toury 1995) or, most visible in the case of literary translations – source-driven, target-led equivalence. The language orientation typology, as proposed by Round (1998) is complemented by the language-level criteria:

- formal equivalence,
- equivalence of the outside world referents (i.e. denotations or referents/extensions),
- equivalents of mental representations or intensions,
- equivalence in functions.

Each of them is subject to re-conceptualization processes presented in the section to follow.

6. Re-conceptualization of meaning as a theory of translation (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010)

TL versions change the propositional content of the SL by cutting down, narrowing, or adding information. The information processed in this way may thus modify the truth conditions of the original propositions in the translated version. However, the main effort in translation goes into retaining a similar cognitive effect on the addressee of the original and the addressee of the translation. What we enter here is the realm of the approaches to meaning based on the pragmatically oriented theories as well as on the theories of Cognitive Grammar.

6.1. Correspondence between total systems of communication – Semiotics and translation

Transfer of information is not limited to the transfer via linguistic forms alone. Information is also conveyed by the whole linguistic and situational context, including the properties of the sender and the receiver of the message as well as the background knowledge of the outside world and of the conventions holding in the community of the sender and that of the receiver. *Semiotic approaches* to language, i.e. approaches which embrace linguistic and non-linguistic (visual, auditory) levels, assume exactly that it is *the totality of such properties that makes meanings communicable*. In this respect, translation cannot be viewed as the transfer of linguistic meanings alone. Optimally, it should be the rendition, via linguistic means, of the SL cultural, literary conventions and the totality of background facts to the TL culture. This assumption, however, is not a viable option. The SL and TL systems are not commensurable in their totality. The universal semiotics hypothesis is then untenable as a possible solution to the problems of meaning equivalence and translatability. What is practiced instead though is a set of strategies *compensating* for the meaning losses and transformations.

In the course of communicative interaction, each participant builds up a system of conceptual domains (*mental spaces* Fauconnier 1985 or discourse domains) based on their knowledge of reality in the form of *knowledge frames* or *Idealized Cognitive Models* (Lakoff 1987, Fillmore 1982) and enriched during the interaction. When two or more conceptual models (knowledge frames) interact a new, *blended,* entity is created. This process takes place through building language-specific constructions (e.g. *Tom sneezed off the papers from the desk*, specific for English but not syntactically possible in Polish) and in the language

of jokes, puns and wordplay. The theory of blending, or conceptual integration, was first proposed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (1998). Linguistic interpretations are born in interaction. They emerge from the input material, covering both language and knowledge of the world, as well as from contextual circumstances, characteristic of a given act. However, the end result cannot always be predicted from the input parameters, and the final utterance does not necessarily give unique clues to its componential parts. Conceptual blending thus involves meaning modulation or meaning emergence, which, in the case of translation from one language to another, presupposes *re-conceptualization* of a SL message into a TL one.

6.2. Cognitive construal and translation as *re-conceptualization*

Looking at the world around, we perceive people, animals, objects, which interact in varied scenes and events. We also resort to constructs of our imagination, and devise abstract entities, which are put in some categorization schemes, then shifted, reshuffled, etc. When a language user wants to convey a message to the addressee, what she has at her disposal are the scenes perceived, filtered by her conceptual system, a linguistic system and other semiotic codes she uses, which structure her experience and shape the contents. Additionally, within the specific codes, there are alternative ways to structure this experience, which are partly conventional, partly discourse- and context-constrained, and partly entirely subjective. In other words, what the conceptualizer presents in her message is her *construal of the world*. The term *construal* is used here in the sense of Langacker (1987), where it is defined as "the relation between the speaker (or hearer) and the situation that he conceptualizes or portrays" (Langacker 1987: 487-488).

Translation, in cognitivist terms then, can be conceived of as *re-conceptualization* of a SL message in the totality of its context and situation. The term *re-conceptualization* (proposed and developed in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010), is partly dictated by new construal parameters in the target language form (TL grammar and meaning structures), different context (author/speaker – i.e. translator, time, place, addressee – TL audience), but also brought about by subjective preferences of the translator in picking up or devising particular target language forms, which do not *profile* the same entities, i.e., do not identify them as *figures* against the base *ground* (see Langacker 1987, 1991). The translator and their readers' mental spaces are populated by characters bearing some *semblance to the original SL ones*, interacting in ways, which remind us of the source interactions, but clearly re-constructed. The TL words and (fully semanticized) constructions give a new perspective, profile different

parts of the base contents and make salient not necessarily identical elements and parts of the original scenes. The translated text then is a *blended outcome* of the original SL forms and meanings and fully native TL forms and their semantics.

7. Equivalence at language levels

7.1. Lexical equivalence

Words and their properties can be treated as 'windows' through which one can reach deeper layers of meaning and offer us access to complex structured packages of stereotypical knowledge such as Idealized Cognitive Models, as well as to massive networks of knowledge structures. If a speaker uses, say, the word *tree*, she can conceptualize its sense with different degrees of specificity (schematicity and granularity) – either down to the perceptual, biological, etc. properties of the object, or at the fairly general *tree as a plant* level. Distinct meaning components of variable complexity will be more directly accessible to the expert (e.g. a botanist) as opposed to a non-expert user of the word. Both lexical compositional properties of different character (e.g. partonymy, hyponymy e.g., *corniferous* vs. *deciduous trees*, etc.) as well as larger units of the ICM type (the function of trees in biology, hydrology, forestry, industry, or else in fun and entertainment, etc.) can be considered practical *points of reference* in contrastive semantic applications, translation including. The role of classical lexical compositionality in the cognitive linguistic framework is limited to a 'coarse-grained picture' of linguistic meaning. To achieve a 'fine-grained picture' what is needed is access to the networks of both linguistic, encyclopaedic as well as interactional (pragmatic-discourse) meanings. The latter are not made focal points in cognitivist literature, but it is the elucidation of such concepts that would make it possible for us to come to grips with the problems of perlocutionary effects and the idea of a fully-fledged Target Language-oriented translation.

7.2. Word combinations in translation

From the point of view of a degree of *cohesiveness* or inter-dependence between lexical items, one can distinguish between three kinds of lexical combination, each of which poses a problem in translational equivalence:

- Combinations of independent lexical units
- Collocations
- Idioms

These three groups have different degrees of *semantic transparency*. What is meant by this term is the extent to which the meaning of a word combination can be uncovered from the meaning of its constituent parts. The meaning of word combinations in (a) and (b) is (almost) fully recoverable from the meaning of their constituents, while in the case of idioms (c) the holistic meaning is different from the sum of the individual lexical senses. The difference between (a) an (b) is that (a) are relatively free word combinations while (b) combinations are based on habitual co-occurance and, even though they are semantically transparent, their form is not predictable.

The combinations of independent lexical units (e.g., *an interesting/red/*, etc., *book*) are the least restricted combinations, where, in the case of translation, each item of a source language can be more freely substituted by an equivalent linguistic item of a target language without necessarily affecting the sense of other elements in the combination.

Idioms, on the other hand (e.g., *it's raining cats and dogs*), are characterized by a narrow range of variability and the maximum cohesion, i.e. the idiom has usually both fixed elements as well as their order. The meaning of an idiom cannot be typically retrieved by making reference to the senses of individual items as would be the case with free combinations of individual lexical units. The meaning of an idiom thus is not predictable from the meaning of its parts.

In the category of collocations, a distinction can be made between *grammatical collocation* and *lexical collocation.* Both types can cause a problem for a translator. *Grammatical collocations*, i.e., phrases consisting of a main part-of-speech element such as a noun or verb and other parts which can co-occur with it, e.g., Verb+Noun *pay a compliment*, form a closed set of patterns to be found in a number of dictionaries. *Lexical collocations*, forming an open set of items (e.g., *at home*; *at 3 pm.*), are less predictable and, as such, difficult to be handled in terms of rules of language or usage. Lexical collocations can be understood as combinations of two or more words used in one of their regular, non-idiomatic

meanings, following certain structural patterns, and restricted in their combinatorics.

Collocations, unlike idioms, can usually be understood by reference to the meanings of the component lexical units, which can also take some modifiers. However, differently from free combinations of words, one of the component elements in collocations has a restricted combinatorial power, e.g. one can *make a (big) mistake, do (some) shopping* or *commit a (serious) crime*. Languages have their own systems of collocations and in English, similarly to a number of other languages, there are classes of verbs, of reduced semantic content, which collocate with different nouns to form a complete sense-expression. The verbs of the *do (somebody a favour), make (so much noise), give (a hand), have (a bath),* etc. classes, are the cases in point. The translation of such multi-unit words into a TL usually yields different lexical combinations than in the SL e.g., Pol. *prawić (komuś) (niewyszukane) komplementy*; *robić (wielki,-e)błąd/zakupy/hałas*; *popełnić (potworną) zbrodnię*; *brać (gorącą)kąpiel*, etc.

Adjectives too collocate with different nouns according to language-specific norms. One can say a *heavy drinker* or *smoker* 'nałogowy pijak/palacz' but not a *heavy teacher* in the same sense of *heavy*, which can refer to weight in this case. In collocations then, word senses are restricted by the sense of *the collocate*. As collocational combinatorics is language-specific, collocations may pose a problem for a translator.

Idiomatic expressions and idioms which have non-transparent meaning require search for the linguistic choices which are similar in content although not necessarily in form.

7.3. Encyclopedic information, culture-specific elements, intertextuality

Similarly to theoretical problems in lexical semantics concerning discrimination between linguistic and encyclopedic information, problems in translation practice may involve linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge. The words used in SL texts which are items specific to a given culture may have no direct equivalents in TL. *Strategies* that are used here would be either borrowing from the SL (Pol. *barszcz* – Eng. borsch), or the borrowing of a form from the TL with the closest possible sense (Pol. *professor nadzwyczajny* – Eng. associate professor). The sense of the word, as it was used in the original however, will not be easily reconstructed from the TL form. In such cases then, two kinds of strategies are practiced depending on the type of text the original is. In the case of informative or referential texts, additional information in the form of *sense explication* or *definition* is in order. Such a technique can be also used in restricted-domain

texts, in some descriptions and narratives (e.g., in journalistic prose). In poetry however, what would be preferred is the original recreation of the SL text in the TL. In such contexts, no matter whether the translator uses a loan word or a close TL form as an equivalent, the original sense should be transferred preferably without a lengthy footnote. The preferred strategies are either forms with a foreign tinge present or else fully re-created and/or domesticated, as e.g., in one of the many Nabokov's puns (1997:62)[2]:

(1)
I have not much at the bank right now but I propose to borrow – you know, as *the Bard* said, with that cold in his head, *to borrow and to borrow and to borrow*[3]

The Bard in the text is William Shakespeare and the triple *borrow* presents a play on the original phrase *Tomorrow, tomorrow, tomorrow* from Macbeth's final monologue in Act V. A translator into German would have no problem with Nabokov's text as the German opposition *morgen* 'tomorrow' fits closely to the German *borgen* 'borrow'. Translating the English text of *Lolita* into Russian though, Nabokov changed the allusion into a reference to *Eugene Onegin* " 'budi zhit' dol'gam, kak zhil' ego otec', po slovam poeta". The Polish translator Robert Stiller on the other hand employed a strategy of domestication:

(1a) W tej chwili akurat nie mam dużo w banku, ale jestem gotów dać w zastaw ostatnie *futro*, jak Makbet, gdy wśród cieni znienacka zaseplenił: *futro, a po futrze, a po futrze znów futro i futro*.

The transator makes reference to the Polish proverbial saying: *jutro będzie futro, a pojutrze po futrze* lit. 'tomorrow will be a furcoat, and the day after tomorrow there will be after – past the furcoat, i.e. there will be no furcoat', indicating the flying time and change. This kind of reference to other, frequently culture-specific texts, is called *intertextuality*.

[2] The example and interpretation quoted after Wróblewski 2013:85.
[3] The examples quoted in this chapter are ordered according to the following sequence: the first examples in the pairs are the original SL texts and the second examples present their translated equivalents.

7.4. Typology of meaning, equivalence and translation strategies

To render a message from one language into another the translator takes two types of criteria into consideration. The first ones are conditions characteristic of a SL and a TL, so-called *typological language conditions*. They are conventional grammatical categories and rules of each of the two languages, not to be freely changed by the translator. The other part of inter-language correspondences are those properties of the TL which can be more freely selected (modified, added and omitted) by the translator. It is the latter that can legitimately be called translation *strategies* while we retain the term *linguistic* or *grammatical constraints* or *pressure* for the former. The repertory of strategies and pressures in translation has been frequently discussed in translation studies. The most widely adopted classification is that proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), which comprises:

- Loan Pol. Christmas pudding for Eng. Christmas pudding
- Calque or Loan translation (substituting the native senses of the expression in terms of similar structure) Pol. mysz (komputerowa) for Eng. mouse
- Literal translation (word-for-word) Pol. mieć z tyłu głowy for Eng. to have at the back of one's mind
- Transposition (switching grammatical category) Pol. Czuję się **dobrze** (Adverb) for Eng. I feel **good** (Adjective).
- Modulation (different discourse conventions) Pol. Dzień dobry **Pani Profesor** for Eng. Good morning, **Professor**
- Correspondence Pol. piątek trzynastego for Eng. Friday the thirteenth (in some other cultures (Spain) – Tuesday the thirteenth)
- Adaptation Pol. schabowy z ziemniakami for Eng. fish and chips

Each of these general strategies can have more particular effects and procedures such as *amplification, reduction, explicitation, implicitation, generalization* and its opposite – *particularization*.

7.4.1 The lexicon

The lexicon of a natural language can be perceived as a network of interrelated nodes, where the nodes correspond to individual vocabulary items of the language. The sense and value of each of the words can be characterized by its position in the network as well as its relationship to other words. The most frequent

approach to lexical semantics perceives meaning as a complex construction built out of several levels or layers (cf. Leech 1981). The boundaries between the levels, or types of meaning, are not always stable or clear-cut, but, taken together they are responsible, as Leech proposes for "the total composite effect of linguistic communication". Each of these semantic aspects poses a challenge in translation.

The core[4] part of the lexical meaning, frequently referred to as the *conceptual* or *denotative meaning*, comprises most essential elements such as the condition of FEMALENESS in the concept of *woman* in English and *kobieta* in Polish. *Connotative* meaning (*connotation*), which, in cognitive models, is incorporated in lexical senses proper, is treated as a separate type of lexical meaning in other approaches and is sometimes labelled *experiential meaning* as it is formed as a consequence of human experience and the conventional language use. The connotational component of the lexical meaning comprises the emotive evaluation associated with the word, which may be different in different cultures. Connotation of the word is a set of non-criterial stereotypic or characteristic properties of the referent of a word, e.g. 'inconstant, prone to tears' with respect to 'woman' in many cultures and languages of the world. While the *sense* of the word, or its *denotation* or *reference*, can be identical across languages, its connotations as well as the speaker's attitude or the evaluative charge of the word (i.e. *affective* meaning) are very frequently distinct. The stereotypical or connotative properties of the concept of a *male*, for instance, can be different in different cultures, conforming either to an idealized model of a 'supporting partner' to that of a 'dominating macho'. Here we can also find instances of *false friends* as e.g. Pol. *Polak* with positive or neutral evaluative charge vs. Am. Eng. *Polack* expressing strongly negative evaluation.

Stylistic meaning called also *interpersonal meaning* of words depends on the discourse topic, serves the speaker identification and is also an exponent of the degree of intimacy and formality between the participants of an interactional event. The basic part of a language vocabulary is formed by the most common vocabulary items (e.g. *child*) and is followed by the informal colloquial (*baby, babe*) and formal literary words *(offspring*). Next two layers comprise technical, scientific (*infant*) and foreign vocabulary items as well as slang and dialectal variants, cant and vulgarisms and, then, poetical and archaic words. The subclasses are not mutually exclusive e.g. the literary vocabulary is heterogenous and may cover a range of words of scientific, archaic, or foreign types (borrowings/loanwords). Each of these categories presents problems of its own in the

[4] Part of this section is based on the *Meaning* chapter of Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.) 2010.

process of translation (Pol. *dziecko* (neutral), *noworodek* (medical), *nowonarodzony* (formal, lofty), *potomek* (formal, official), the negatively charged *bachor* and the English loanword *baby*). While technical and scientific vocabulary items may be the least problematic, as they are frequently based on *internationalisms*, familiar to professional groups sharing the same occupation, such varieties as dialectal variants or archaisms and poetical uses may pose an immense problem in translation practice.

Meaning conveyed by a particular grammatical category i.e. *grammatical* or *categorial meaning* is also rooted in the use of a relevant grammatical form of lexical items. Languages differ with regard to the degree of correspondence between grammatical categories and relevant semantic dimensions (compare Pol. *baba, babka, babsztyl, babsko, babcia, babunia*, etc. 'older woman (frequently unpleasant) – grandmother – granny – young, attractive woman (polysemy of the form *babka*)'.

One of the essential issues in translating to or from languages with, say, a rich inflectional system can be the transposition of those aspects of meaning which are incorporated in the *grammatical categories* of a given word. Inflectional languages usually have a category of grammatical gender of Nouns, irrespective of their sex differentiation (e.g., Pol. *książka* 'book' Feminine, *stół* 'table' Masculine, *mydło* 'soap' *Neuter*). Other languages like English, on the other hand, use natural gender, typically reflecting the sex of the referent or its neutrality with respect to this dimension. The *grammatically* conveyed meaning can influence word connotation and imagery associated with a given concept in different languages e.g. the image of *death as a male* (Germanic cultures) or a *female* (Slavic cultures), and can thus be especially relevant in arts (painting, sculpture) and in translation, particularly of literary texts.

Cross linguistic differences occur also with regard to the *collocative* or *syntagmatic* meaning, i.e. the holistic semantics of a lexical item which results from the syntactic environment viz. the co-occurrence restrictions of a given word, e.g. Eng. *to take photographs*, Pol. 'to *make* photographs' (*robić zdjęcia*) or Eng. *to take temperature* Germ. '*measure* temperature' (*Fieber messen*). These aspects of lexical meaning are directly manifested in translation.

Contrastive or *paradigmatic* meaning of a word is this aspect of its meaning which is derived from its relationship to other members of the same semantic field. To delimit the boundaries of such English words as *anxiety* or *annoyance* one has to resort to other words expressing emotions such as *anger*, *surprise*, *fear*, etc. and to understand what *barbecue* is, one has to see its relations to other member of the culinary field such as *grill*, *roast* etc. In the translation of such items to the languages which have some conceptual and/or lexical gaps, the

translator resorts to borrowing (e.g. Fr. *barbecue*), (a set of) closest equivalents (Germ. *grillen, braten*) or to descriptive techniques.

Implicative (also *presupposed, reflected, implied*) *meaning* of a lexical item is another aspect of word meaning which should be looked after in the translation process. It may refer either to logical or pragmatic presuppositions of an item (e.g. Eng. *bald* refers to objects which do not have natural covering but presupposes the existence or the expectation on the part of a speaker of such natural covering). Implicative meaning may also include implicatures present in a given discourse, e.g. the Eng. phrase *member states* 'państwa członkowskie' has specific implicative meaning in the texts involving the European Union and, as such, may have to be translated differently than when such a phrase has no implications of that type.

A direct consequence of the exploitation of a *phonetic form* of a word on the other hand in order to shape its cognitive, connotative or affective meaning is the semantization of the linguistic form. The phonetic form is essential in poetry and *onomatepoeia* i.e. vocal imitation of sounds, vowel harmony and sound symbolism are also the instances of semanticized form e.g. Eng. *ting, bang* Est. *tinn* or Indones. *ting, bong* or Pol. *bim-bom*, etc.

7.5. Neologisms and translation

Peter Newmark (1988: 33) defines neologisms as "newly coined lexical units or existing lexical units that acquire a new sense". Neologisms appear in diverse text types. In scientific or technological writing but also in the language of media or advertisements, they occur first of all to point to an outside world referent discovered or created by the community members. In fine literature reference is most frequently made to mental entities alone, the creations which have no designates in the surrounding reality. Such newly coined linguistic items are both a product of human imagination and an outcome of linguistic rules used creatively by language speakers. While the neologisms which have an outside referent (*fax, laptop*) are likely to find eventually their way into dictionaries, thesauri or other reference tools like computer corpora, those invented by poets or authors of literature (e.g., James Joyce *shuit*) are frequently unique coinages found either in one text or in one author's writing. Those then have very little chance to appear in dictionaries of general language.

The problem with finding equivalents of such novel creations is complex. It is not sufficient to say that they are the linguistic units which appear in the SL texts but do not exist in TL. Such a statement could refer to all possible conceptual gaps of a TL when compared with a SL. Here the SL item can be a word of

some currency in the SL system, such as e.g. labels for products of new technologies, while their import to the TL system may require either direct borrowing or coining a novel form. A translator of technical texts can resort to either of the two, though creating neologisms is not always recommended (cf. Newmark 1988:15). On the other hand, direct SL loanwords are not, as a rule, particularly welcome by TL language policy makers.

The main techniques of translating novel SL forms in general involve the processes of borrowing and loan translation, productive affixation, semantic shifts and paraphrasing. Neologisms in fine literature are the forms and/or senses novel to the SL and they should be rendered as such into the TL. Newmark distinguishes twelve types of neologisms, divided into two groups, which are extended and modified in later publications. Some examples of neologisms we can provide here (*Nineteen Eighty – Four* George Orwell tr. Tomasz Mirkowicz) include:

A. Existing lexical items with new senses:

- words and abbreviations, *Big Brother (bb) – Wielki Brat (wb)*[5]
- collocations, *Big Brother is watching you – Wielki Brat patrzy*
- compounds *Newspeak – nowomowa, crimestop – zbronioszlaban*
- blending *Miniluv (Ministry of Love) – Minimiło (Ministerstwo miłości)*
- affixation *ungood – bezdobry, goodest (best) – najdobry*

B. New forms:

- acronyms (new and old referents) and abbreviations, *Ficdep (Fiction Department) – Lidep (Departament Literatury)*

By far the best known passage in English literature containing neologisms is Lewis Carroll's *Jabberwocky*, the first lines of which run as follows: " 'Twas brilig, and the slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe". The poem abounds in lexical neologisms but is nevertheless interpretable due to the retention of authentic structure words, correct morphology and syntax as well as due to the use of phonetically meaningful clusters which help in creating a peculiar, unsettling atmosphere. Ready-made equivalents to such creations cannot be immedi-

[5] The abbreviation *wb* in Polish, pronounced as ['voo 'bə] additionally activates (particularly with the older generation) a similar form – *ub*, pronounced alike as ['oo 'bə], which stands for ***U****rząd* ***B****ezpieczeństwa* 'Security Office' and brings about worst communist practices into mind. This case is an example of qualitative reconceptualization example.

ately found in the TL. The translator has to, on the one hand, resort to the conventional morphology and structure of the TL and look for possible original creations that the TL system offers to convey the expressive function of the SL text. The Polish translations (in fact the translated versions into numerous other languages too) of Carroll's poem are all creative and abound in impressive numbers of neologisms (www. http://home.agh.edu.pl/~szymon/jabberwocky.shtml):

Lewis Carroll *Jabberwocky* (1871)
Twas brilig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.

Pol. 1. (tr. Stanisław Barańczak) *Dziaberliada*
Brzdęśniało już; ślimonne prztowie
Wyrło i warło się w gulbieży;
Zmimszałe ćwiły borogowie
rcie grdypały z mrzerzy.

Pol. 2. (tr. Janusz Korwin-Mikke) *Żabrołak*
Błyszniało – szlisgich hopuch świr
Tęczując w kałdach świtrzem wre,
Mizgłupny był borolągw hyr,
Chrząszczury wlizły młe.

Pol.3. (tr. Bogumiła Kaniewska) D*żabrokłap*
W dzionek błyskliwy ślniły grzaski,
Co się wśród grętów wygregrały,
Praary fumnie darły kraski,
A śliskie szmyki się drąskały.

The interesting strategies employed in all the versions of this first stanza of the poem are mainly formation of new compounds and blended constructions, phonetic symbolism and associative meanings. What is striking though is the fact that – to maintain intelligibility – grammatical processes (prepositional phrases formation, nominal and verbal category formation, sentence patterns, etc.) are not modified to such an extent either in the original or in its Polish versions.

Colloquial language, most notably slang, has also a strong expressive function and is a rich source of neologisms (see Urban Dictionary[6]). However, its lavish productivity is combatted by its mutability, characterized by lack of stability and frequent change. The translation of creative slang expressions poses additional problems of the sociolinguistic nature. Slang, a language variety of a social group in one community, cannot be simply rendered as a regional or regional dialect of a TL community. To translate slang from the SL the translator has to devise a new sub-code in the TL or resort to a modified version of one of the available TL systems.

7.6. Convention and creativity – corpus data

The situation gets even more complex when richer collocational patterns of use are taken into consideration. Various metaphorical or otherwise extended uses, *nonce*-formations, metaphors, may be fairly opaque to a translator. Access to full contexts and the possibility of comparing various uses provided by *language corpora*, large computerized collections of representative and balanced samples of texts, comprising different types, styles, modes and registers, can facilitate the task of comprehending and transducting the problematic linguistic items. The other extreme end of the conventionality-creativity scale comprises domain-restricted terms, idiomatic expressions and conventional phraseology. The acquisition of this whole world of domain-restricted *terminology*, the familiarity with which cannot be obtained without sufficient exposure to authentic TL texts, is another advantage of the use of corpora for translation practitioners. For that reason, it is not only *concordancing* programs, which extract a given item with a smaller or larger context, and display them, that are important here, but the possibility of accessing a more complete text on a computer is of comparable importance as well. A good translation professional must, obviously, be familiar with conventional uses, but, at the same time, s/he also has to be aware of probabilities of other, less frequent, options. Corpus data, provided the corpus is sufficiently large, can provide both. Moreover, the information on the frequencies of such items, keywords, collocations and clusters, available in most software

[6] http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Knosh&defid=6821156.
E.g., Knosh
Knosh is slang for food. Knosh can refer to food itself (noun) or the act of eating food (verb).
"Mike I'm starving man, let's go get some knosh."
"Do you have snacks? I need something to knosh on."

now, can help the translator to select a TL equivalent of *similar currency* (Pęzik 2011), which is as important as the qualitative – meaning-based – criterion.

The requirement of the translator's familiarity with the rarer nuances of both the source and target languages puts a very strict discipline on the professional translator and the translation trainer. They have to actively look for new vocabulary items, phraseology, etc. This discipline is even stricter with interpreters who deal in their jobs with the linguistic material of the immediate reference and currency with no direct access to the relevant aids. Corpora, especially those built on line, give translators a unique possibility to access more recent linguistic material accumulated in a systematic way.

Metaphoric language and linguistic creativity and their expression (see Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2012a) show language- and culture-specificity of conceptualizations. SL and TL metaphors, though seemingly identical, may refer to distinct outside world scenarios. The metaphoric Source Domain of TOUCH in *I am touched (with your kindness)* in English is mapped on the Target Domain of positive EMOTIONAL AFFECTION connected with kindness and desirable behaviour. The same target domain in Polish in *Jestem dotknięty* lit. 'I am touched' maps on a negative EMOTIONAL AFFECTION target domain as in *Jestem dotknięty twoimi obrzydliwymi oskarżeniami* lit. 'I am touched with your disgusting accusations' means in Polish 'I am hurt with your disgusting accusations', while the semantic equivalent of the English *I'm touched* is the Polish *Jestem **w**zruszony* lit. 'I'm moved (***w*** 'inside')'. In turn though the English *I'm moved* can also be rendered as the Polish *Jestem **po**ruszony* which is closer to the English *I'm surprised/astonished* (often with a negative external stimulus). This kind of *displacement of* senses, in this case distinct metaphoric mappings as well as the frequency of use of particular metaphoric scenarios, can also be taken as a dimension according to which differences between particular languages are identified (see Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Wilson 2013).

Conventionally, languages also present distinct patterns in *polysemic* (i.e., multi-meaning) *extensions*. The English speaker perceives, for example, a number of objects and phenomena in the real world, which he categorizes in terms of *similar properties* of the polysemous concept (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007) of *running* and assigns them to the same class, unlike the Polish language user, for whom the English meaning extension patterns overlap with Polish ones only to some extent:

(2) run
- (2i) This man is running fast
- (2ii) The horse was running to the barn
- (2iii) Mr Clinton is running for presidency

(2iv) Pete was running a tap
(2v) He was running a big nation
(2vi) A brook was running along the road
(2vii) The engine stopped running
(2viii) She murmured, running a finger down the page
(2ix) Small houses were running along from left to right
(2x) running commentary
(2xi) runny nose

Speakers of other languages, though capable to understand the motivation behind the above categorization, assume different conventional optics and Polish users would employ a lexicographic equivalent *biec/biegać* 'to run' in the case of running as a physical activity, but they would employ different verbs for the remaining examples:

(2a) Eng. The boy *runs* – Pol. Chłopie biega.
(2b) Eng. The motor *runs* – Pol. Motor chodzi (*walks*)
(2c) Eng. The clock *runs*. – Pol. Zegar chodzi (*walks*)
(2d) Eng. His nose *runs*. – Pol. Z nosa mu cieknie (lit. *From nose it drips him*)
(2e) Eng. Mrs Clinton is *running* for presidency – Pol. Pani Clinton bierze udział w wyścigu o prezydenturę (*races for presidency*)
(2f) *running* commentary – bieżący komentarz/ komentarz na bieżąco (*running*)
(2g) *running* water – bieżąca woda (*runny*)

Conventional equivalents – range of senses

As was mentioned before, SL-TL equivalents are conceptually non-identical. There can be envisaged six cross-linguistic (lexicalised) equivalence contexts:

- SL-TL one (lexicalised)-to-one (lexicalised) equivalents Eng. *philosophy* – Pol. *filozofia*
- SL-TL one-to-zero (lexicalised) equivalents (mostly culture-specific items) – Eng. *regulars (at the pub)* – Pol. *stali bywalcy/goście (pubu)* lit. 'steady customers (of the pub)'
- SL-TL zero (lexicalised)-to-one equivalents (mostly culture-specific items) – Eng. ∅ – Pol. *włoszczyzna* 'a combination of basic vegetables used to cook some soups'
- SL-TL one (lexicalised)-to-many (lexicalised) equivalents Eng. *go* – Pol. *iść, jechać*

- SL-TL many (lexicalised)-to-one (lexicalised) equivalents Pol. *żal, smutek, tęsknota* – Eng. *sadness*; Eng. *time, tense* – Pol. *czas*
- SL-TL many-to-many equivalents (multi-value and multi-dimensional equivalents):
  Eng. *pudding/ Christmas pudding* – Pol. *budyń, deser, pudding*/Christmas pudding Eng. *translation; interpreting* – Pol. *przekład/tłumaczenie*

The examples below show networks of semantic relations in English and in Polish with respect to the Polish concepts of *państwowy* and *prywatny* with reference to terms relating to health service and medical institutions:

(3)

Pol.
prywatny lit. 'private' – *państwowy* referring/belonging to state'

private health insurance 'prywatne ubezpieczenie', state-run hospital 'państwowy szpital', private hospitals 'prywatne szpitale, state sector 'sektor państwowy', outpatient clinic 'poradnia/przychodnia medyczna', private health-care providers 'prywatna służba zdrowia', medical workers 'służba zdrowia', work in the formal sector 'praca w sektorze państwowym', workplace insurance 'ubezpiecznie pracownicze', health expenditure 'wydatki na zdrowie', out-of-pocket payments 'opłaty pokrywane przez pacjanta', the sick paying over the counter 'chorzy płacący sami za leki', counterfeit medicines 'leki podrabiane', unlicensed dispensaries 'punkty sprzedające leki bez uprawnień', health inspectors 'inspektorzy medyczni', pre-paid health insurance 'opłaty wstępne na ubezpieczenie zdrowotne', pooling medical costs in times of need 'skomasowanie wydatków na służbę zdrowia w potrzebie', affordable health care 'opieka zdrowotna, na którą wszystkich stać', health-cover offer with a local insurer ''oferta ubezpieczenia zdrowotnego przez miejscowego ubezpieczyciela', basic inpatient and outpatient annual cover 'pokrycie rocznych kosztów medycznych na szpitale i poradnie/przychodnie', work on health care 'praca w służbie zdrowia', state-paid doctor 'lekarz opłacany przez państwową służbę zdrowia', a no-frills but life-saving health care (informal) lit. 'opieka zdrowotna "bez cudów", ale ratująca życie', 'podstawowa opieka zdrowotna'

The above English words and phrases in (3) are terms generated from newspaper texts on American health care system (*The Economist* Oct-Dec 2013), addressed to educated audiences.

7.8 Words and terms – typology of translation texts

The examples in (3) above are mostly *terms*. The relationship between words in general lexicon of a language and words which can be identified as *terms* is not easy to define (Sager 1986, Cabré 1992). To put it briefly, *terms are the lexical units assigned a unique sense and identified with reference to only one conceptual system or a restricted knowledge domain* as e.g. the concept of *light* in the *wave* theory or the concept of *grammar* in the linguistic *transformational-generative* theory. Both the understanding of terms in a SL as well as their TL equivalents presuppose familiarity with the unique conceptual system underlying a theory a given concept is a part of.

Each linguistic variety characteristic of a given restricted domain (referred to as sublanguages in some publications) is associated with its own *ontology*, i.e. a hierarchical system of terms representing this part of the outside reality, such as e.g. contract law or nuclear physics. Contrary to the putatively universal ontologies created (or, sometimes perhaps, discovered) by philosophers (see Fig. 4 as an example of the universal top-branched ontology Casati 1998), whose aim is to account for the structure of the universe in a language and in a domain-neutral fashion, contemporary ontologies involved in computer-based conceptual modelling are in the majority of cases domain-specific taxonomies (see Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2003, 2005).

The oldest language-based ontological models come from lexicographic material and can be found in thesauri of variouos kinds starting from medieval encyclopaedic glossaries up to modern thesauri such as the widely-used *Roget's Thesaurus*. Such common-sense models are based on what is frequently referred to as *naive physics* and, stemming from it, linguistic models incorporating *naive* or *folk-model semantics*.

(4)

1. Objects, Natural Units and Natural Kinds
2. Events, Processes and Causality
3. Stuffs, States of Matter, Qualities
4. Surfaces, Limits, Boundaries, Media
5. Motivation, Requiredness, Value

The term *ontology* has been recently extended to include a more specific sense, i.e. "a neutral and (in the best case) computationally tractable description or theory of a given domain which can be accepted and reused by all information gatherers in that domain" (cf. Casati 1998). Here *axiomaticity* in terms of *formal representation of the system* is a rule for the description to be 'computationally tractable'. Ontologies, together with their more domain-specific realizations, i.e. taxonomies, are used in information storage, retrieval, and reuse for different purposes. Ontologies for specific domains, frequently simple taxonomic terminological structures, are built relative to their application. Therefore, one cannot say that there exists a single best ontology of a domain. Likewise, the ontology's *level of granularity* tends to be domain-specific and function-dependent. The purpose of more universal, foundational, as some would call them, ontologies, is more general and aims at facilitating co-operation among different agents, human and artificial.

(5) Polish *educational system* basic ontology:

Żłobek	'Nursery'
Przedszkole	'Kindergarten'
Szkoła podstawowa	'Primary school'
Gimnazjum	'Middle school'
Liceum	'High school'
(profilowane)	(profiled: ogólnokształcące 'general' vs. zawodowe/technikum 'vocational')
Kolegium	'College'
Wyższa szkoła zawodowa	'High Vocational School/University/Academy'
vs.	
Uniwersytet	'University'

The British English ontological system for educational domain as for a number of other domains (e.g. administrative system, law, etc.), is different from that in Poland or USA. Taking the *administrative structure* of the country as another example, the translator can either select the closest possible TL level of (administrative unit) equivalence for his/her purposes e.g., Pol. *województwo* 'county/shire, etc.', resort to a higher, hyperonymic (less determined) unit 'region', coin a calque 'voivodship' or retain the original Polish form as a loan-word 'województwo', most often with an adequate definition or explanation e.g., 'the chief unit in the territorial division in Poland for administrative, judicial and political purposes' or 'the largest local government unit in Poland'.

Words in general language frequently carry either distinct or modified senses when contrasted with terms. Compare the word *mass*, which is associated with a property and weight in ordinary English, while it has no necessary association with weight in physics, where *mass* is a relation to acceleration while the property and weight might be inferred (cf. Frawley 1992). The translation of a text with specialized lexicon then should retain in the TL text both the universally acknowledged terms and collocations of a particular domain and, whenever possible, the inferential structure of the text in the SL. In (6) below senses of the English term *accumulator* followed by examples from authentic materials (corpus-driven concordances) are provided, followed by the Polish equivalent constructions.

(6) *accumulator* exemplifies a cross-linguistic polysemy and language-specific extension patterns (examples from Longman Corpus):
- *accumulator* used interchangeably with *battery* (ex. 1 below)
- a processor register (ex. 2 below)
- computer storage (ex. 3 below)
- a person who accumulates (wealth) (ex. 4 below) [AGENTIVE nominal]
- accumulated events (ex. 5 below)

N	Concordance
1	whereas secondary ones can be recharged. The lead-acid *accumulator* used in cars consists of secondary cells.
2	Thus we have a processor register called the *accumulator*, the same length as a word of computer storage.
3	Load the contents of a store location into the *accumulator*, overwriting the accumulator's previous contents.
4	Accumulated wealth outlasts the *accumulator*, as does accumulated knowledge; wealthy men establish funds
5	FIVE nations compete on the Serpentine this weekend in a *six-event accumulator* for a possible $5,000.

(6a) Polish

(i) *akumulator* = *bateria* 'accumulator = battery' (ex. 1 below)

(ii) *akumulować* (formal) *bogactwo* 'accumulate wealth'*; akumulator bogactwa* 'wealth accumulator' 'a tool to accumulate wealth', *akumulatornia/akumulatorownia* as a production area (ex. 2 below)

N Concordance

1 Najdroższe, bo kosztujące aż 300 zł, są podwójne lampy halogenowe z *akumulatorem*, które mogą świecić nawet przez kilkadziesiąt godzin.
Pol. '(lamps with) a battery'

2 pomieszczenia produkcyjne o charakterze pomocniczym – *akumulatorownia*, warsztat.
Pol. 'room in a production plant where accumulators or batteries are kept'

Metaphoric extensions such as the ones below are used in non-terminological contexts (ex. 4 and 5 below):

4 Metheny bowiem, świadom rychłej zmiany barw, *ładuje akumulatory, czyli zbiera pomysły* na pierwszą płytę w barwach nowej wytwórni.
Pol. 'Thus Metheny, […] is charging [his] batteries i.e., collecting ideas for his first record, in the new firm'

5 Wyjeżdżam w góry – *muszę naładować akumulatory*
Pol.'I'm leaving for the mountains – I have to charge my accumulators'

non-term *naładować akumulatory/ baterie* (metaphorically) – 'to charge batteries – in this context: 'to have a good rest to get ready for more work'

As can be seen, the Polish equivalents of the English terms participate in different word-formation processes, and can present a number of conceptual extension patterns, some of them overlapping in the two languages (metaphorical *charging the batteries*), some others like polysemic clusters (Eng. *How much do you* ***charge*** *for that?*) or absence of absolute equivalence or synonymy (*a* battery *of tests*), distinct for the structures and across the languages.

As to the comparison of terms with words of general language, terms are more like ordinary words judging from their *conceptual-semantic nature*, but they usually develop more elaborate systems of *semantic determination*, exhibit *more constrained* selection potential with respect to knowledge frames as well as syntactic patterns and they also acquire a *special status* when put in *discursive use*. In a cross-linguistic perspective, terms get frequently borrowed together with the phonetic/graphic form, as well as with a precise top-level ontological model, most often with a similar type and system of concept elaboration, even though their polysemic and extension patterns tend to remain language and culture-specific. To present various networks of terms, ontological hierarchies are

used not only in more linguistically oriented applications such as e.g. lexicography (cf. *WordNet* in Fellbaum 1990; BIT design in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1993), translation and language teaching but also to explain different social and economic phenomena.

The problem of synonymy and polysemy in lexical semantics is often confronted with the problem of semantic sameness and differentiation in terminology (compare the *accumulator* vs. *battery* examples). The ideal situation for terminology would be if problems of contextual synonymy were the domain of semantics and pragmatics while conceptual synonymy or equivalence were dealt with only in terms of terminology and were solved by means of *standardization*. In practice though, the two are not separate and translators working on their own do not propose their individual linguistic solutions for standardization.

In many cases preference is given to *international* terms rather than to native solutions for reasons of frequency and range. Apart from the content of terminological semantics in translation though as e.g, in the case of Pol. *oferta* – corresponding regularly to English *offer*, what is of importance is also their *pragmatic constraints*, which make the equivalent *offer* unsuitable for the contexts of say *commercial bid* as in *Złożyliśmy ofertę w przetargu* – We submitted a *bid* in the tender (Sax 32012:14).

8. Translation and language naturalness

Linguistic units have a variable degree of *cognitive entrenchment*, depending on the frequency of their occurrence in actual language use. The more entrenched a structure is in a linguistic system, the more likely it will be considered part of linguistic convention. The English sentence *We have never intended sending an unlimited supply of white men to rule these islands* for instance, can have an almost literal equivalent in the Polish sentence *Nigdy nie zamierzaliśmy wysyłania nieograniczonych zasobów białych ludzi, aby rządzić tymi wyspami* or else – in its approximate variant (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2012) *Nigdy nie zamierzaliśmy wysyłać nieograniczonej liczby białych, aby sprawowali władzę nad tymi wyspami*. The latter is, structurally and lexically, more preferred and frequent, i.e. more entrenched in Polish, than the first variant. The more frequent and more preferred utterances in a given context the more *natural* the utterance is considered to be (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk et al. 2001). The translator then should be ready to estimate *the degree of entrenchment of a unit in a SL i.e. its contextual naturalness* to find a closest TL equivalent in this respect.

9. Semantics and interaction: meanings emerge in interaction

Language does not function in vacuum. It is typically used in an interaction – direct or indirect, in spoken, written or any other channel and mode. Language then should be interpreted in terms of a cognitive-interactional framework as an expression of two perspectives[7]. First, as partly conventional conceptualisation of the socially accepted reality in terms of recurrent patterns of neural activation, and secondly, as an expression of an open potential for capturing *alternative realities* where new links are created. Language is asymmmetrically constrained on different linguistic levels (in the sense of Jakobson 1971: 242), by the principles of linguistic convention as well as the psycho-physical abilities and preferences of its users. On each occasion meanings of linguistic units referring to these realities are individually re-created and negotiated among the participants of the communicative act. They are dynamic entities that, as investigated in connectionist research (cf. Morelli & Miller Brown 1992), do not *reside* at any particular place in the neural network but emerge at a higher level of neural activation.

The main components of a cognitive model of linguistic (inter-)action (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 1985) are affective states and psychological and physical needs of the speaker and addressee, such properties as their social status, needs, expectations, etc., perceived prior to and during the interaction, the linguistic and paralinguistic reaction of the addressee to the speaker's linguistic (and paralinguistic) action, as well as their knowledge of the universe. The conceptualization of these components with each of the participants creates the background framing, *sensu largo*, of an interactional act.

The essential property of the theory of re-conceptualization is that it is evident in the discourse process of message interpretation. Part of re-conceptualization processes are an outcome of a TL *morphological and syntactic pressure*, e.g., there is no direct literal equivalent of the English Passive sentence *I was given this book a minute ago* in Polish, so there exists a clear syntactic (language-typological) pressure on the translator to use another – approximate – construction (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2012) e.g. *Dostałam tę książkę minutę temu* 'I got this book a minute ago', rather than a structurally equivalent one. The other part of re-conceptualization processes are translators' preferred *strategies* – i.e., a selection of a more preferred, morpho-syntactic option out of possible TL (closer or more distant) equivalents.

[7] See Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1987:103 for a Dynamic Semantics model of language.

10. Types of qualitative re-conceptualization

The main divide then between re-conceptualizaton types is that between those associated with a particular language type, i.e., a *typologically-based re-conconceptualization*, i.e. linguistic constraints and pressures, and the other – synonymous with *translation strategies* – associated with the subjective preferences towards particular linguistic choices translators show in their tasks.

The examples below are instances of typologically driven re-conceptualization patterns:

(7) Eng. passive voice > Pol. reflexive verb (syntactic pressure)

Eng. (Passive + Prep Passive nominalization) > Pol. (Reflexive + Prep nominalization)

- I had been saved *by being prompt*.
- Uratowałem się *dzięki swej żwawości*.

The syntactic pressure is also clearly seen in the following pair in changing the English passive voice into the Polish active voice with the simultaneous change of the verbs (Transitive Passive *receive* > Intransitive Active *nadszedł* 'arrived'):

(8)

- One day a letter was received
- Pewnego dnia nadszedł list

A certain flattening of meaning (syntactic simplification) is also observed in the following example:

(9a) bladobłękitny zając z fajansu, ze skrzyneczką na plecach, do której sypie się cukier
(9b) a pale blue china rabbit with a sugar bowl on its back

In (10a) and (10b) the construal differences – dictated by typological pressure – are present:

(10a) Blakną w słońcu, bo *okno jest od południa*.
(10b) They're fading in the sunlight since *the window faces south*.

In cross-linguistic comparisons what is conventionally observed are weakly commensurable categorical hierarchies in language and, rooted in them, a *dynamic displacement of senses* (cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1987)[8]. On top of this, a translation product is a result of an inter-discursive activity. Meanings can be abstracted from their contexts but in their natural use they are context-sensitive and *emerge* in the course of an interaction. Translation thus has to do with various re-conceptualization operations.

If we make reference to the main types of equivalence mentioned before, i.e.,

- formal equivalence,
- equivalence of the outside world referents (i.e. denotations or referents/extensions), equivalents of mental representations or intensions,
- and equivalence of functions,

the example below (11a/11b) – a translation strategy – is an instance of both re-conceptualization in mental representation and in function (example from TVP *Polonia* Polish film translation):

(11a) Idę na kolację do wiejskiego klubu
(11b) I'm going to dinner to a country club

Polish *kolacja* can be a more modest (cold) meal and perhaps served at a later time than English *dinner*. English *country club* has both outdoor facilities, location, interior architecture, and numerous entertaining functions, elitist sports in particular, totally different than Polish *wiejski klub*, usually with smaller, less sophisticated interior. Evident here are also differences in the perlocutionary effect on the Polish (SL) and Eglish (TL) audiences.

Differences in *referents* are multiple and they are conditioned by different factors, e.g., by the rule of political correctness as in the example below;

(12a) przypomniał mi się *nasz pies Murzyn*
(12b) I remembered *our dog Blackie* [lit. 'Negro']

[8] As shown in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 1987, a cross-linguistic displacement of senses is a typical phenomenon in comparing languages. For instance, the verb *go* in English, a superordinate category for numerous verbs of movement, has no direct equivalent in Polish at the same categorial level. In Polish the concept of going can be considered to have equivalents implemented by two more specific verbs *iść* 'walk' and *jechać* 'move by/in a vehicle', which, in turn, would correspond to still more specific English verbs such as *ride*, *drive*, etc., at a lower level of the categorization hierarchy.

A number of more fine-grained re-conceptualization types can be represented by the examples to follow:

(13a) na Rynku... jest *sklepik szwarc-mydło i powidło* (71)
(13b) on the market square... there was a *general store* (104)

The culture-specific description in the Polish original activates a clearly smaller area (*sklepik* – lit. a little shop) with masses of goods in more or less disorderly heaps (*szwarc-mydło i powidło*), usually with the owner selling the goods, while the English version evokes rather a corresponding culture-spectific image of an American open-shelf department store, larger, possibly with a number of shop assistants and cash-registers.

Each of the equivalence types can either be constructed to evoke a more SL- or else a TL-oriented image and conceptualization type. In the former – so-called *foreignization* – the translator retains the original form of the lexical item and/or structure as in the title characters of *Hamlet*, *Harry Potter* or, in a recent film series, *Downton Abbey*, in the English original and its Polish translation. In the opposite strategy – *domestication* – the translator resorts to the TL repertory of proper names, compound parts, etc., as in *Wuthering Heights – Wichrowe Wzgórza*, or *Alice in Wonderland – Alicja w Krainie Czarów.* A frequent strategy is to retain foreign-sounding names and words – with no obvious TL equivalents – in their original (or phonetically or graphemically) modified forms, and render into a TL those linguistic forms which have natural TL equivalents. Each of the strategies has a different perlocutionary effect – the creation of a more SL-specific, frequently exotic, mysterious, etc. atmosphere in the former and introducing TL home-like elements in the latter context.

11. Translation and regional and historical varieties

Re-conceptualization processes are mostly visible in translation of regional and historical varieties of language. There are obviously no determined rules as to what strategies to use in such cases, although there are certain tendencies observed.

The first tendency is marked by attempts to introduce *archaisms* or *regional (dialect)* variants to TL versions as approximate equivalents of both historical and regional varieties of SL texts. The second case presents the introduction of *non-standard TL equivalents*, associated with lower social classes, frequently introduced on the phonetic level and represented as so-called *phonetic spelling*

(*eye dialect*). The third strategy is the use of a *(more) formal TL style* to represent a historically older, more formal or more distancing variety of language:

(14a) dlatego zapanowałem nad sobą i odpowiedziałem sucho: – *Mylisz się*, Haniu, jeśli sądzisz, że *ty jesteś* powodem.
(14b) so mastered myself and answered dryly: '*Thou art* mistaken, Hania, in thinking that *thou art* the cause '

Non-standard or less formal TL varieties are used to present regional SL varieties. Foreign accent in a SL is frequently replaced by *foreigner talk* in a TL with original foreign elements used in the SL text often retained in the TL, which nevertheless introduces elements of re-conceptualization:

(15a) Po czym dodał z dumą: – Sam pan wielki powiedział, że *Kali jest donkey*
(15b) After which he added with pride: 'The great master himself said that *Kali is a donkey*.'

The perlocutionary effect of the TL utterance is that in (15a) no foreign material is present in the English TL text so no distancing accent is present in the English TL text except for the semantically foreignized phrase *great master*, so low distancing accent is present on this level. On the other hand, a compensating strategy in the form of a less standard sequence of tenses (…*said* that Kali *is*…) has been employed.

The fourth translational strategies aiming to retain equivalence on the perlocutionary level are so-called *eye-dialectal* translational properties. This strategy is practiced mostly in literary translation and occurs in two forms. The first one covers deliberate spelling errors, which have no obvious effect on the pronunciation but whose special status is marked by erroneous spelling such as e.g. *mruz* 'frost' instead of *mróz* or *świerzy* 'fresh' in the place of *świeży* in Polish. Such errors are usually called *native-spelling* errors. The other form involves portraying the actual pronunciation with phonetically modified spelling as in the English text "When de fros' is on de pun'kin an' de sno'-flakes in de ar', I den begin rejoicin'-hog-killin' time is near." [When the frost is on the pumpkin and the snow flakes in the air, I then begin rejoicing – hog-killing time is near] (Daniel Webster Davis, "Hog Meat"). The latter is used as a clue towards the maintenance of the perlocutionary effect of a particular social marking (sometimes stigmatization) of a language variety.

A general tendency visible in a number of translated texts pertains to a flattening (or neutralization) of the original complexity of the text, evident in the use of a less varied and dense vocabulary and simpler syntax. Lewandowska-

Tomaszczyk (2012) analyses emotion terms in translation and finds that e.g., the English translation of the contemporary Polish novel *Samotność w sieci* 'Loneliness in the net' has a much less varied *fear* vocabulary and less complex syntax than the Polish original. This tendency is also exemplified in other materials from the PELCRA translation corpus:

(16a) *żywiąc się* (lit. *feeding himself*) od tygodnia prawie wyłącznie durrą *wykradaną* (lit. *stolen from*) wielbłądom.
(16b) He *sustained himself* for a week almost exclusively upon durra *taken* from the camels

Compensatory strategies of various kinds are one of possible ways to secure a comparable intended effect in translation. Examples (17a, b) present structural compensation, examples (18a, b) show a definitional – generalizing effect, while examples in (19a, b) are an instance of eliminating the regional forms to retain it only in the lexical semantic content.

(17a) It was his custom to *mount* straight to the nursery, taking about three degrees of the staircase at once
(17b) Zwykle *przychodził* od razu *na górę* do dziecinnego pokoju, przy czym biegł szybko, przeskakując po trzy schody naraz.
(18a) He sent his son to *Eton*
(18b) Wysłał syna do *elitarnego gimnazjum w Anglii*.
(19a)...stary dziad. Mówiło się na niego *"pastusz"*... O świcie zbierał *z objeść bydlęta*
(19b) an old guy who was known as *"the Shepherd"*...At dawn, he'd collect *the cattle from the farmyards*

12. Quantitative aspects of equivalence: language corpora

Apart from the *qualitative changes*, *quantitative linguistic* parameters such as the frequency of occurrence of a language form, its combinatorics with other items in discourse as well as patterns of semantic similarity, oppositeness and inclusion, all contribute to a language specific character of SL and TL forms. They are the quantitative parameters of message re-conceptualization, referred to in part 7.6. above and in the sections to follow.

Cognitive approaches to language and the use of *language corpora* are two recurrent themes in contemporary linguistics. The former emphasises the status

of meaning content in linguistic theory and description. The latter is instrumental in the identification of meaning structures and their context as well as in *their quantitative characteristics* in language, providing data and instruments to identify *frequency-based* rules of translational equivalence.

The quantitative and qualitative methodologies used in translation studies interplay and new insights are obtained as a consequence of investigating explicit corpus-based data with a more tacit semantic enquiry. The approach often used is a Cognitive Corpus-based Linguistic approach as proposed in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Dziwirek (2008) and Dziwirek and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010) and applied to contrastive and to corpus-based translation studies.

One example of an interesting area at the interface of Cognitive Linguistics, computerized language data and cross-linguistic investigation, is *semantic prosody* (cf. Sinclair, 1992). Some words seem always to like the company of certain other words and disprefer the company of others. These words trigger specific semantics in their neighbours. The term *semantic prosody* implies thus the existence of an 'intuitive' meaning of an item, which is manifested only in its context (cf. Louw 1993: 172). Search for prosodically cognate concepts can be successfully carried out only in large quantities of language data, e.g., the adjective *utterly* collocates more frequently with negatively rather than positively loaded concepts such as *stupid*, *disgusting*, etc. Outcomes of the prosodic analysis based on more than one language are easily applicable in translation work and translator training.

12.1. Frequencies and registers

An important point connected with the use of language corpora is discussed in Biber (1993: 226), who mentions in his analysis of register-diversified corpora that "In fact, corpus-based research shows that our intuitions about lexical patterns are often incorrect (cf. Sinclair 1992). However, similar to the patterns for grammatical structures, for many words there is no general pattern of use that holds across the whole language; rather, different word senses and collocational patterns are strongly preferred in different registers". There are big differences across different registers in the *frequency of use* of similar lexical items. For example, Biber (1993: 227) finds that in the social science, *certain* is quite common, *sure* is relatively rare, and *definite* is quite rare while in fiction the pattern is quite opposite: *certain* is relatively rare, *sure* is relatively common, and *definite* is quite rare. "These patterns alone", Biber concludes further, "show that the semantic domain of certainty in English could not be adequately described without considering the patterns in complementary registers".

In recent computer-based applications using parallel and comparable texts, bi- and multilingual alignment and automatic equivalence acquisition based on statistical regularities, are performed, which make it possible for translators to build Translation Memories faster and on a larger scale as machine aids to human translation (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk et. al. 1989; Oakes & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007/8) .

Conclusions

The concept of *equivalence*, so essential for any cross-linguistic analysis, evolves in the *Cognitive Corpus-Based Translation* (CCT) as a dynamic notion, represented as a cline gradually exhibiting more and more diversification both in terms of qualitative (construal) types of SL-TL differences as well as the quantitative (frequency) parameters of particular linguistic forms. The degree of equivalence between SL and TL structures can thus be measured in terms of the reference categories mentioned above such as the typology of basic levels and prototypical category members, image-schemata and their extensions as well as the construal relations of various types. The global equivalence criterion is the range and strength of the intended effect achieved by a particular SL and TL. This is a fairly *broad concept of equivalence* proposed here. Meaning dynamism is observed not only in the source language text. We experience it on-line in new TL interpretations of the source message.

Equivalence is a fluid notion then. The SL and TL systems and the translator exert their pressures. The translator has eventually the crucial role in setting up SL – TL equivalence. It is through their activities that events in the real world or in a fictitious world get mediated in human, machine and google translation processes. Translators are TL users' eyes, ears and touch. In the modern world – this is taking place even in a more literal sense, particularly in the case of text-to-sound or sound- to-text audio-descriptive contexts. Thus, the scope of equivalence is getting more and more extended at present times.

Background Reading

Bogucki, Ł. (2004). *A Relevance Framework for Constraints on Cinema Subtitling*. Lodz: Lodz University Press.

Cabré, M. T. (1999) [1992]. *Terminology – Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gutt, E.-A., (1991). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

House, J. (1981). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2004). "Lexical Problems of Translation" – Art. 48. Vol. 1. *An International Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies, 3 Volumes* (Eds. Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Harald Kittel, Werner Koller, José Lambert and Fritz Paul). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 455-465.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2010). "Re-conceptualization and the emergence of discourse meaning as a theory of translation". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & M. Thelen (eds.) *Meaning in Translation*. Frankfurt a. Main: Peter Lang. 105-148.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (ed.) (2010). *New Ways to Language*. Łódź: Łódź University Press.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2012a). "Explicit and tacit – An interplay of the qualitative and quantitative approaches to translation" In: Michael Oakes and Meng Ji (eds). *Quantitative Methods in Corpus-Based Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 3-33.

Loerscher, W. (1991) *Translation Performance, Translation Process, Translation Strategies. A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Benjamins Translation Library Vol. 66. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. (1995). *The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Vinay, J.-P. and J. Darbelnet (1995) [1958]. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation.* [trans.] J.C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture and Cognition. Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Further Reading

Biber, D. (2003). "Variation among university spoken and written registers: A new multi-dimensional analysis". In: Ch. Meyer & P. Leistyna (eds). *Corpus Analysis: Language Structure and Language Use*, Amsterdam: Rodopi. 47-70.

Bogucki, Ł. and M. Deckert (eds.). (2012). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Casati, R. (1998). (with B. Smith and Achille C. Varzi). "Ontological Tools for Geographic Representation". In: N. Guarino (ed.), (1998). *Formal Ontology in Information Systems*, Amsterdam: IOS Press. 77–85.

Chomsky, N. (1964). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Duff, A. (1981). Third Language*: Recurrent Problems of Translation into English.* Pergamon Press.

Dziwirek, K. and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010). *Complex Emotions and Grammatical Mismatches.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990). "Polysystem Studies". *International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*. Volume 11, number 1.

Fauconnier, G. (1985). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Languages*. Cambridge, Mass.: A Bradford Book. The MIT Press.

Fauconnier, G. and M. Turner. (1998). "Conceptual Integration Networks". *Cognitive Science* 22: 2 : 133-187.

Fellbaum, Ch. (1990), "English Verbs as a Semantic Net". Report 43. Cognitive Science Laboratory, Princeton: Princeton University.

Fillmore, Ch. J. (1982). "Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis". In: R. J. Jarvella and W. Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place and Action,* London: John Wiley. 31 – 59.

Frawley, W. (1992) "Semantics, sublanguage, and the translation of specialized lexicon". In: Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.) *Translation and Meaning*. Part 2. Maastricht. 321-332.

Jakobson, R. 1971. "Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbances." In: *Selected Writings, vol. II*. THe Hague: Mouton. 239-259.

Johnson, M. 1987. *The Body in the Mind.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Katz, J. J. (1978), "Effability and Translation". In: Guenthner, F. and M. Guenthner-Reutter (eds.) *Meaning and Translation. Philosophical and Linguistic Approaches*. New York: University Press. 191-234.

Keenan, L.E. (1978). "Some Logical Problems in Translation". In: Guenthner, F. and M. Guenthner-Reutter (eds.) *Meaning and Translation. Philosophical and Linguistic Approaches.* New York: University Press. 157-189.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Thing: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* vol. 1, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lefevere, A. (1975). *Translating poetry: seven strategies and a blueprint.* Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1987). *Conceptual Analysis, Linguistic Meaning, and Verbal Interaction.* Łódź: Łódź University Press.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1993), "Bilingual Thesaurus (BIT), Field Theory, and Cognitive Linguistics." In: Peter Rolf Lutzeier (ed.), *Studies in Lexical Field Theory*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1999). "A Cognitive-interactional model of cross-linguistic analysis: New perspectives on 'tertium comparationis' and the concept of equivalence". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.), *Cognitive Perspectives on Language*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 53-76.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2003), "Ontologies and language corpora". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.) *PALC 2001: Practical Applications in Language Corpora*. Frankfurt a. Main: Peter Lang. 11-32.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2008). "On the cross-language relationship in lexicology and terminology". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen (eds.). *Translation and Meaning.* Part 8. Maastricht: Zuyd University. 297-307.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2007): "Polysemy, prototypes and radial categories". *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics.* Dirk Geeraerts & Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) Oxford*:* Oxford University Press. 139-169.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2012). "Approximative Spaces and the Tolerance Threshold in Communication". *International Journal of Cognitive Linguistics* Volume 2 Issue 2. 2-19.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B., Oakes, M. and M. Wynne (2000). "Automatic Alignment of Polish and English Texts". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and P. J. Melia (Eds) *Palc '99 Conference Proceedings of Practical Applications of Language Corpora*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 77-86.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B., J. Osborne, and F. Schulte. (2001). *Foreign Language Teaching and Information Communication Technology*. Frankfurt A. Main: Peter Lang.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and K. Dziwirek (Eds.) (2008). *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics.* Frankfurt A. Main: Peter Lang.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and P. Wilson (2013) "English *Fear* and Polish *Strach* in Contrast: Grid Approach and Cognitive Corpus Linguistic Methodology". In: J. Fontaine, K.R. Scherer and C. Soriano (Eds.) *Components of Emotional Meaning: a Sourcebook.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 425-436.

Lewis, D.K. (1969). *Convention: a Philosophical Study*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Louw, B. (1993). "Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies". In: Baker, M. Francis, G., and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.) *Text and Technology*. In Honour of John Sinclair. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: Benjamins. 157-176.

Morelli, R. and W. Miller Brown (1992). "Computational Models of Cognition". In: Morelli, R. , W. Miller Brown, D. Anselmi, K. Haberlandt, D. Lloyd (eds), *Minds, Brains and Computers,* Perspectives in Cognitive Science and Artificial Intelligence. New Jersey: Ablex. 1-35.

Newmark, P. (1987). A *Textbook of Translation.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. (1964) *Towards the Science of Translation*. Leyden: E.J. Brill.

Oakes, M. P. & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2007/8). "Bi- and trilingual alignment and concordancing as machine aids to human translation". In: Teubert, W., & Krishnamurthy, R. (eds.) *Corpus Linguistics* (6-Volume Set): *Critical Concepts in Linguistics* Part 4. London and New York: Routledge. 457-467.

Oittinen, R. (2000). *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland.

Pęzik, P. (2011). "Providing corpus feedback for translators with the PELCRA search engine for NKJP". In: Stanislaw Gozdz-Roszkowski (ed.) *Explorations across Languages & Corpora. PALC 2009 Proceedings.* Frankfurt a. Main: Peter Lang.

Quine, W. V. (1964). "Meaning and Translation". In: Fodor, J. A. and J. J. Katz (eds.), *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 460-78.

Reiss, K. and H. J. Vermeer (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Roget, P. M. (1962, 1982) [1852], Lloyd, Susan M., ed., *Roget's Thesaurus*, Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Limited.

Rosch, E. (1973), "Natural Categories". *Cognitive Psychology* 4, 328-350.

Round, N. (1998). *Translation Studies in Hispanic Contexts.* Glasgow: BHS.

Sager, N. (1986). "Sublanguage: Linguistic Phenomenon, Computational Tool". In: R. Kittredge and J. Lehrberger (eds.) *Sublanguage: Studies of Language in Restricted Semantic Domains*. 1-17, Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Sax, D. J., (2012). "'Good Feelings' and 'Hospitality' in Polish Business Language: An Intercultural-pragmatic Challenge Neglected in Polish-English Translator Tools and Training". In: Ł. Bogucki and M. Deckert (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 3-21.

Scott (1996). "WordSmith Tools Manual", Oxford University Press. Available at: http://www.liv.ac.uk/~ms2928

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay on the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1979). "A taxonomy of illocutionary acts". In: John R. Searle (ed.) *Expression and Meaning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-29.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sinclair J. M. (1992). "Trust the Text", In: M. Davies & L. Ravelli (eds). *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice*. London: Pinter. 5-19.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Trier, Jost (1931). *Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinn bezirk des Vertsnades.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Whorf, B. L. (1941). *Language, Mind and Reality*. Printed by the Theosophical Society in 1942 "The Theosophist" Madras, India. Vol 63:1. 281–91. Reprinted in J. B. Carroll (1956: 246–270). In 1952 also reprinted in *Etc., a Review of General Semantics*. 9:167–188.

Wróblewski, J. (2013). "Dolores de la traducción, or Lolita in Translation". In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen (eds.) *Translation and Meaning* Part 10. 79-90.

Language Corpora

English:
BNC
Longman-Microconcord Sampler

Polish:
Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego www.nkjp.pl
15-mln PELCRA Sampler

Parallel Polish-to-English and English-to-Polish contemporary text resources
Alice in Wonderland (Jabberwocky) Lewis Carroll tr. Stanisław Barańczak, Janusz Korwin-Mikke, Bogumiła Kaniewska
Lolita Vladimir Nabokov tr. Robert Stiller
Robinson Crusoe Daniel Defoe tr. Władysław Ludwik Anczyc
Nineteen Eighty – Four George Orwell tr. Tomasz Mirkowicz
The Cat in the Hat Dr. Seuss tr. Stanisław Barańczak
Dukla Andrzej Stasiuk tr. Bill Johnston
Henryk Sienkiewicz *Reading Canon* tr. Jeremiah Curtin
S@motność w sieci Janusz Leon Wiśniewski tr. Philip Stoeckle

Translation Procedures

Jacek Tadeusz Waliński

University of Łódź

jacek.walinski@gmail.com

Abstract: A basic survey across a given language pair normally reveals units that are structurally incongruent with one another, which demonstrates that translation cannot be reduced to establishing a straightforward correspondence between individual words. To properly render the meaning of the source text, translators must introduce *translation shifts*, i.e. departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the source language to the target language. This chapter reviews a taxonomy of *translation procedures* used for dealing with the translation shifts proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), which has been regarded a springboard for later taxonomies of translation techniques and strategies.

Keywords: translation procedures, translation shifts, translation strategies, unit of translation, direct translation, oblique translation

1. Introduction

A question of *translation procedures* is associated with *equivalence* (see Chapter 1; see also Baker 2011) and a division between *literal* and *free* translation strategies, where the *literal* generally refers to translation of the target text by following individual word of the source text as closely as possible, while the *free* translation focuses on capturing the sense of longer stretches of the source text. It is also closely related to a distinction of *translation units* (see Hatim & Munday 2004 for a review), in particular a *lexicological translation unit*, understood as a group of lexemes that form a single element of thought. A basic survey across a given language pair normally reveals units that are structurally incongruent with one another. It can be illustrated with the verb "fetch", whose meaning corresponds to two Polish verbs "iść + przynieść", or the compound "apple pie",

which is normally rendered in Polish with a single noun "szarlotka". Such examples demonstrate that translation cannot be reduced to establishing a straightforward correspondence between individual words.

In real life scenarios, translators often cope with more elaborate structures, which due to *entrenchment** require certain ways of translating, while not others, to produce a massage that is meaningful to the target language users.

*) In modern approaches to language there is a growing tendency to replace the idea of *grammaticality* with that of *entrenchment*, which is derived from the usage-based approach to meaning postulated by *cognitive linguistics*. As put by Langacker (2008a: 38): "Meanings (like other linguistic structures) are recognized as part of a language only to the extent that they are (i) entrenched in the minds of individual speakers and (ii) conventional for members of a speech community. Only a limited array of senses satisfy these criteria and qualify as established *linguistic units*. But since entrenchment and conventionalization are inherently matters of degree, there is no discrete boundary between senses which have and which lack the status of established units. We find instead a gradation leading from novel interpretations, through incipient senses, to established linguistic meanings". For example, Apple, Inc. is famous for notoriously using marketing slogans that break conventions of grammaticality. In 1997 the company introduced the attention-grabbing slogan "Think different", which was received as grammatically unconventional. Despite initial criticisms, the slogan has been widely accepted, which makes it grammatical (see Trenga 2010).

(author's note)

For example, the following notice spotted in a Polish self-service bar above garbage cans: "Prosimy nie wyrzucać pełnych kubków" with the accompanying translation "We ask to not throw away full cups" may sound unfortunately puzzling to native speakers of English, who would probably expect in this context a more conventional message, like "Please do not dispose of liquids". Such examples demonstrate that the structure of the SL often must be changed in the target language to properly render the meaning of the source text. Those small, yet meaningful, changes that occur in the process of translation are called *translation shifts*. Catford (1965/2000: 141) defines them as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL". Although Catford was the first to use the term *shift*, a comprehensive taxonomy of shifts that occur in translation was established by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1958), who developed a taxonomy of *translation procedures*.

2. Translation procedures

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) reject individual words as units of translation by emphasizing that translators deal with ideas and feelings in various semantic fields, rather than individual lexemes. They define the unit of translation as "the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually" (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958 quoted in Hatim & Munday 2004: 18). From this outlook, the translation unit is equivalent to the above-mentioned *lexicological unit* and corresponds largely to a *unit of thought*, since all these terms basically convey the same concept with emphasis put on different facets. Following this perspective Hatim and Munday (2004: 27) describe the unit of translation as "a TL piece of language which plays the same role in the TL system as an SL piece of language plays in the SL system". Such a denomination of the translation unit delimits borders between formal correspondence at the structural level, on the one hand, and semantic equivalence in the particular context, on the other. The translation shift occurs when rendering a translation for a particular segment of the text requires the translator to break the formal correspondence between surface structures functioning in SL and TL.

Sometimes, translation shifts are required to achieve a meaningful translation of relatively common lexemes. For example, the adverb "upstairs" conflates both the direction (up) and the medium (stairs) of movement. Consequently, translating "(She went) upstairs" into Polish, which does not have a parallel adverb, requires using at least three distinct lexemes "schodami na górę", but even four "po schodach na górę" would not be inappropriate. And vice-versa, translating instrumental forms of Polish nouns used to encode instruments of motion, such as "autobusem", often requires using prepositional phrases, such as "by bus". Moreover, the translation shifts are employed to achieve equivalence at the pragmatic level. For example, translating "Once upon a time…" as "Dawno, dawno temu …" creates a parallel dramatic effect on the reader; using forms "Pani/Pani" for translating "you" enables the translator to preserve the level of formality in correspondence; changing the adjective-noun order for the nominal "blue shark" into "żarłacz błękitny" effectuates in retaining naming conventions; and so on. Understanding such systematic shifts between linguistic structures is a basic aspect of daily practice in translation.

Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/2000) taxonomy of *translation procedures* used to deal with incompatibilities between SL and TL structures distinguishes two major *methods of translation*. A *direct translation*, which generally resembles word by word quotation of the original message in the target language, includes *borrowing*, *calque* and *literal translation*. An *oblique translation*, in

which the translator interprets, e.g. elaborates or summarizes, the explicit contents of the original, embraces *transposition*, *modulation*, *equivalence*, and *adaptation* translation procedures. Moreover, these procedures can be employed at three levels of language: (a) the lexicon; (b) the grammatical structures; and (c) the *message*, which stands for higher elements of text, including, besides sentences and paragraphs, certain situational utterances that convey broader meanings. For instance, although the phrase "Polish jokes" refers in its origins to jokes made specifically of Poles, it can be used as an umbrella term for jokes made of other ethnic groups (Brzozowska 2010). It must be emphasized, however, that while the direct translation is more closely tied to the original text and the oblique translation relies to a greater extent on interpretive resemblance to function independently, this distinction is not always a clear-cut dichotomy. In real life scenarios, it marks two opposite ends of a wide spectrum of options available to translators. A particular choice is often dictated by the *relevance* of a given message to the intended audience (see Chapter 7; see also Bogucki 2004; Sperber & Wilson 1995).

3. *Direct* translation procedures

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) note that due to structural and metalinguistic parallelisms that occur between languages it is often possible to overcome gaps (or *lacunae*) between the source language and the target language by transposing the SL message piece by piece into the TL. In such cases, when the translator notices a gap in the target language, they can employ either a parallel category or a parallel concept to convey the meaning of the source text. This can be accomplished with one of the following *direct translation procedures*.

(1) **Borrowing**, which is relatively the simplest of all procedures used for translation, involves using foreign phrasing in the target text. The reason for the gap in the target language is usually metalinguistic. Nowadays, it is frequently caused by new technologies entering rapidly the surrounding reality. For example, while "laptop" can be translated into Polish as "komputer przenośny", its more recent variant, i.e. "tablet" appears to function in Polish exclusively in a lexical form borrowed directly from English. Another reason for using borrowings is that the concept discussed in the source text is relatively unknown to the target audience. This seems to be the case with the much discussed *gender* ideology, which was not translated into Polish, as "ideologia płci", but rather "ideologia gender". Although the concept of *gender* is obviously as universal to Polish speakers as it is to any other audience worldwide, the recent discussion

focuses on some specific aspects of European regulations, which is emphasized by using that particular foreign term in this otherwise familiar context.

As pointed out by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000), perhaps the most interesting aspect of using borrowings relates to creating specific stylistic effects, e.g. introducing the flavor of the foreign culture into a translation. For instance, certain phrases from French are sometimes used to create an aura of nostalgia for the past when French was the *lingua franca*, which can be exemplified with the famous *Michelle* ballad by the Beatles. In such cases the translator may opt to leave the foreign elements intact. On the other hand, terms borrowed from English tend to be associated with the modern socio-economic development, which seems to explain why some companies in Poland decide to call their human resources departments "Dział Human Resources" instead of "Dział Kadr".

A remarkable example of employing borrowings for a stylistic effect in *literary translation* (Chapter 9) are Robert Stiller's subsequent translations of the novel "A Clockwork Orange" by Anthony Burgess (1991, 2001). In order to emphasize a violent, outright barbaric, nature of the protagonist and his gang, Burgess invented a special slang for the book, which was based on modified Slavic words borrowed mainly from Russian. For instance, "droog" means "friend", "korova" means "cow", and so on. To preserve the harshness of that slang for the Polish reader, who is naturally much more familiar with the sound of Slavic languages than the original English-speaking audience, in his second attempt Stiller back-translated, in a way, Slavic borrowings into English-sounding expressions to make them more outlandish (Kubińska & Kubiński 2004; Lukas 2008).

(2) **Calque** is a special kind of borrowing in which the TL borrows an expression form the SL by translating literally each of the original elements. The result creates either, a *lexical calque*, which preserves the syntactic structure of the TL, but at the same time introduces a new mode of expression; or a *structural calque*, which introduces a new construction into the language. Examples of lexical calques functioning in Polish include "lokowanie produktu" (product placement), "przeglądarka internetowa" (Internet browser), "drapacz chmur" (skyscraper), and "dział zasobów ludzkich", which is another common variant of labeling human resources departments in Polish companies. An example of an unfortunate calque that occurs when translating without proper background from Polish to English is the bar notice "asking to not throw away full cups" quoted in the introductory section.

Structural calques seem to be to less conspicuous, still they can be easily found in contemporary Polish. Examples include: "szybki kredyt" (fast loan), "zdrowa żywność" (healthy food), "tania odzież" (second-hand clothes), to name but a few. All these phrases break the conventional way of distinguishing cate-

gories by postpositioning the adjective, e.g. "kredyt długoterminowy", "żywność bezglutenowa", "odzież robocza". Other examples, such as "auto-myjnia" (car-wash) or "biznes plan" (business plan) employ nouns for the attributive function, which, unlike English, is not normally used in the Polish grammatical system (Sztencel, 2009).

Since *borrowing* and *calque* are strongly related, it is sometimes difficult to draw an absolute border between these two translation procedures. For example, the translation "aplikacje dla Androida" (applications for Android) borrows both the structure and lexis, which makes it an amalgamation of these categories. The problem of loan expressions in contemporary Polish is much more complex. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000) distinguishes several types of loans at different language levels. She classifies *loan shifts* as incorporating both *calques*, i.e. loans where "foreign language elements are replaced by semantically equivalent native ones" (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic 2000: 15), and *semantic loans*, i.e. native language words used in accordance with the donor word semantics.

Polish has a long history of borrowing expressions from English in a wide variety of semantic areas, including business, sport, technology, as well as numerous other domains (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006). Although borrowings and calques are relatively straightforward solutions to various problematic situations encountered in the translation process, they should be used with caution. It seems that a lot of translators are biased to think that words and structures borrowed from English sound perfectly right to Polish speakers, which is not necessarily true. Expressions like "marketingowiec" (marketer) or "zjeść coś w fast-foodzie" (to eat something in a fast-food [restaurant]) sound awkward, despite the fact that both *marketing* and *fast-food* have become popular words used in common contexts. More natural equivalents for these expressions, at least in most common contexts, are "specjalista ds. marketingu" and "zjeść coś w barze", respectively.

(3) **Literal translation,** or *word for word* translation, relies on the direct transfer of a text from SL into a grammatical and meaningful text in TL. Using this procedure, the translator focuses predominantly on adhering to the linguistic rules of the target language. In practice, literal translation occurs most commonly when translating between two languages of the same family, such as French and Italian, and works most efficiently when they also share the same culture. Despite seemingly limited scope of applications, this procedure is among preferred ways of translating in those functional contexts where more emphasis is laid on preserving the verbatim meaning of the original text than attaining stylistic elegance, which is often the case with *legal translation* (Chapter 10).

If, after applying the first three procedures, the resulting translation is still unacceptable, i.e. the target text has no meaning, gives another meaning, or

skews the original message in any other way, the procedures of *oblique translation* can be employed to achieve a better result.

4. *Oblique* translation procedures

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) note that due to structural and metalinguistic differences between languages certain stylistic effects are unattainable without upsetting the lexis or the syntactic order in the target language. In such cases more complex methods must be employed to convey the meaning of the source text. Although at a cursory glance they might look fairly sophisticated, or even unusual, the *oblique translation procedures* allow translators to exert a strict control over the reliability of their efforts.

(4) **Transposition** involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the text. It can be applied intralinguistically, i.e. within a particular language. For instance, "She announced she would resign" can be transposed to "She announced her resignation". Similarly in Polish, instead of saying "Ogłosiła, że rezygnuje" we can use "Ogłosiła [swoją] rezygnację". The original expression is referred to as the *base expression*, and the result as the *transposed expression*.

Transposition is a highly versatile translation procedure. For example, English adjectives "elven" or "elvish" (from the word *elf*, which descends from Germanic mythology) do not seem to have natural equivalents in Polish, despite the fact that due to contacts with Germanic cultures, and in particular the enormous popularity of Tolkien's books/film adaptations, *elves* are widely known to Polish audience. Although some translators attempt to use adjectives "elfowy" or "elficki", they may sound awkward to some Polish speakers, because Polish usually employs a genitive form in postposition in such contexts. For that reason, expressions "miecz elfów" and "księżniczka elfów" seem to sound more natural than "elficki miecz" and "elfowa księżniczka" as translations for "evlish sword" and "elven princess", respectively. Similarly, the phrase "okręty wikingów" seems to be a better choice than "wikińskie / wikingowe / wikingowskie okręty". Moreover, transposition can be employed for a better economy of the target text. For instance, the sentence "[The word 'Hispanic' can refer to] people whose origins range from Mexican and Puerto Rican to Cuban and Argentinean." can be translated literary as ". . . osób pochodzenia zarówno meksykańskiego i portorykańskiego, jak i kubańskiego i argentyńskiego". However, perhaps a more efficient choice is to use country names instead of nationalities: ". . . osób pochodzących zarówno z Meksyku i Portoryko, jak i z Kuby

i Argentyny". The transposed expression is both more manageable for the translator and more easily graspable for the reader.

As demonstrated above, the transposed expression sometimes has a substantially different stylistic value than the base expression. Since transposition enables rendering specific nuances of style, it is a basic means for fine-tuning stylistic elegance of the translated text. Moreover, if a translation obtained in this manner fits better the resulting utterance from the stylistic perspective, the transposed expression is, somewhat paradoxically, more literary in character.

(5) **Modulation** involves changing the form of the message through a change in perspective. An alteration of this kind may be required in contexts where a literal or transposed translation still sounds unidiomatic or awkward in the TL, despite being a grammatically correct utterance. As with transposition, in some cases modulation may be optional, while in others it is obligatory. A good example of fixed modulation is the change that occurs between some Polish and English verbal constructions in grammatically prescribed contexts, which can be observed for certain expressions of state. For example, "He is 40 years old" must be translated as "On ma 40 lat" and "Are you on the phone?" as "Czy masz/posiadasz telefon?" (cf. Fisiak, et al. 1987). Yet, modulation typically operates at the phrase level. For instance, the set phrase "If it wasn't for . . ." must be translated, more or less, as "Jedynie dzięki . . .", because any attempts at word by word translation, e.g. "Jeśli to nie byłoby dla / z powodu", sound preposterous. Examples of optional modulations that are frequently encountered in Polish translations of English texts include rendering "unless" as "chyba, że", or "It is not uncommon . . ." as "Dość powszechnie . . .". However, the distinction between obligatory and optional modulation is not always clear-cut, as it is determined in each case by the wider linguistic context.

(6) **Equivalence**, also known as *reformulation*, produces an equivalent text in the target language by using completely different stylistic and structural methods. Classical examples of equivalence include translation of exclamations and expletives. For instance, English "Ouch!" corresponds to Polish "Au!", while "Damn it!" to "Niech to szlag [trafi]!". Another type of expressions that normally require reformulation to fit into the target text involves onomatopoeia of animal sounds. For instance, while horses in Polish stomp "patataj", English ones apparently generate "bumpety-bump" with their hooves, etc. Such examples demonstrate a specific feature of equivalence as the translation procedure: it practically always relates to the whole of a message. Moreover, since it embraces an opulent repertoire of idioms, sayings, proverbs, clichés, etc., it tends to be fixed in most cases.

Translating proverbs is a good example of employing equivalence for rendering more elaborate structures between SL and TL. For example, "Rome wasn't built in a day" equals to "Nie od razu Kraków zbudowano"; "Don't count your chickens before they're hatched" corresponds, at least for the most part, to "Nie dziel skóry na niedźwiedziu". In some cases, however, finding an equivalent may not be so easy. For instance, the old-fashioned, but still common English saying "A rolling stone gathers no moss", which according to CALD (2008) is used to mean that "a person who is always travelling and changing jobs has the advantage of having no responsibilities, but also has disadvantages such as having no permanent place to live" does not seem to have an equally widespread counterpart in Polish. It can probably be translated as "Toczący się kamień nie obrasta mchem" (PWN-Oxford 2004), yet it is not something frequently heard in everyday speech. For that reason, it resembles a calque rather than an equivalence, which demonstrates that within this procedure certain borderline cases exist, as well. The equivalence is also typically employed to translate idioms. For example, "like two peas in a pod" is probably best translated as "jak dwie krople wody", while "apples and oranges" can be rendered in a good number of contexts as "różne jak woda i ogień". Again, one must bear in mind that not all English idioms have direct counterparts in Polish, and vice-versa.

(7) **Adaptation** is used when the type of situation referred to by the SL message does not function in the TL culture. In such cases the translator must recreate a situation that can be regarded as more or less equivalent. From this outlook, adaptation is a specific kind of *situational* equivalence. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000: 91) discuss an example of an Englishman who, without taking much notice, kisses his daughter on the mouth as a greeting of a loving father after a long journey. However, translating "He kissed his daughter on the mouth" literary would probably sound awkward to French audience, since in that culture it may have a different connotation. Consequently, a translation into French requires a special kind of over-rendering.[1]

Adaptations are particularly common in translations of book and movie titles (Jarniewicz: 2000). A good example of adaptation in this context is the translation of "Broken Arrow" (Segan & Woo: 1996). Although, at a first glance, it seems that the title could be translated literally as "Złamana strzała", a closer look reveals that it refers to US nuclear accident definition codes, where

[1] Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000: 91) also quote an anecdote about a simultaneous interpreter who, having adapted "cricket" into "Tour de France" in a context of a particularly popular sport, put himself in a difficult situation when the French delegate thanked the original speaker for reference to such a typically French sport. To avoid embarrassment the interpreter simply reversed the adaptation back into "cricket" when translating to his English client.

the phrase signifies "an actual accident involving a nuclear weapon, warhead, or component" (Hebert 2008: 26). Since Poland at the time when the movie was released had not officially admitted possession nor even storage of nuclear weapons on its territory (Łuczak 1996), such emergency codes were not available for use in translations. The film was distributed under the title "Tajna broń".

Translators are often reluctant to make use of adaptation, as it invariably affects not only the syntactic structure, but also the development and representation of ideas within the paragraph, chapter, or the text as a whole. In extreme scenarios, a particular adaptation can affect extra-textual contexts, which can be illustrated with the following movie title sequence, in which the initial translation influenced subsequent releases: *Die Hard* (Margolin & McTiernan 1988) [original movie] – "Szklana pułapka"; *Spy Hard* (Nielsen & Friedberg 1996) [a parody comedy with numerous references to the original movie] – "Szklanką po łapkach"; A *Good Day to Die Hard* (Karnowski & Moore 2013) [the latest film in the series] – "Szklana pułapka 5".

The absence of adaptation may be noticeable by the overall tone of the text that does not sound right in an indefinable way. It is the unfortunate impression given by some international organization publications, where, for the sake of an exaggerated insistence on parallelism, the people in charge demand translations based on calques. The result often sounds unnatural, which is referred to as *translationese*.[2]

5. Conclusion

From a general perspective, translation shifts can be viewed either as unwelcome deviations from the source text in the course of the translation act or as something indispensable and desired to overcome specific differences between the SL and TL (Bakker, Koster & van Leuven-Zwart 1998). Although the taxonomy introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet has been criticized for being nothing more than a comparison between English and French at the level of words, phrases, and sentences taken out of the context, it can be regarded as the proposal that formed a springboard for later taxonomies of translation *techniques* and *strategies*. Scholars exploring the translation shifts labeled and re-labeled them in

[2] The term *translationese* is a pejorative term used to refer to the language of translation that derives from calquing ST lexical or syntactic patterning (see Duff 1981). Newmark (2003: 96) uses a similar term *translatorese* to refer to the automatic choice of the most common dictionary translation of a word where a less common alternative would be more appropriate.

various ways to achieve a more comprehensive and clear-cut categorizations (see Marco 2009 for a review of inconsistencies between the terms *procedure*, *strategy*, *method*, and *technique* within translation studies). For example, Nida (1964) uses the term *techniques of adjustment* to discuss processes targeted at producing semantically equivalent structures from a communicative perspective. Newmark (1988) discusses *procedures* applied to sentences and smaller units of language, which he distinguishes from *methods* referring to the whole text. Van Leuven-Zwart (1989, 1990) presents an extensive analysis of translation procedures based on extracts from translations of Latin American fiction. Chesterman (1997) makes a distinction between *global* and *local strategies*, as well as between *comprehension* and *production strategies*. Diaz-Cintaz & Remael (2007) review strategies applied specifically in the practice of *subtitling*. Despite such efforts, all existing classifications still demonstrate certain deficiencies (Gambier 2010), which can be attributed to the fact that all categorizations demonstrate a natural tendency to overlap to some extent (cf. Rosch 1978).

A closer look at Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation procedures encourages one to look beyond simple structural alterations between SL and TL to see the role of the translator as a creative intermediary between the original author and the target audience in the process of translation-mediated communication. The last few decades have seen a considerable change in the focus of translation studies from the formalist approaches concentrating predominantly on linguistic transcoding to more functionally (e.g. Vermeer 1978/2000), and socio-culturally (e.g. Sperber & Wilson 1995) oriented approaches taking into consideration a vast array of extra-textual factors involved in the process of translation. More recently, an increasingly important role is attributed to *cognitive linguistics* as the frame of reference for the discipline of translation studies (see Tabakowska 1993; Hejwowski 2004; Deckert 2013).

References

Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation, 2nd Ed.* [First edition published in 1992]. New York: Routledge.

Bakker, M., Koster, C. & van Leuven-Zwart, K. (1998). Shifts of Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (226–231). London: Routledge.

Bogucki, Ł. (2004). A *Relevance Framework for Constraints on Cinema Subtitling*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Brzozowska, D. (2010). Humor in Cultural Discourse: Polish Jokes about China and Japan. *Cultural Perspectives*, 15, 68–83.

CALD. (2008). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 3rd Ed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Catford, J.C. (1965/2000). Translation Shifts [First published in 1965]. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 141–147). London: Routledge.
Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Deckert, M. (2013). *Meaning in Subtitling: Toward a Contrastive Cognitive Semantic Model*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Díaz Cintas, J., & Remael, A. (2007). *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
Duff, A. (1981). *The Third Language: Recurrent Problems of Translating into English*. Oxford: Pergamon.
Fisiak, J., Lipińska-Grzegorek, M., & Zabrocki, T. (1987). *An Introductory English-Polish Contrastive Grammar, 2nd Ed*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
Gambier, Y. (2010). Translation strategies and tactics. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hebert, A. J. (2008 February). Of Bent Spears and Broken Arrows. *Air Force Magazine*, 91(2), 26.
Hejwowski, K. (2004). *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
Jarniewicz, J. (2000). Przekład tytułu: między egzotyką a adaptacją. In W. Kubiński, O. Kubińska, & T. Z. Wolański (Eds.), *Przekładając nieprzekładalne* (pp. 477–483). Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
Kubińska, O, & Kubiński, W. (2004). Osobliwy przypadek dwóch polskich przekładów A Clockwork Orange Anthony Burgessa: wycieczka w kulturowe "uinnienie". In O. Kubińska & W. Kubiński (Eds.), *Przekladając nieprzekladalne 2* (pp. 67–76). Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
Lukas, K. (2008). Konstruowanie kulturowej odmienności w przekładach 'A Clockwork Orange' Anthony'ego Burgessa. In P. Fast & P. Janikowski (Eds.): *Odmienność kulturowa w przekładzie* (pp. 83–100). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe "Śląsk".
Łuczak, W. (1996 July). Poland's Atomic Adventure. *Air International*, 51(1), 18–21.
Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (2006). *Angielsko-polskie kontakty językowe*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
Marco, J. (2009). The terminology of translation: Epistemological, conceptual and intercultural problems and their social consequences. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *The Metalanguage of Translation* (255–269). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Newmark, P. (1988). A *Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
Newmark, P. (2003). Translation now – 24. *The Linguist*, 42(3), 95–96.
Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. (2000). A *study of the lexico-semantic and grammatical influence of English on the Polish of the younger generation of Poles (19–35 years of age)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG.

PWN-Oxford. (2004). *The PWN-Oxford English-Polish and Polish-English Dictionary*. [CD-ROM]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of Categorisation. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and Categorisation* (pp. 27–48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition, 2nd Ed*. [Fist edition published in 1986]. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sztencel, M. (2009). Boundaries Crossed: The Influence of English on Modern Polish. *E-pisteme*, 2(1), 3–17.

Tabakowska, E. (1993). *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Trenga, B. (2010, October 7). "Think Different" or "Think Differently": Can Emmy-award-winning advertisement be ungrammatical? *Grammar Girl*. Retrieved from http://www.quickanddirtytips.com/education/grammar/think-different-or-think-differently

van Leuven-Zwart, K. (1989). Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I. *Target*, 1(2), 151–81.

van Leuven-Zwart, K. (1990). Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, II. *Target*, 2(1), 69–95.

Vermeer, J. (1978/2000). Skopos and Commission in Translational Action [Trans. A. Chesterman]. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 227–238). London: Routledge.

Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958/2000). A Methodology for Translation. [An excerpt from *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, trans. and eds. J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995, first published in 1958 as *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*] In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 84–93). London: Routledge.

Literary texts and films

Burgess, A. (1991). *Mechaniczna pomarańcza* [Trans. R. Stiller]. Warszawa: WEMA.

Burgess, A. (2001). *Nakręcana pomarańcza* [Trans. R. Stiller]. Kraków: Etiuda.

Karnowski, T. (Producer), & Moore, J. (2013). A *Good Day to Die Hard* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Margolin, B. (Producer), & McTiernan, J. (Director). (1988). *Die Hard* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Nielsen, L. (Producer), & Friedberg, R. (1996). *Spy Hard* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Segan, A. L. (Producer), Woo, J. (Director). (1996). *Broken Arrow* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Linguistic Barriers to Translating

Janusz Wróblewski

University of Łódź

jzwrob@gmail.com

Abstract: This chapter focuses on purely linguistic barriers in translation. Such barriers generally stem from the fact that the grammatical systems of different languages are different. For example, when a language with a system of articles (e.g. English or German) uses those articles in a functionally relevant manner, this may prove difficult to translate into a language without articles (e.g. Polish). Also discrepancies between the number or gender systems of nouns and verbs between languages can cause certain problems in translation. Additionally, some linguistic barriers appear at the level of lexical meaning (shared exponence, polysemy, oligosemy). The final part of this chapter is devoted to translating wordplay – the trickiest linguistic barrier to translation. Whenever we see a clever pun ("Żubr czeka na polanie", from the TV commercial of Żubr beer) and think of ways of expressing it in another language, our immediate reaction is likely to be "But that's untranslatable!" And yet, as numerous wordplay-studded books available in translation show, wordplay is generally translatable. This section defines wordplay, presents its classification and then discusses various procedures for translating wordplay (the procedures are illustrated with numerous examples).

Keywords: linguistic untranslatability, polysemy, wordplay, puns, compensation, neologisms

1. Introduction

The relationship between language and culture notwithstanding, it is obvious that quite often translators face not so much cultural as more or less purely linguistic barriers to translating. These stem first of all from the general fact that the grammatical systems of different languages are different.

In most cases, the differences between the source-language and the target-language systems will be relatively unimportant – the translation does not pre-

serve the full meaning of the original, but the resultant translation loss (or gain) is functionally irrelevant: for example, the Arabic word *kitaabeen* does not mean exactly the same as the English word *books*, because the English word comes from a two-term system (singular vs. plural), while the Arabic word comes from a three-term system (singular vs. dual vs. plural) and represents the dual number, but it generally can be translated as *books* (or, *two books*) without any problems (Catford 1965: 36).

Sometimes, however, the discrepancy between the language systems leads to a serious obstacle in translation. For example, English and German have a system of articles[1] while Polish does not. This causes visible problems to Poles when they have to produce a text in English or German (and this includes translation into these languages), but this in itself is only an educational problem and not a real linguistic barrier, because the same Poles will have no problems (or at least fewer problems) translating from English or German into Polish: in some contexts the articles will simply be ignored (for example, when the indefinite article "a/an" precedes a noun which is used as a Subject Complement – as in "John is a teacher"), and in other contexts their function will be taken over by other words (e.g. demonstrative pronouns; cf. "This is **the** book I told you about" and "To jest **ta** książka, o której ci mówiłem"), or expressed by means of word order (cf. "**An elephant** walked into my garden" and "Do mojego ogrodu wszedł **słoń**" [indefinite specific] vs. "**An elephant** is a big mammal" and "**Słoń** jest wielkim ssakiem" [indefinite generic]; see Krzeszowski 1980: 176). On the other hand, when a language with a system of articles uses those articles in a functionally relevant manner, this may prove to be a serious translational problem. For example, in some of their TV commercials, Volkswagen advertise their car as "Volkswagen. Das Auto". This will work perfectly well in English ("Volkswagen. The Car") or in other languages with articles, but is really hard to render into Polish, which does not normally signal the contrast between indefiniteness and definiteness of nouns.

The translator into Polish (and other article-less languages) faces a similar problem with the short story "A Scandal in Bohemia" by Arthur Conan Doyle, which begins with the sentence: "To Sherlock Holmes she is always *the* woman." and which ends: "And when he speaks of Irene Adler, or when he refers to

[1] For those readers who do not speak German, it should be pointed out here that the two systems, although superficially slightly similar, are in reality dramatically different. This difference is reflected in Polish, where the English articles are called *przedimki* ("pre-nominals"), while the German articles are referred to as *rodzajniki*, *i.e.* "gender-markers" – they indicate not only the gender, but also the number and case of the nouns (they are declined), and their distribution is somewhat different from that of English.

her photograph, it is always under the honourable title of *the* woman." (Doyle 1994: 3 and 29). The question is how to render "***the*** woman" in such a way as to bring out the implied contrast with "***a*** woman". Difficult as this task may seem, however, it is not impossible, on account of the fact that here, unlike in the case of the Volkswagen commercial, the translator is dealing with a longer stretch of text – the full story, and not just a three/two-word slogan. The solution chosen by Irena Doleżal-Nowicka was simply to highlight the word *kobieta* by means of expanded spacing, so that the respective sentences read: "Dla Sherlocka Holmesa była zawsze k o b i e t ą..." "Kiedy zaś wspomina o historii z fotografią albo Irenę Adler, mówi o niej zawsze z szacunkiem jako o k o b i e c i e." (Doyle 1972: 3 and 28).

Also differences between the number systems of nouns between languages can become a barrier. For example, nouns in Japanese are not inflected for number. Normally, this does not matter, as in most situations the number will be specified by means of a numeral and a proper classifier, but there can be contexts where the specification comes later, and this can lead to certain problems. Wiesław Kotański gives an interesting example of an untranslatable short dialogue from Japanese. The first speaker says:

> "ieno sobani kiga arimasu" ("There is a tree/There are some trees near the house").

Since the Japanese noun is not marked for number, the second speaker asks:

> "nambon arimasuka" ("How many?")

The answer is:

> "ippon arimasu" ("One")
> (After Wojtasiewicz 1957: 50).

We cannot translate the first line as "There is a tree near the house", because then the second speaker's question will sound dumb. If, on the other hand, we render it using the plural form, then, in turn, the first speaker's answer sounds odd and changes the whole exchange into a rather silly joke. Obviously the unmarkedness for number of the first line is vital here (or, functionally relevant, to use Catford's terminology), as it triggers off the remaining part of the dialogue. However, there is no way it can be reproduced naturally in English or Polish, because in both these languages every countable noun is marked for number.

Also differences in the gender systems of languages can occasionally cause certain problems. For example, the poem "Lullaby" by Wystan Hugh Auden begins with the following words:

> "Lay your sleeping head, my love,
> Human on my faithless arm;"

which Jerzy Sito translates as:

> "Połóż śpiącą głowę, mała,
> Ludzką, na moim ramieniu;"
> (Auden 1988: 70-71)

As we can see, the English vocative "my love" is not marked for gender, whereas the Polish word "mała" is feminine. Perhaps this is not a dramatic mistake in translation, but in view of the fact that Auden was homosexual, the specification of the sex of the addressee as feminine does seem odd. Incidentally, it would be equally wrong to make the addressee clearly masculine, because the poem does not talk openly about homosexuality – ideally, deliberate ambiguity of the source text should be preserved wherever possible, and in this poem the addressee should remain genderless, which Barańczak managed to do by turning the vocative into an epithet of the noun *head*:

> "Złóż głowę – śpiącą, kochaną
> Ludzką – na moim ramieniu"
> (Barańczak 1993: 483)

What can be a minor problem in a poem becomes a major one in a novel based on the unspecified gender of the narrator. When in the novel *Written on the Body* by Jeanette Winterson we read "I went", we do not know whether the words are produced by a man or by a woman. Unfortunately, the lack of the gender marker on English verbs is impossible (or at least extremely difficult) to reproduce in Polish. We have to say "poszedłem" (masculine) or "poszłam" (feminine). With some other verbs, the translator has certain possibilities of manoeuvring: for example, the phrase "wpadłam w przygnębienie" can be made impersonal and therefore unmarked for gender – "ogarnęło mnie przygnębienie", some other verbs can be changed into the passive voice, some phrases can be modified by replacing the main verb, and thus "Zrozumiałam, że kocham Y" ("I realised or understood that I was in love with Y") becomes "Stało się jasne, że kocham Y" ("It became clear that ..."), but this strategy has obvious limitations, and therefore translating this novel into Polish, Hanna Mizerska used the feminine gender throughout and added

a preface explaining the problem and telling readers what they were losing. Jerzy Jarniewicz had a similar problem with Philip Roth's novel *Deception*, which presents conversations between a married man and a married woman written in free direct speech (it is not specified who says what) (Jarniewicz 2002: 78-80; see also Jarniewicz 1996).

Obviously, if translation from English into Polish imposes markedness, translation in the opposite direction loses it. Stanisław Lem's short story "Maska" begins with the narrator not fully conscious of its identity, and therefore talking about itself using the Polish neuter gender in the first person past tenses of verbs: "powiększałom się i rozpoznawałom siebie", "kiedym mogło już dokładnie ogarnąć własny kształt", "leżałom jeszcze bezwładne", "dotknęłom zimnych, gładkich, wklęsłych płyt", etc. (Lem 1976: 5). (Later the being feels an inflow or influx of sex and becomes female). This verbal experiment is very effective, but the trick cannot be reproduced in English or any other language which has no gender marker on the first person past tenses of verbs.

Differences between gender marking of certain notions in various languages can cause certain clashes with our expectations with respect to our perception of the order of things. Thus in English *Death* is traditionally associated with the masculine gender (the Grim Reaper), and in German it is clearly marked as *der Tod*, whereas the Polish noun *śmierć* is always feminine. The poem "Die Todesfuge" by Paul Celan exists in at least four translations into Polish, and yet each of them violates our perception to a certain extent. The German text says at one point:

> der Tod ist ein Meister aus Deutschland sein Auge ist blau
> er trifft dich mit bleierner Kugel er trifft dich genau
> (Literally, "Death is a master from Germany his eye is blue
> he will hit you with his lead bullet he will hit you precisely").

In English the image is the same, but in Polish the phrase "Śmierć jest mistrzem z Niemiec" (all the four translations) sounds slightly odd: the subject is feminine, the subject complement masculine, and there is not much that can be done about it. Theoretically, the phrase could be rendered as "Śmierć jest mistrzynią z Niemiec", with the subject complement also feminine, but the original *master* refers of course to *master executioner* as well as conjuring up images of soldiers and firing squads, and calling Death "a mistress from Germany" ruins the effect completely (see Ostrowski 2002: 145-147).

Another famous example of a gender mismatch in literary translation comes from the poem "Ein Fichtenbaum" by Heinrich Heine in the Russian translation by Lermontov. In the original, a spruce tree (the *Fichtenbaum* of the title, mas-

culine gender) “träumt von einer Palme” (“dreams of a palm tree”, feminine gender):

> Ein Fichtenbaum steht einsam
> Im Norden auf kahler Höh’.
> Ihn schläfert; mit weißer Decke
> Umhüllen ihn Eis und Schnee.
>
> Er träumt von einer Palme,
> Die, fern im Morgenland,
> Einsam und schweigend trauert
> Auf brennender Felsenwand.
> (Heine 1980: 82)

This will work perfectly well in Polish, where a masculine *świerk* can dream of a feminine *palma*, but not in Russian. The Russian equivalent of *Fichtenbaum* is *ель*, which is feminine gender. It is true that Lermontov replaced the original tree with a pine tree – in Russian *сосна*, but this is also feminine, as is *пальма*, i.e. the palm tree, so that the heterosexual emotional relationship between the trees (or rather lovers, whom the trees symbolize) turns inadvertently into a lesbian one; Lermontov’s version reads:

> На севере диком стоит одиноко
> На голой вершине сосна
> И дремлет, качаясь, и снегом сыпучим
> Одета, как ризой, она.
>
> И снится ей всё, что в пустыне далекой,
> В том крае, где солнца восход,
> Одна и грустна на утёсе горючем
> Прекрасная пальма растёт.
> (Lermontov 1976: 76).

Interestingly enough, in French both the *épicéa* of the title and *un palmier* are masculine, which again would turn the original longing into something which it was not meant to be (see also Lebiedziński 1981: 157 and Pisarska 1989: 52).

Wawrzyniak reports that when, on the 9th of November 1970, Georges Pompidou announced the death of General de Gaulle with the famous words: «Françaises, Français, le général de Gaulle est mort. La France est veuve.», some translators had a serious problem with rendering his words, or, more specifically, the second sentence. Polish does not offer any problems here (“Francja jest wdową”), as the Polish name of France is feminine, and neither does English

with its fully natural "France is a widow", but in German the name of France is neuter, and the image of France as a wife and of General de Gaulle as a husband is lost. Consequently, instead of translating the text literally ("Frankreich ist Witwe"), the German translator achieves a much better result playing on the concept of General de Gaulle as a father and offering the version "Frankreich ist verwaist" (literally, "France is orphaned") (see Wawrzyniak 1991: 55-56).

Naturally, it is not only the differences between the grammatical systems of different languages that can cause translational problems; numerous linguistic barriers appear at the level of lexical meaning.

Catford (1965: 94-96) points out that linguistic untranslatability stems first of all from ambiguities peculiar to the source language which are functionally relevant in the SL text. He subdivides them into those which involve *shared exponence*, when two or more lexical or grammatical items have the same exponent, as in the phrase "Time flies", being on one hand an observation on the passing of time and, on the other hand, at least technically, a request to measure the velocity with which the said flies fly, and those which involve *polysemy*, when one item has more than one meaning or, more specifically, when it has a very general meaning with "a wide range of specific situational features". Other situations where linguistic untranslatability can occur involve what Catford terms *oligosemy*, that is, cases where a word or structure has a restricted range of meaning, where this restriction is functionally relevant in the SL text, and where this cannot be reproduced in a natural manner in the TL text. For example, the Russian word *пришла* (*prišla*) means "came / arrived *on foot*". In most contexts, it can be translated into English simply as "came" or "arrived", but if the detail about somebody arriving on foot is functionally relevant, then we are dealing with oligosemy and we are facing a linguistic barrier.

Let us look at the following bit of dialogue from Maxim Gorki's novel *Детство* (*Detstvo*, i.e., *Childhood*). The author / narrator, a little child, is talking to his grandmother, who has arrived from Nizhny / Nižnij Novgorod:

> – Ты откуда пришла? – спросил я ее.
> Она ответила:
> – С верху, из Нижнего, да не пришла, а приехала! По воде-то не ходят, шиш!
> (Gorki 1913-14)

In the Polish translation by Krystyna Bilska the text reads:

> – Skąd tu przyszłaś? – spytałem.
> – Z góry, z Niżnego – odpowiedziała – i nie przyszłam, tylko przyjechałam! Po wodzie przecież się nie chodzi, bąku.
> (Gorki 1974)

It can be seen immediately that there are no translational problems between Russian and Polish in this passage, because Polish shares the restriction on the verb *przychodzić* with Russian. In English, however, the dialogue cannot be reproduced in a natural manner. "Ты откуда пришла?" ("Ty otkuda prišla?") can be rendered simply and naturally as "Where did you come from?", but the explanation "не пришла, а приехала" ("ne prišla, a priyexala") looks virtually untranslatable (in fact, when I asked Google Translate to translate it, the version I received was: "did not come, and come"). The published English translation has:

> "Where did you come from?" I asked her.
> "From up there, from Nijni," she answered; "but I did not walk here, I came by boat. One does not walk on water, you little imp."
> (Gorky 1915)

This reads much better than the Google Translate version, but the grandmother's correction "but I did not walk here" does not stem naturally from the boy's question, because the boy did not use the verb *walk*.

Incidentally, the relative untranslatability of this passage stems not only from the oligosemy of *пришла* (*prišla*), but also from the polysemy of *С верху* (*S verxu*) and the shared exponence of *Нижнего* (*Nižnego*). The phrase *S verxu* can be interpreted to mean something like "from above" or "from upstairs" on one hand and "from up yonder" or "from upriver" on the other, and the word *нижний* (*nižnij*) is both an adjective which means "lower" and a common abbreviation of the place name Нижний Новгород (Nižnij Novgorod). The boy finds the grandmother's answer absurd and totally incomprehensible: he proceeds to muse on who lives upstairs and who lives in the basement, and on ways of coming downstairs (riding down the banisters or falling) and to wonder what water has to do with that – he clearly understands the phrase *S verxu* in the sense of "from upstairs", while the grandmother obviously means "from upriver", and he clearly does not understand the reference to *Нижний* / *Нижнего* (*Nižnij / Nižnego*) (see Gorki 1913-14 and Catford 1965: 96-98).

2. Wordplay as a problem in translation

The trickiest linguistic barrier to translation, however, is offered by wordplay.

Let us look, for instance, at the slogan "Żubr czeka na polanie" from the TV commercial of Żubr beer and think of ways of expressing it in another language. The word *Żubr*, apart from being a brand of beer, means "the European bison or wisent", the verb *czeka* means "is waiting", and the phrase *na polanie* means

both "in a/the clearing or glade" and "to be poured", and this is where our challenge lies, because there is no way the ambiguity of the phrase *na polanie* can be reproduced in English, French, German, etc. A few years ago another Polish beer company advertised by means of the slogan "Mariola O KOCIM spojrzeniu", which means more or less, "Mariola WITH CAT-LIKE eyes / gaze", but the point is of course that the slogan contains the name of the beer – OKOCIM. Again, it is probably impossible to reproduce this effect in any other language, but this does not mean that all puns are by definition untranslatable. The problem is that they usually cannot be translated literally.

But what precisely is wordplay?

In a narrower sense of this word, wordplay is a play **on** words, or a pun, that is, "A figure of speech depending upon a similarity of sound and a disparity of meaning" (Fogle 1974: 681), or "the humorous use of a word that has two meanings, or of different words that sound the same" (*OALD* 1995). Thus at one end of the field marked "puns" we have *one* word (or structure) placed in such a context that two (or more) separate, individual meanings are activated at once (as in the following joke: "Question: Where the doorbell rings off-key...? Answer: Must be a flat."[2]), and at the opposite end we have *two* different words or structures (occasionally more) which look or sound similar and which are placed next to each other (as in the famous Italian maxim *traduttore traditore*, which aptly sums up the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of translation). In a broader sense – wordplay is playing **with** words, and includes all sorts of linguistic deviations, some of which are somewhat un-pun-like: for example, playing with *parts* of words (for instance, Nabokov offers *mauvemail* as a milder form of *blackmail* and turns a *therapist* into *the rapist* – 1980: 70–71 and 147–148), spoonerisms, modifying recognizable phrases, as when Richard Curtis, Simon Bell and Helen Fielding published the book *Who's Had Who* (Faber & Faber, 1987), obviously hinting at, and playing on, the title of the world-famous reference publications *Who's Who*, or, generally, playing with language at various levels, as Joyce did in his *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* (McArthur 1992: 787).

One point may require clarification here, namely the fact that some authors distinguish between a pun and a play on words. For example, Freud in his book *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten* (originally published in 1905; the English translation is entitled *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*)

[2] The joke is of course based on two meanings of the noun *flat*: (1) "(a symbol for) a note that is a semitone lower than a stated note" (*CALD* 2003), which accounts for the sound of the doorbell being off-key, and (2) "(US *apartment*) a set of rooms for living which are part of a larger building and are usually all on one floor" (*CALD* 2003), which accounts for the doorbell being there.

says that puns (actually, in the original, he uses the German word *Kalauer*, and the French term *Calembourgs*) are:

> the lowest form of verbal joke, probably because they are the 'cheapest' – can be made with the least trouble. And they do in fact make the least demand on the technique of expression, just as the play upon words proper makes the highest. While in the latter the two meanings should find their expression in identically the same word, which on that account is usually said only once, it is enough for a pun if the two words expressing the two meanings recall each other by some vague similarity, whether they have a general similarity of structure or a rhyming assonance, or whether they have the same first few letters, and so on.
> (Freud 1983: 80)

As examples of the play on words proper, Freud quotes two jokes in French from a book by K. Fischer (*Über den Witz*, 1889, Heidelberg, 2nd ed.), who, apparently, also insisted that a play on words was different from, and nobler than, a pun: (1) when Napoleon III assumed power, he immediately confiscated the property of the House of Orleans; someone commented: "C'est le premier vol de l'aigle" ("It's the eagle's first *vol"*, *vol* meaning both 'flight' and 'theft'); (2) trying to test the wit of one of his courtiers, King Louis XV of France asked him to make a joke of which the King would be the subject; the courtier replied immediately: "Le roi n'est pas sujet" ["The King is not a subject"] (Freud 1983: 71). Incidentally, the same story exists in English, about Thomas Killigrew (1612-1683), page to King Charles I and later fool and jester of King Charles II. As an example of a mere pun, Freud quotes, *inter alia*, Ludwig Hevesi's comment about an Italian poet: "Since he could not exterminate the *Cäsaren* [Caesars], he at least eliminated the *Cäsuren* [caesuras]" (Freud 1983: 81).

Another, and, frankly speaking, somewhat incoherent distinction between puns and a play on words is proposed by Hammond and Hughes (1978: 8–9), but usually, the terms *pun* and *play on words* are used interchangeably and in the present chapter, in accordance with majority usage, they will be treated as synonyms.

The most detailed and most precise definition of wordplay is probably that offered by Delabastita:

> wordplay is the general name indicating the various textual phenomena (i.e. on the level of performance or *parole*) in which certain features inherent in the structure of the language used (level of competence or *langue*) are exploited in such a way as to establish a communicatively significant, (near-)simultaneous confrontation of at least two linguistic structures with more or less dissimilar meanings (signifieds) and more or less similar forms (signifiers).
> (1993: 57, but cf. also 2001: 48)

Delabastita has also proposed one of the neatest classifications of puns. He divides puns into four major groups, namely those based on homonymy, homophony, paronymy, and homography; moreover, each of these types can be vertical and horizontal, depending on whether the two (or more) meanings are activated simultaneously or successively, which gives us eight categories altogether (1993: 78-81). There are of course certain problems with Delabastita's classification: for one thing, it is not at all clear whether homophones include near-homophones or not (specifically, should the following pun: "The dairymaid is a girl who ought to know butter", echoing the well-known expression *to know better*, meaning "to be wise enough not to do something" [Maltzev 1980: 15], be classified as a vertical homophonic pun or perhaps as a paronymic one?); moreover, some puns will not fit any of Delabastita's categories at all (e.g., the above-quoted *mauvemail*), but other than that, this classification provides quite a useful framework for a discussion of wordplay.

Let us now look at examples of the specific categories of puns as translational problems.

3. Classification of puns

3.1. Vertical homonymic puns

This is the ideal, prototypical play on words proper, where one word is put in a context in which both its meanings are activated at once, as in Mercutio's last and pain-full pun "Ask for me tomorrow and you shall find me a grave man" from *Romeo and Juliet* (Act III, Scene I; Shakespeare 1958: 492). The word *grave* means 'serious', but also evokes the image of a grave.

Another example from the same category is the following popular question-and-answer exchange: Question: "Is life worth living?" Answer: "Depends on the liver." The word *liver* means both the human being performing the action of living (morphologically *to live* + the suffix *-er*, which denotes the doer of an action) and the organ in the body, known in Polish as *wątroba*.

A very clever homonymic pun – one without the actual word being used – appears in the novel *The Light Fantastic* by Terry Pratchett. Twoflower is talking about a card game:

> 'It's a special kind of playing,' said Twoflower. 'It's called –' he hesitated. Language wasn't his strong point. 'In your language it's called a thing you put across a river, for example,' he concluded, 'I think.'

'Aqueduct?' hazarded Rincewind. 'Fishing line? Weir? Dam?'
'Yes, possibly.'
(Pratchett 1986: 127-128)

One of the cleverest vertical homonymic puns (and also one of the most difficult to translate) comes from Pratchett's *Equal Rites*: "The lodgings were on the top floor next to the well-guarded premises of a respectable dealer in stolen property because, as Granny had heard, good fences make good neighbours." (1987: 119) The starting point for this wordplay is of course the quotation "Good fences make good neighbours" from the poem "Mending Wall" by Robert Frost (1992: 48-50),[3] which is based on the traditional meaning of the word *fence*, the one known to most English language learners and included even in concise dictionaries, namely, "a structure which divides two areas of land, similar to a wall but made of wood or wire and supported with posts" (*CALD* 2003), in Polish *płot*. Pratchett, however, puts this saying in a context which activates also a completely different meaning of *fence*, not so widely known, and usually not included in smaller-sized dictionaries, i.e. "a person who buys and sells stolen goods" (*CALD* 2003), or, to use Pratchett's own phrasing, "a dealer in stolen property", in Polish *paser*. Since there is no way the word *płot* can be turned into the word *paser* in Polish, the translator faces a really serious problem here.

Incidentally, some examples might be hard to classify as vertical or horizontal. Let us look at the following short passage from the novel *Jingo* – Commander Vimes bids farewell to his butler Willikins, who has volunteered to join the army and is about to leave: "'Well, we shall miss you, Willikins.' Others may not, he thought. Especially if they have time for a second shot." (Pratchett 1998: 68). Technically, the word *miss* is used only once and as such qualifies as a vertical pun. On the other hand, its second meaning is not activated until slightly later, which might classify the pun as horizontal.

3.2. Horizontal homonymic puns

Homonyms are repeated, occasionally with a slight grammatical modification (e.g., singular vs. plural, etc.). They are obviously somewhat easier to make, and therefore more frequent. We find several such puns in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*; for example, there are two in the scene in which the Dormouse is telling the story of three little sisters who lived at the bottom of a well:

[3] Leszek Elektorowicz renders those words from Frost's poem as "Mur to gwarancja dobrego sąsiedztwa." (*Poeci* 1974: 128), and in Stanisław Barańczak's translation they are: "Gdzie dobre płoty, tam dobrzy sąsiedzi." (Frost 1992: 49-51)

> ‘And so these three little sisters–they were learning to draw, you know–’
> ‘What did they draw?’ said Alice, quite forgetting her promise.
> ‘Treacle,’ said the Dormouse, without considering at all this time.”
> (Carroll 1990: 152)

As can be seen, the word *draw* is used here first rather in the sense of making a picture of something, using a pencil or pen, and afterwards rather in the sense of pulling. And a few lines later, we read:

> ‘But they were *in* the well,’ Alice said to the Dormouse, not choosing to notice this last remark.
> ‘Of course they were’, said the Dormouse; ‘well in.’
> (Carroll 1990: 154)

A simple pun of this type appears also in the first paragraph of the Foreword to Nabokov’s *Lolita*: “Mr Clark’s decision may have been influenced by the fact that the editor of his choice had just been awarded the Poling Prize for a modest work (‘Do the Senses make Sense?’)” (1980: 5).

Let us have a look at one more example: David Benedictus in his sequel to the *Winnie-the-Pooh* books, called *Return to the Hundred Acre Wood*, has Pooh use the word *odd* in the sense of ‘strange’ and then has Piglet picking it up with reference to odd vs. even numbers. Piglet visits Pooh and finds him

> anxiously counting his pots of honey.
> “Isn’t it odd?” said Pooh.
> “Isn’t what odd?”
> Pooh rubbed his nose with his paw. “I wish they would sit still. They shuffle around when they think I’m not looking. A moment ago there were eleven and now there are only ten. It is odd, isn’t it, Piglet?”
> “It’s even,” said Piglet, “if it’s ten, that is. And if it isn’t, it isn’t.”
> (Benedictus 2009: 1-2)

3.3. Vertical homophonic puns

When spoken, vertical homophonic puns are no different from homonymic puns: one word or phrase activates more than one meaning simultaneously. For example, we hear the phrase [mai kju:], and in our mind’s eye we see ‘my cue’, ‘my queue’, and perhaps also ‘my Q’. Of course, when we see this phrase written, one of the meanings is foregrounded, so the spelling spoils the effect to a certain extent, but in the proper circumstances the multiple activation is still there.

Therefore, when we read in *Lolita*: "'Vivian Darkbloom' has written a biography, 'My Cue', to be published shortly, and critics who have perused the manuscript call it her best book" (Nabokov 1980: 6), we know that apart from suggesting the basic "visible" meaning ("a word or action in a play or film, which is used as a signal by a performer to begin saying or doing something" – *CALD* 2003), the word *Cue*, or rather the sound [kju:], refers also to the nickname and the initial of the surname of the character named Clare Quilty (it is his biography).

Similarly, when Terry Pratchett in *Night Watch* talks about "the Bridge of Size" (2003: 40), he is obviously playing on the better-known Bridge of Sighs, or Ponte dei Sospiri in Venice, and confronting *Size* with its homophone *Sighs*.

3.4. Horizontal homophonic puns

Horizontal homophonic punning consists usually in having one character saying a word and then having another character "misunderstanding" it, mistaking it for its homophone. For example, in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, the Mouse is talking about a tale, and Alice visualizes the word *tail*:

> 'Mine is a long and a sad tale!' said the Mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing.
> 'It *is* a long tail, certainly,' said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's tail; 'but why do you call it sad?'
> (Carroll 1990: 68-70)

Or Alice is explaining the movements of the Earth to the Duchess, and the Duchess thinks of ... something else:

> 'You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis –'
> 'Talking of axes,' said the Duchess, 'chop off her head!'
> (Carroll 1990: 122-124)

Let me quote one more horizontal homophonic pun from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*: this one is based on homophony not of single words, but of a word and a phrase. The Mock Turtle reminisces about his school years:

> 'The master was an old Turtle – we used to call him Tortoise –'
> (Polish *żółw morski* and *żółw lądowy*, respectively.)

Alice is naturally surprised:

> 'Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn't one?' Alice asked.
> 'We called him Tortoise because he taught us,' said the Mock Turtle angrily: 'really you are very dull!'
> (Carroll 1990: 192)

The joke consists in the fact that the word *Tortoise* and the phrase *taught us* are (near-)homophones. Since it is highly unlikely that the two will remain homophones in another language, the passage presents the translator with another really serious problem.

3.5. Vertical paronymic puns

Paronyms are words which look similar, but which have different meanings. As an example of a vertical paronymic pun Delabastita (1993: 81) quotes the word *intrinsicate* from *Antony and Cleopatra* (this word is a conflation of *intricate* and *intrinsic*). Cleopatra speaks (to an asp, which she applies to her breast):

> With thy sharp teeth this knot intrinsicate
> Of life at once untie. Poor venomous fool,
> Be angry, and dispatch.
> (Act V, Scene ii, 307-309; Shakespeare 1958: 1264)

Numerous vertical paronymic puns can be found in James Joyce. For example, the famous phrase "they were yung and easily freudened" from *Finnegans Wake* clearly conveys the meaning "young and easily frightened", but it also puns on the names of two famous psychoanalysts, Jung and Freud (Book 1, Chapter 5, Joyce 1982a: 115).

Actually, a lot of *Finnegans Wake* looks like a conflation of various words, not necessarily pure paronyms; for instance, the word *penisolate* from the second paragraph of the book: "Sir Tristram, violer d'amores, fr'over the short sea, had passencore rearrived from North Armorica on this side the scraggy isthmus of Europe Minor to wielderfight his penisolate war ..." (Joyce 1982a: 3), suggests such words as *penis*, *peninsula*, and *isolate*.

Also the famous poem "Jabberwocky" from Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass* conflates a number of words; let us quote the first stanza here:

‘Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.
(Carroll 1998: 197)

Thus, for example, *slithy* combines *lithe* and *slimy*, while *mimsy* is a conflation of *miserable* and *flimsy* (Carroll himself, in the words of Humpty-Dumpty, calls such conflations *portmanteau* words – Carroll 1998: 198-199)

3.6. Horizontal paronymic puns

Making a horizontal paronymic pun consists in putting two similar-looking words close to each other. It is probably the easiest type of pun to make, and therefore many people consider it an inferior form of wordplay, but horizontal paronymic puns are still occasionally used in literature.

For example, a few can be found in Nabokov’s *Lolita* – thus to most people, women are women, but Humbert in *Lolita* distinguishes two female sexes, and states: “But to me, through the prism of my senses, ‘they were as different as mist and mast’.” (Nabokov 1980: 18). As could be expected, this is relatively easy to translate; the Russian text has a horizontal paronymic pun here which, moreover, retains one of the original meanings: “они были столь же различны между собой, как мечта и мачта” (literally, “as a dream and mast”; Nabokov 1998). (See also the case of “the cowman and the sheepman” from *Lolita*, discussed in the section on translating wordplay – specifically, in the section on compensation).

Additionally, we might have look at a prayer, quoted by Shipley (1979: 261), which also juxtaposes three similar-looking and -sounding words:

God loving me
Guard me in sleep
Guide me to Thee

3.7. Vertical homographic puns

By definition, homographic puns involve the use of words which are written in the same way but which are pronounced differently; e.g. lead [li:d] = “to be in front, to be first, or to be winning”; “to control a group of people, a country, or

a situation"; "to go in a particular direction or have a particular result, or to allow or cause this", and lead [led] = "a chemical element that is a very heavy, soft, dark grey, poisonous metal, used especially in the past on roofs and for pipes and also for protection against radiation" and "(the narrow strip of) coloured material, usually black and made of graphite, in the centre of a pencil" (*CALD* 2003). Homographs are very rare in Polish owing to the relatively regular correspondences between sounds and spellings, but they are not impossible; e.g., we have *Dania* – the Polish name of the country Denmark, and *Dania* – the common noun which means "food" or "dishes" (as in the phrase *Dania i napoje*, "Food and beverages"). Interestingly enough, the only example of a vertical homographic pun quoted by Delabastita is the word *The-rapist* (1993: 81), which is used by Nabokov in *Lolita*, but which is used there "horizontally", so to speak, and therefore this example will be presented in the next section.

3.8. Horizontal homographic puns

In Chapter 1 of Part Two of *Lolita* Humbert observes:

> **The rapist** was Charlie Holmes; I am the **therapist** – a matter of nice spacing in the way of distinction.
> (Nabokov 1980: 147–8).

No matter whether the word is used vertically or horizontally, the effect cannot be reproduced literally in any other language and, therefore, in the Russian *Lolita* Nabokov substituted a horizontal paronymic pun for the original wordplay: "**Растлением** занимался Чарли Хольмс; я же занимаюсь **растением**, детским **растением** …" (roughly, the Russian texts contrasts the seduction of a minor and looking after a child's growth; Nabokov 1998).

3.9. Miscellaneous

Some puns are obviously difficult to translate, but some are equally difficult to classify. For instance, when Nabokov plays on the morphological structure of the word *blackmail*, and replaces *black* with *mauve*, thus giving this word a somewhat "gentler" character, the resulting punning coinage does not fit into any of Delabastita's categories:

> Then, figuratively speaking, I shattered the glass, and boldly imagined […] how eventually I might blackmail – no, that is too strong a word – **mauvemail** big Haze into letting me consort with little Haze …
> (Nabokov 1980: 70-71).

Among the cleverer instances of miscellaneous wordplay in *Lolita* we might mention also the nicknames of the classrooms at Beardsley:

> Mushroom, Room-In 8, B-room, Room-BA and so on.
> (Nabokov 1980: 195)

The first word is obvious; the remaining ones play on *ruminate*, *broom*, and *rumba*, respectively. Perhaps with some good will, the words could be treated as a sequence of vertical paronymic puns, but they are certainly not prototypical paronymic puns. And the inventiveness and creativity of punsters goes much farther.

In the early 1990s, a German magazine (its name escapes me) entitled one of its articles "Die BeeRDigung der DDR". The basic meaning of the word *Beerdigung* is "burial, funeral, or interment", but the point here is that the capital letters spell BRD, i.e. Bundesrepublik Deutschland. The article talked about the burial of the German Democratic Republic, but also about its transformation, about its becoming BRD, Bundesrepublik Deutschland. This is certainly a simultaneous confrontation of two linguistic structures with dissimilar meanings; it is visibly vertical, but it is not homonymic, not homophonic, not homographic, and not really paronymic.

Even if we fit the *BeeRDigung* into the paronymic puns or establish an additional category for it, we still have problems. Where do we place Joyce's multilingual puns, like the following "Fieluhr? Filou!" from *Finnegans Wake* (Joyce 1982a: 213)? Admittedly, they might be treated as homophonic, except that in this case the homophones belong to two different languages: the first word is a somewhat corrupted German question about the time, and the second word is French and means roughly "rogue, rascal, crook or thief", the implication of this juxtaposition being probably that time is a thief.

And where do we classify puns based not just on two languages, but also on two different scripts? Elena Slobodian mentions a few very interesting titles of Russian novels, based on the interplay between the Cyrillic script and English. For example, Eva Punsh (Ева Пунш) published a novel called *Крысolove,* which plays on the Russian word *крысолов*, [literally, 'rat-catcher'] and, of course, the English word *love*. «Крысолов» also happens to be the title of a poem by Marina Tsvetaeva (Марина Цветаева) about the Rattenfänger von Hameln (better known in English as the Pied Piper of Hamelin), first published

in 1925, and of a short story by Alexander Grin, both of which get quoted in Eva Punsh's book. Eva Punsh is also the author of a book called *Net.любви*, which exploits the fact that the English word *net* happens to be a transliteration of the Russian word *нет*, meaning "no" (the whole title would thus mean more or less "No Love" confronted with "A/The Net of Love" or "Internet Loves"). Another writer – Oksana Robski (Оксана Викторовна Робски) – wrote a novel *Про любоff/on*, the title of which is based on the modification of the spelling of the word *любовь*, meaning "love", in accordance with the French spelling of the Russian surname Smirnoff (in Russian, Смирнов) and the famous brand of vodka, and which then plays on the adverbial particles *off* vs. *on* (cf. Slobodian 2010).

4. Ways of translating puns

But let us leave the problems of the classification of puns aside, and let us turn to ways of translating them.

As far as translating wordplay is concerned, Delabastita lists nine specific procedures for dealing with wordplay (some of them with numerous subdivisions); they are:

(1) PUN > PUN (a pun gets translated as a pun); (2) PUN > NON-PUN (the translator ignores a pun and renders the basic meaning of the given phrase); (3) PUN > PUNOID (the translator renders a pun as another rhetorical device; e.g. a rhyming couplet or a literary allusion); (4) PUN > ZERO (the phrase or sentence which contains a pun gets omitted); (5) Direct copy: PUN S.T. = PUN T.T. (the translator copies the source-text pun into the target text); (6) Transference: PUN S.T. = PUN T.T. (this means imposing the SL meaning onto the TL word[4]); (7) Addition: NON-PUN > PUN (the translator makes a pun in the TL where the original text had an ordinary phrase); (8) Addition (New textual material): ZERO > PUN (the translator adds some text in order to introduce a pun); (9) Editorial Techniques (Footnotes, etc.) (Delabastita 1993: vii and 192-227). (Interestingly enough, the procedure called *transference* does not reappear on the lists in

[4] This happened, for instance, in biblical translation. As Delabastita explains: "Since the Jews were not allowed to utter the name of God, they used the word for 'master' instead. When the Bible was translated into Greek, the Greek word for 'master' was given the additional meaning of 'God' by way of meaning transference..." (1993: 246). As is commonly known, the same procedure was applied in other European languages, including Polish.

Delabastita 1996: 134 and 2004: 604; moreover, in Delabastita 2004: 604, the term PUNOID gets replaced with RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE.)

It seems to me, however, that they can be reduced to five major ones (although direct copy is not really translation); the translator can: (1) ignore the pun and translate the basic meaning of the relevant phrase(s), which covers Delabastita's procedures 2 and 4; (2) copy the pun directly from the source text into the target text (Delabastita's procedure 5); (3) explain the pun in a footnote (this is Delabastita's procedure 9); (4) try to translate the pun or to reproduce some form of wordplay at the place of the original pun (Delabastita's procedures 1 and 3), and (5) ignore a specific pun but compensate for it by introducing a play on words elsewhere in the text (Delabastita's procedures 7 and 8).

Moreover, it must be added here that some of these procedures can be combined; for example, the translator translates a pun as a new pun, but leaves the original wordplay too, as Jacques Le Clercq did in his English translation of *Gargantua et Pantagruel* (see below); or the translator uses the PUN > PUN procedure and provides a footnote explaining the source-text pun anyway (as Robert Stiller did in his bilingual *Alice* – Carroll 1990). Obviously, editorial techniques such as footnotes, etc., can be combined with virtually any other procedure, but they are especially common, if not required, with direct copy, where readers of the translation might not understand the point of the joke. Naturally, the compensatory procedures can be used independently of any other procedures, so that in a sense they also combine with other procedures.

Let us now look at these five procedures in more detail.

4.1. Ignoring the pun.

The first possibility is the simplest and, despite appearances to the contrary, not always reprehensible: the translator ignores the wordplay and translates the basic meaning of the phrase in question or, if the phrase without the wordplay is really meaningless (e.g. the half-homonymic, half-homophonic riddle: "How would you paint the sun and the wind?" "The sun rose and the wind blue/blew"), omits it altogether.

Thus if one of the characters in the murder mystery by Ngaio Marsh entitled *Scales of Justice* introduces his cats: Ptolemy, Alexis, and Edie, adding after a moment "Edie Puss, of course" (1958: 12), playing on the name Oedipus, it seems to me that the translator can perfectly legitimately introduce the third cat (actually, a kitten) as, for instance, Cleopatra or Antigone, and forget the reference to Oedipus. The original name tells the reader two things: that the owner of the cats is fond of Greek history and literature, and that he is a punster, but, since

neither point is relevant to the plot, ignoring one of them (specifically, the second one) will not produce a dramatic translational loss. Of course, this does not mean that the pun cannot be recreated in Polish – for example, the kitten can be introduced as "Mas" and then, after the listener expresses her surprise, the cat-owner adds "Oczywiście Mas-Kotka" (meaning 'mascot', and exploiting the fact the Polish equivalent of this word contains the word for 'kitten'), but, frankly speaking, I do not think that informing the reader about a minor character's penchant for punning is that important here.

Even if a book abounds in wordplay, if puns are its vital feature, this does not mean that the translator has to try to translate every single one of them. It is all right to omit one or even a few, provided that the majority are somehow reproduced: the overall stylistic effect will still be preserved, and whether a book contains 37 puns or just 33 is really irrelevant. Thus although Tadeusz Boy-Żeleński managed to reproduce most of the puns from *Gargantua et Pantagruel*, the following *contrepèterie* (spoonerism) from the 21st chapter of *Pantagruel*:

> – Mais, (dist il), equivocquez sur "A Beaumont le Viconte."
> – Je ne scauroys, dist elle.
> – C'est, (dist il), "A beau con le vit monte."
> (Literally: But, says he, produce a pun on "To Beaumont the viscount." – I couldn't do it, says she. – it is, says he, "for beautiful cunt the cock rises.")
> (quoted after Toury 1997: 279)

does not appear in the Polish edition (see Rabelais 1988: Vol. 1 – pp. 198ff.).

Also Piotr Cholewa omitted a few puns from his translations of Pratchett – for example, the following wordplay from the Discworld novel *Mort* (Mort lands a job with Death; the job – at least initially – involves cleaning after the horses):

> Some jobs offer **increments**. This one offered – well, **quite the reverse**, but at least it was in the warm and fairly easy to get the hang of.
> (Pratchett 1987b: 33; emphasis mine – JW)

gets a non-pun rendering: "Praca nie dawała szczególnej satysfakcji, ale przynajmniej było ciepło i technikę dało się opanować bez problemu" (Pratchett 2002: 33), even though it lends itself almost immediately to translation into Polish – based on a similar opposition: „Na ogół posada wiąże się z **dochodami**. Ta wiązała się – no cóż, z **czymś wprost przeciwnym**, ale..." (This translation is mine – JW). Technically, the word *increment* means 'one of a series of salary or pay increases', and corresponds rather to the Polish word *podwyżka*, but it is the

word *dochody* (literally, 'income') that expresses the opposite of the Polish equivalent of the word implied by the phrase "quite the reverse".

Let us look also at the following scene from *Moving Pictures*, which contains a nice homonymic pun:

> Ginger stared, panic-stricken, out of the carriage window.
> 'Who are all these people?' she said.
> 'They're fans,' said Dibbler.
> 'But I'm not hot!'
> 'Uncle means that they're people who like seeing you in the clicks,' said Soll.
> (Pratchett 1991: 267)

Ginger, a young movie star(let), "misunderstands" the word *fans* ('admirers') and comments "But I'm not hot!" referring to the second meaning of *fans*, namely 'devices for moving the air around to produce a cooling effect'. In Polish, the equivalent of *fans* in the sense of 'admirers' is simply *fani*, or *wielbiciele*, but in the sense of 'devices for cooling the air', it is either *wachlarze* or *wiatra(cz)ki*. Naturally, a literal translation of Dibbler's words into Polish cannot be ambiguous and will not trigger off any associations with being (or not being) hot. Therefore, translating the book into Polish, Piotr Cholewa simply omitted this wordplay, replacing Ginger's comment with a neutral question "Who?"; his version reads:

> Ginger w panice wyglądała przez okno powozu.
> – Kim są ci wszyscy ludzie?
> – To fani – wyjaśnił Dibbler.
> – Kto?
> – Wujek chciał powiedzieć, że to ludzie, którzy lubią cię oglądać w migawkach.
> (Pratchett 2000: 248)

4.2. Copying the pun.

Copying the source-text pun into the target text is not really translation, but it is sometimes used by translators. For example, the English translation of *Gargantua et Pantagruel*, by Jacques Le Clercq, reproduced in *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*, offers the spoonerism quoted in the previous section preserved in French plus an English one:

> "One moment!" Panurge begged. "Please equivocate on '*à Beaumont le Viconte*?'or on 'Runt and Codger are fellow-muckers!' "
> "I don't know what you mean!"
> "Quite easy! '*A beau con le vit monte*,' 'Cunt and Roger are mellow fuckers!' […]"
> **(**Rabelais in Norton 1980: Vol. 1 – p. 1274**)**

Also two German translations of Joyce's *Ulysses* copy Lenehan's riddle:

> Lenehan extended his hands in protest.
> – But my riddle! he said. What opera is like a railway line?
> – Opera? Mr O'Madden Burke's sphinx face reriddled.
> Lenehan announced gladly:
> – *The Rose of Castille.* See the wheeze? Rows of cast steel. Gee!
> (Joyce 1978: 135)

The translation by Georg Goyert runs:

> Welche Oper hat Ähnlichkeit mit einem Eisenbahngeleise? [...]
> – The Rose of Castille. Seht ihr den Witz? Rows of cast steel. He!
> (1927, 1: 280–281)

The newer translation by Hans Wollschläger reads:

> Welche Oper gleicht einer Eisenbahnlinie? [...]
> – Die *Rose of Castille*. Nicht kapiert? *Rows of cast steel*. Na?
> (1980, 1: 195)

This one, however, provides also an explanatory footnote: "– Die *Rose of Castille – Rows of cast steel* (engl.) phonet. Wortspiel: Rose von Kastilien – Reihen aus Gußstahl (Schienen, Gleise)." (The German examples are quoted after Szczerbowski 1998: 85-86). Which leads us nicely into the next section.

4.3. Explaining the pun in a footnote.

The third possibility for dealing with wordplay is explaining it in a footnote. Some ambiguities are so important for the plot that they cannot be omitted or translated otherwise than literally, and, literal translation being impossible, they have to be explained with reference to the original. For instance, S.S. Van Dine's murder mystery *The Bishop Murder Case* is really centred around the double meaning of the word *bishop* in English: 'a priest of high rank' (in Polish: *biskup*) and 'a chess piece' (known in Poland as *goniec* or – from German – *laufer*).

Since there is no way those two separate Polish equivalents can be combined into one, the translator had no option but to explain this fact by providing an appropriate footnote: "W angielskiej terminologii szachowej 'biskup' oznacza 'gońca'" (Van Dine 1991: 145).

Let us now consider the following fragment from the short story "It's a Dog's Life" by John Lutz [the narrator and protagonist, private detective Milo Morgan, introduces his dog to Lieutenant Jack Redaway – incidentally, a very unpleasant character]:

> 'This is Sam,' I said. 'He doesn't bite or make a mess.'
> 'The gentleman of the firm. As a private detective, Morgan, I would think you'd have noticed that "Sam" doesn't suit that animal's gender.'
> 'It's short for Samantha,' I explained. 'Since Sam's been neutered, we use the male pronoun for the sake of convenience. …
> 'Don't tell me. I already heard. Sam Spayed.'
> (Lutz 1990: 99)

To *spay* means 'to remove the ovaries of a female animal' (*CALD* 2003), but the point of the joke is that Lieutenant Redaway's remark plays on the name ***Sam Spade*** (the words *Spayed* and *Spade* being of course homophones) – well-known to the aficionados of detective fiction – the name of the main character, a private detective, in the famous hard-boiled mystery novel *The Maltese Falcon* by Dashiell Hammett and in the equally famous 1941 film directed by John Houston and starring Humphrey Bogart. Again, since it is probably impossible to translate this wordplay into Polish **and** to retain the allusion to Sam Spade, the potential translator (to the best of my knowledge, this short story has not been translated into Polish yet) would have to either omit the joke altogether, or explain it in a footnote.

To quote an example from a published translation: in Terry Pratchett's novel *Truckers* (the first part of the so-called *Nome*, or *Bromeliad*, *Trilogy*), the nomes have stolen a truck and are driving it along a road. At one point Angalo sees a road sign; Grimma and Masklin read: "Road Works Ahead". Angalo is happy that he can drive ahead at full speed, but Masklin is surprised that anybody should want to tell drivers about a road which works; to him, it would make sense to inform people about a road which does not work... Of course, this will not work in Polish. Theoretically, it would be possible to produce some kind of wordplay here, because the basic Polish equivalent of the word *road – droga* – happens to have additional meanings such as "dear" and "expensive", while the Polish equivalent of the word *works* (*roboty*) happens to be homonymic with the Polish word for *robots*, but this would entail substantial changes in the dialogue and, in view of what happens next (the nomes discover that there is no

road ahead), the whole scene would not be as effective as in the original, and therefore Jarosław Kotarski simply translated the sign as the nomes (mis)understood it, i.e., as "Z przodu działająca droga", and provided the following explanatory footnote: "Znak ten w języku polskim nosi nazwę 'Roboty drogowe', po angielsku *Road Works Ahead*. Zastosowano tu tłumaczenie dosłowne, gdyż inaczej dialog byłby niezrozumiały (przyp. tłum.)" (Pratchett 2009: 221).

4.4. Trying to translate the pun.

It is true that some examples of wordplay might prove to be untranslatable and might have to be omitted or glossed, but it is equally true that some can be translated (albeit not necessarily in the classical sense of this word). Thus of the two jokes about computer-illiterate computer users quoted by Bogucki (2007: 22-23),[5] the first one is really untranslatable into Polish, but the second one is not. Let us look at the first one:

> Tech Support: 'I need you to right-click on the Open Desktop.'
> 'Okay,' says the customer.
> Tech Support: 'Did you get a pop-up menu?'
> 'No,' replies the customer.
> Tech Support: 'Okay. Right-click again. Do you see a pop-up menu?'
> 'Not at all,' replies the customer.
> Tech Support: 'Okay, sir. Can you tell me what you have done up until this point?'
> 'Sure,' replies the customer. 'You told me to write "click" so I wrote down "click".'

The joke is untranslatable, because there is no way we can reproduce in Polish the homophony of *right* and *write* on which it is based, and the interplay of those two words is vital here. Let us now look at the second joke:

> Tom is trying to get his new computer working. He's having trouble so he calls over Harry to give him a hand. Harry switches on the computer then asks Tom if he wants it password protected.
> 'Oh yes, I read about that in the manual. I think the password I'll have is "DaffyDuckBugsBunnyTomandJerry".'
> 'That's a very long password,' says Harry.
> 'Yes,' replies Tom. 'But the manual says it has to be at least four characters.'

[5] The two jokes come originally from Arnott, Stephen and Haskins, Mike. 2004. *Man Walks Into a Bar. The Ultimate Collection of Jokes and One-Liners*. Chester: Ebury Press, p. 235 (Bogucki 2007: 23).

This one can be translated into Polish relatively easily, except that the translation cannot be literal.

If we try to translate this joke literally, i.e., if we retain the "DaffyDuck-BugsBunnyTomandJerry" password, we run into a problem. The problem is of course the word "characters". In English, a *character* means both "a letter, number, or other mark or sign used in writing or printing, or the space one of these takes" and "a person represented in a film, play, or story" (*CALD* 2003), but in Polish the two meanings are expressed by means of different words (*znak* and *postać*, respectively). If, however, we modify the password into something like, for instance, "zakazwjazduzakazpostojuzakazwyprzedzaniastop" (roughly, "no entry for vehicular traffic, no waiting, no overtaking, stop"), then we can continue to the very punchline:

> – To strasznie długie hasło – mówi Harry.
> – Tak – odpowiada Tom – ale w podręczniku jest napisane, że to mają być przynajmniej cztery znaki.

Perhaps the Polish version, which exploits the relative polysemy of the Polish word *znaki* (technically, *road signs* are *znaki drogowe*), is less effective and less amusing than the original, but at least the joke can be told, unlike the first one, which can only be explained.

Also most of the puns presented in the section on the classification of puns can be translated into Polish, and while some of these might test the translator's inventiveness, some actually lend themselves to translation almost immediately (even if some translators do not see it). Let us have a look at some examples (this is not a systematic study of all those puns in all the translations, and therefore only some of the most interesting solutions will be presented).

Thus although Mercutio's vertical homonymic pun on the word *grave* gets a non-pun rendering in Paszkowski's translation – "Znajdziesz mię jutro spokojnym jak trusia." (Szekspir 1973: 451), Maciej Słomczyński succeeded – at least to a certain extent – in recreating the homonymy of the word *grave*; his version reads:

> Odwiedźcie mnie jutro, a zobaczycie, że mam grobową minę.
> [Literally, "Visit me tomorrow, and you'll see that I have a grave mien"]
> (Shakespeare 2005: 64)

The adjective *grobowy* means "grave-like, serious", and therefore, by extension, something like "fitting for a grave".

The pun on "the liver" cannot be rendered as a standard homonymic pun in Polish, but if we answer the question as "Zależy od Ż/żywca", then we do have

a kind of pun here, "Żywiec" being a brand of beer and a neologism which potentially could mean a human being performing the action of living...

Let us return for a moment to the pun on "fans". As was stated above, Piotr Cholewa did not reproduce this wordplay. It seems to me, however, that although the association with heat (or lack of it) cannot be reproduced in Polish, preserving wordplay in this bit of dialogue is relatively simple. The Polish word *wielbiciele* just happens to be phonetically similar, if not identical, with the phrase *wielbi cielę*, which means 'adores (or worships) a/the calf', so that it might trigger off an equally silly question on the part of Ginger: "Who adores a/the calf?" Here is my version of this dialogue, with a horizontal homophonic pun (I have retained the last line in Piotr Cholewa's translation):

> – Kim są ci wszyscy ludzie?
> – To wielbiciele – wyjaśnił Dibbler.
> – Kto wielbi cielę?
> – Wujek chciał powiedzieć, że to ludzie, którzy lubią cię oglądać w migawkach.

It will have been observed that some puns are slightly easier to translate than some others. For example, the joke from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* about the three little sisters in the well being "well in" has been translated into Polish without any problems by all the major translators of *Alice*: Marianowicz is close to an ideal translation, but unfortunately he spoils it somewhat by being unnecessarily verbose. The simplest solution would be to express "well in" by means of the phrase "od stu dni w studni" ("in the well for a hundred days", reversed), but Marianowicz adds a few words and changes the speaker:

> Aby znowu nie obrazić Susła, Alicja zapytała bardzo ostrożnie:
> – A jak długo rysowały one ten syrop w studni?
> – Sama odpowiedziałaś sobie przecież na to pytanie – rzekł Kapelusznik. – Od stu dni – rzecz jasna.
> (Carroll 1988: 128-129)

Słomczyński moves away from a pun towards a kind of spoonerism and offers a phonetically amusing but semantically empty phrase "w studni na dole, dudni w stodole" (Carroll 1972: 80), but Stiller and Kozak simply borrow Marianowicz's obvious homophonic solution quoted above (Carroll 1990: 155 and 1997: 82, respectively).

Also the pun on *senses* from *Lolita* turned out to be easy to translate for both Polish translators of the novel, Robert Stiller and Michał Kłobukowski:

„Co myśleć o zmysłach?" ['What to think of the senses?']
(Nabokov 1991: 5)

„Czy zmysły są zmyślne?" ['Are the senses clever?']
(Nabokov 1997: 5)

On the other hand David Benedictus's clever pun from *Return to the Hundred Acre Wood* ("It is *odd*, isn't it, Piglet?" "It's *even*," said Piglet – Benedictus 2009: 1-2) did not get rendered as a pun in the Polish edition, but neither did it get ignored completely. Let us look at the corresponding fragment in the Polish translation by Michał Rusinek:

–To nie do wiary – stwierdził Puchatek.
– Co nie do wiary?
Kubuś podrapał się łapą po nosku.
– Wolałbym, żeby stały spokojnie. A one się wiercą, kiedy myślą, że nie patrzę. Jeszcze przed chwilą było ich jedenaście, a teraz jest tylko dziesięć. To nie do wiary, prawda, Prosiaczku?
– Nie do wiary, ale do pary – powiedział Prosiaczek. – Jeśli jest dziesięć, ma się rozumieć. A jeśli nie, to nie.
(Benedictus 2010: 5).

As can be seen, Rusinek translates "It is odd, isn't it, Piglet?" as if it were "It is unbelievable, isn't it, Piglet?" and then he puts the Polish equivalent of "It is unbelievable", i.e. "Nie do wiary", next to a possible Polish equivalent of "It is even" ("do pary"), thus producing a rhyming pair which would presumably be termed a punoid, or related rhetorical device.

Let us turn now to the vertical homophonic pun on *Cue* discussed above. Although both Stiller and Kłobukowski offer a non-pun rendering of the title of Vivian Darkbloom's biography "My Cue", it seems to me that a simple homonymic solution is possible here: I would title the book "Pyta Q", which can be interpreted to mean both "Q asks" and "Q's penis".

Also it seems to me that "the Bridge of Size" from *Night Watch*, translated by Cholewa flatly as "Most Spory" (Pratchett 2008: 28) can be called more creatively as Most Eastchnień or Most Ostchnień (both playing on the Polish name for the Bridge of Sighs, i.e., Most Westchnień, the first version being English-based – East vs. West – and the second one being based on the German opposition of Ost vs. West).

It needs to be stressed, however, that the translating of puns is often a matter of happy inspiration and that it is definitely much easier to invent puns when one does not work to a deadline. Papers on translation theory contain numerous ex-

amples of puns rendered as non-puns (and sometimes explained in a footnote) in the published translation, and then rendered as clever puns by the given translation theorist (see, for instance, Szymenderski 2009 and Wróblewski 2013).

Let us now return to the horizontal homophonic pun on *axis* and *axes.* The pun comes from Chapter VI ("Pig and Pepper") of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, and is based on the phonetic similarity between the words *axis* ('a real or imaginary straight line which goes through the centre of a spinning object') and the plural of *axe* ('a tool used for cutting wood and which consists of a heavy iron or steel blade at the end of a long wooden handle' – *CALD* 2003), that is, *axes*. Although it is impossible to play on the Polish equivalents of those two words, because they are dramatically dissimilar, Marianowicz succeeded in solving the problem brilliantly, building a pun on the Polish equivalent of the word *axes* – *topory* – and offering probably the best Polish translation imaginable:

> – ...Bo ziemia, wie pani, potrzebuje dwudziestu czterech godzin na pełny obrót dokoła swej osi. A najważniejsza rzecz *to pory roku*...
> – Skoro już mowa *o toporach* – przerwała Księżna – to zetnij jej natychmiast głowę!
> (Carroll 1988: 102)

His version exploits the fact that the Polish word *topory* happens to be homophonic – as well as being homographic – with two separate words: *to* (a demonstrative pronoun, which in Polish can also perform the function of the copula *to be*) and *pory* (meaning 'times' or 'seasons', and here used as part of the phrase *seasons of the year*). Marianowicz simply expands Alice's astronomy lesson by one sentence, which means literally: "And the most important thing ***are the seasons*** of the year...", thus giving the Duchess perfect "axes" to talk of, and probably only the desire and/or necessity to find another solution forced Maciej Słomczyński to introduce a rather unnatural and somewhat convoluted construction here:

> [...] ziemia wiruje wokół swej osi raz na dwadzieścia cztery godziny, czy by się tego chciało, czy nie chciało...
> – Niech ciało, powiadasz? Dobrze, niech ciało jej odrąbią od głowy! Utnij jej głowę!
> (Carroll 1972: 64)

Both Stiller and Kozak borrow from Marianowicz (see Carroll 1990: 123-125 and 1997: 63).

Incidentally, there is a translation of this pun which is far better in a sense than the original: into French. In the French version in question Alice says: "[...] vous voyez bien, la terre met vingt-quatre heures à faire sa révolution." To which the Duchess replies: "Ah! Vous parlez de faire des révolutions! Qu'on lui coupe la tête!" (Quoted after Victor Proetz 1971: 106).

Marianowicz was also quite successful in rendering the *Tortoise / taught us* pun from *Alice*. In his version, the Turtle gets replaced with a Shark, whom the pupils called Sawfish, and the text reads:

> Nauczycielem naszym był pewien stary, bezzębny Rekin, którego nazywaliśmy Piłą.
> – Dlaczego nazywaliście go Piłą, skoro był Rekinem, a w dodatku nie miał zębów? – zapytała Alicja.
> – Ponieważ piłował nas wciąż w czasie lekcji – odparł ze zniecierpliwieniem Niby Żółw.
> (Carroll 1988: 166)

For Polish-less readers, the verb *piłować* (literally, "to saw") has an additional slangy meaning: "to demand constant hard work from pupils at school; to be a harsh, severe, and demanding teacher". For comparison, let us have a look at Maciej Słomczyński's version of this wordplay; here, the Turtle remains the Turtle, and the pupils call him Oyster, because the Polish word for *oyster* – *ostryga* – contains the adjective *ostry*, which means "sharp" or "harsh", and which thus could be used to describe a teacher:

> Nauczycielem był stary Żółw... Nazywaliśmy go Ostrygą.
> – Dlaczego nazywaliście go Ostrygą, jeżeli nią nie był? – zapytała Alicja.
> – Nazywaliśmy go Ostrygą, bo był ostry – powiedział gniewnie Żółwiciel.
> (Carroll 1972: 101-102)

It would be interesting to analyse the remaining translations of this example and of the other puns listed in the section on the classification of puns, but the translations presented above are sufficient to illustrate the general point, which is that, although at first glance many puns may look untranslatable, they are untranslatable only in terms of semantic equivalence. If we redefine translation to include cases of formal substitution, then most instances of wordplay will turn out to be perfectly translatable, even if initially they do pose a challenge for the translator.

It is worth adding here that while some puns may be untranslatable into one language, they might fare better in another language. Thus the famous Italian maxim *traduttore traditore* cannot be translated as a pun into Polish, but it can be

rendered into Chinese, where fān ‘yi means “to translate”, and fānyi’ corresponds to such expressions as “to break a contract” or “to fail to keep one’s word” (see Szczerbowski 2003: 23, who quotes here Chinese signs from the *Bolshoj Kitajsko Russkij Słowar’*), and into Hungarian, where the saying “a fordítás: ferdítés” means roughly something like “translation is distortion”[6]. And, it seems to me, an English pun rendering is also possible: *translator transtraitor* (my own coinage – JW), even if it stretches the rules of English word formation to a certain extent.

4.5. Ignoring a specific pun and compensating for it elsewhere.

The last thing a translator can do when dealing with wordplay is to ignore it, but to introduce a play on words elsewhere in the text (compensation in place). Sometimes a translator may want to produce additional instances of wordplay not so much in order to make up for a specific pun which he failed to translate as to compensate for more broadly understood inevitable translational losses, or simply because puns are a stylistic feature of the original and a fragment of the target text just lends itself to punning.

It is well-known, for instance, that Nabokov introduced additional puns when he was translating his novel *Lolita* from English into Russian; for example, where the original English version has a relatively neutral phrase “both of us were panting as **the cowman and the sheepman** never do after their battles” (Nabokov 1980: 298), Nabokov’s Russian *Lolita* introduces two paronymic puns and has “мы оба пыхтели, как **королю коров и барону баранов** [i.e.: “the king of cows and the baron of rams” in the dative case] никогда не случается пыхтеть после схватки” (Nabokov 1989), which Stiller, who collated both the English and the Russian *Lolita*, reproduced in Polish literally as: “obaj sapaliśmy tak okrutnie, jak to **królowi krów i baronowi baranów** po ich walce nigdy się nie zdarzało” (Nabokov 1991: 335; emphasis mine – JW), which – incidentally – shows how easy it is sometimes to translate puns between related languages.

The said Stiller introduced a few puns of his own into his translation of *Lolita* into Polish. Since one of the characters is called Trapp, where the English original has a simple sentence:

[6] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Untranslatability [accessed 1 December 2013].

> I became sickeningly conscious that Trapp had changed his tactics and was still with us, in this or that rented car.
> (Nabokov 1980: 225)[7]

Stiller offers a clever horizontal paronymic pun:

> … aż skręciło mnie od uświadomienia, że **Trapp** zmienił taktykę **trapienia** i dalej nam towarzyszy: w takim lub inym wynajętym samochodzie. [Literally: " … that Trapp had changed his tactics **of pestering us** …"]
> (Nabokov 1991: 253; emphasis mine – JW)

Moreover, where the English text mentions Cyrano: "You are a blind girl. Palpate the face of: a Greek youth, Cyrano, Santa Claus, a baby, a laughing faun, a sleeping stranger, your father" (Nabokov 1980: 228), the Russian version only specifying additionally that the character is "Сирано-де-Бержерак", Stiller adds a punning comment in square brackets: "*Jesteś niewidoma. Badaj dotykiem począwszy od twarzy następujące postacie: grecki młodzieniec, Cyrano de Bergerac* [chodzi o jego wielki nos Cyranos][8], *święty Mikołaj, niemowlę, śmiejący się w łaskotkach faun, śpiący nieznajomy, twój ojciec."* (Nabokov 1991: 256).

5. Additional problems

Naturally, there are more linguistic barriers to translating. Hejwowski mentions in this context also such elements as idioms, sayings and proverbs (2004: 108-112), and he is certainly right. Idioms are tricky, because sometimes a translator may not realise that he / she is dealing with an idiom, but this is not a real linguistic barrier, only a language trap. Bronisław Zieliński once told a very instructive story of a trap he almost fell into when he was translating *Roderick Random* by Tobias Smollett. This novel contains a fairly obscure English idiom *to dine with Duke Humphrey*, and the context was so misleading ("When we arrived at our dining-place, we found all the eatables at the inn bespoke by a certain nobleman, who had got the start of us and, in all likelihood, my mistress and her mother must have dined with Duke Humphrey, had I not exerted myself in their behalf ...") that the translator's first idea was to translate it literal-

[7] The Russian *Lolita* has no wordplay here either: "… а затем мне стало отвратительно ясно, что Трапп переменил тактику и продолжает ехать за нами, но уже в других, наемных машинах." (Nabokov 1989).

[8] Literally: "the talk is about his large nose, Cyranose" – JW.

ly ("Gdybym się nie postarał, moja pani i jej matka musiałyby jeść / jadłyby obiad z diukiem / księciem Humphrey"), and it was only his suspiciousness that made him look beyond the literal meaning and led him to discover that this idiom means "to go dinnerless" (the full story is reported in Wróblewski 1996: 216). When, however, an author uses an idiom both in its idiomatic and in its literal sense – which could be regarded as a form of wordplay – then the translator faces a real barrier. For example, let us look at the following passage from Charles Dickens's *Martin Chuzzlewit*:

> It has been said that there is no instance, in modern times, of a Chuzzlewit having been found on terms of intimacy with the Great. But here again the sneering detractors who weave such miserable figments from their malicious brains, are stricken dumb by evidence. For letters are yet in the possession of various branches of the family, from which it distinctly appears, being stated in so many words, that one Diggory Chuzzlewit was in the habit of perpetually dining with Duke Humphrey. So constantly was he a guest at that nobleman's table, indeed; and so unceasingly were His Grace's hospitality and companionship forced, as it were, upon him; that we find him uneasy, and full of constraint and reluctance: writing his friends to the effect that if they fail to do so and so by bearer, he will have no choice but to dine again with Duke Humphrey: and expressing himself in a very marked and extraordinary manner as one surfeited of High Life and Gracious Company.
> (Dickens 1994: 5-6; see also the endnote on page 790)

As can be seen, Dickens used the idiom *to dine with Duke Humphrey* in its idiomatic sense of "going without dinner", but he also played on its literal meaning of being "on terms of intimacy with the Great", and therefore a translation based on the corresponding Polish idiom *obejść się smakiem* fails, as does a literal translation, because without the readers' awareness of the idiomatic meaning, the irony of the passage is gone. Hence, the passage is virtually untranslatable.

Also neologisms can prove difficult to translate (see Hejwowski 2004: 112-118), both those which are relatively meaningless, such as, for instance, the names of the various species encountered by Ijon Tichy during his space voyages – let us try to translate the reference to "nieścisłości dotyczące m. in. Odołęgów (a nie "Odolęgów", jak podawał tekst), także Meopsery, Muciochów i gatunku Powołów (Phlegmus Invariabilis Hopfstosseri)" from *Dzienniki gwiazdowe* (Lem 1966: 6) – and those which have some sort of meaning defined by the author; eg., "ziemista (specjalista od planety Ziemia), próżniarz (kosmonauta), rdzawki (choroba robotów), wzrocza (organ wzroku istot pozaziemskich), kompoter (robot podający kompot)" (these examples from Lem are quoted after Hejwowski 2004: 113).

Finally, all sorts of poetic experiments can turn out to be impossible to translate. Stanisław Barańczak is a translator who is not afraid of challenges – in fact, he himself issued as many as 40 challenges in his book *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu*, i.e., he challenged his readers to translate 40 poems which are so complex in their meaning and structure as to be virtually untranslatable, and then presented his own solutions (1992: 211ff), but when he was preparing an anthology of poems by E. E. Cummings, with one poem he simply gave up. The poem in question is the one which opens the last volume published during the poet's lifetime (e e cummings, *95 poems*):

l(a

le
af
fa

ll

s)
one
l

iness
(Cummings 1983: 344-345)

The semantic meaning of the text is easy to understand and to translate: what we have got here is the word *loneliness* and the phrase a *leaf falls* inserted in it, but the effects produced by the arrangement of the letters – for one thing, the *la* and *le* looking almost like the French feminine and masculine articles, for another, the mirrored *af* of *leaf* and *fa* of *falls* and the double ll in the middle, and finally, the fact that the word *loneliness* has three signals of oneness: the letter l, which looks like the numeral one, then the word *one* itself, and then the letter l again – all of this forced Barańczak to present this poem in the anthology only in the original, in the Afterword, and to state that it is untranslatable. For the time being, I think, we have to agree with him – the graphic shape of the poem makes it really untranslatable. But ...

For many years Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* was also considered untranslatable. In 1972 Maciej Słomczyński included some fragments of the novel in his anthology of Joyce's poetical works (Joyce 1972: 53-58), and in 1973 he published a more extensive section, called "Anna Livia Plurabelle", with some fairly clever solutions (Joyce 1973: 42–53). Then in 1982 Tomasz Mirkowicz offered

a rendering of the first six paragraphs of the novel (Joyce 1982b: 352–354), and finally, in 2012 Krzysztof Bartnicki published a complete translation of this novel. Who knows, perhaps in a few years someone will offer an equally ingenious rendering of the so far untranslatable "l(a leaf falls)oneliness"?

References

Barańczak, Stanisław. 1992. *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu. Szkice o warsztacie tłumacza poezji z dodatkiem poglądowym w postaci „Małej Antologii Przekładów-Problemów"*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo a5.

Bogucki, Łukasz. 2007. *Zarys przekładoznawstwa dla studentów neofilologii*. Łódź: Wyższa Szkoła Studiów Międzynarodowych w Łodzi.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a Double Tongue: an investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Editions Rodopi B.V. (*Approaches to Translation Studies*, Vol. 11).

Delabastita, Dirk. 1996. "Introduction". In: Delabastita, D. (ed.), *Wordplay & Translation. Special Issue: The Translator. Studies in Intercultural Communication*. 2 (2): 127-139.

Delabastita, Dirk (ed.). 1997. *Traductio. Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, and Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur.

Delabastita, Dirk. 2001. "Aspects of interlingual ambiguity: polyglot punning". In: *Quitte ou double sense. Articles sur l'ambiguïté offerts à Ronald Landheer*. Textes réunis par Paul Bogaards, Johan Rooryck et Paul J. Smith. Avec la collaboration de Véronique van Gelderen. Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Rodopi: 45-64.

Delabastita Dirk. 2004. "Wordplay as a translation problem: A linguistic perspective". In: Kittel, Harald, Juliane House, Brigitte Schultze, et al. (eds.), *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. 600-606.

Fogle, S.F. 1974. "Pun". In: Preminger A. (ed.), *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Enlarged Edition. London: The Macmillan Press: 681-682.

Freud, Sigmund. 1983 [1905]. *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. Translated from the German and edited by James Strachey. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Hammond, Paul and Patrick Hughes. 1978. U*pon the Pun. Dual Meaning in Words and Pictures*. London: W. H. Allen & Co. Ltd.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2004. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. 1996. "Problems with Gender in English-Polish Literary Translation". In: Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.) 1996: 235-239.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. 2002. "Problematyka rodzaju w przekładzie literackim". In: Sokoloski, Duda and Scholz (eds.) 2002: 73-86.

Kropiwiec, Urszula, Maria Filipowicz-Rudek and Jadwiga Konieczna-Twardzikowa, (eds.). 2003. *Między oryginałem a przekładem*. Vol. VIII. *Stereotyp a przekład*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz P. 1980. *Gramatyka angielska dla Polaków*. Warszawa: PWN.

Lebiedziński, Henryk. 1981. *Elementy przekładoznawstwa ogólnego*. Warszawa: PWN.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.). 1996. *Translation and Meaning, Part 4. Proceedings of the Łódź Session of the 2nd Maastricht–Łódź Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning"*, 22–24 September 1995. Maastricht: Hogeschool Maastricht, School of Translation and Interpreting.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.). 2013. *Translation and Meaning Part 10. Proceedings of the Lodz Session of the 5th International Maastricht-Lodz Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning", Held in Lodz (Poland), 16-19 September 2010*. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting, Zuyd University of Applied Sciences.

Maltzev, V.A. 1980. *An Introduction to Linguistic Poetics*. Minsk: Higher School.

McArthur, Tom. 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ostrowski, Marek. 2002. "Zu der Übersetzung der Gedichte Paul Celans ins Polnische". In: Sokoloski, Duda and Scholz (eds.) 2002: 141-153.

Pisarska, Alicja. 1989. *Creativity of Translators. The Translation of Metaphorical Expressions in Non-literary Texts*. Poznań: UAM.

Proetz, Victor. 1971. T*he Astonishment of Words. An Experiment in the Comparison of Languages*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Shipley, Joseph T. (ed.). 1979 [1970]. *Dictionary of World Literary Terms*. Forms. Technique. Criticism. Completely Revised and Enlarged Edition. London, Boston and Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Slobodian, Elena. 2010. "Graficzne przyswajanie zapożyczeń z języka angielskiego w języku rosyjskim początku XXI wieku i moda językowa". *Linguistica Copernicana*. – Toruń. – No. 2(4), 311-322.

Sokoloski, Richard, Henryk Duda and Jacek Scholz (eds.). 2002. *Warsztaty Translatorskie II / Workshop on Translation II*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL; Ottawa: Slavic Research Group – University of Ottawa.

Szczerbowski, Tadeusz. 1998. *Gry językowe w przekładach „Ulissesa" Jamesa Joyce'a*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Języka Polskiego PAN.

Szczerbowski, Tadeusz. 2003. "Stereotypy i przekłady, czyli "kłamstwa" motywowane kulturowo". In: Kropiwiec et al. 2003: 23-33.

Szymenderski, Tomasz. 2009. "Pratchett in Polish: Translation and Humour in Truckers". In: Kearns, John (ed.). 2009. *Translation Ireland*. Volume 18, number 1. Torino: Trauben: 81-102.

Toury, Gideon. 1997. "What Is It That Renders a Spoonerism (Un)translatable?" In: Delabastita 1997: 271–291.

Wawrzyniak, Zdzisław. 1991. *Praktyczne aspekty translacji literackiej na przykładzie języków niemieckiego i angielskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
Wojtasiewicz, Olgierd. 1957. *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia*. Wrocław, Warszawa: Zakład Imienia Ossolińskich.
Wróblewski, Janusz. 1996. "False Friends Revisited". In: Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.) 1996: 213–222.
Wróblewski, Janusz. 2013. "Dolores de la Traducción, or *Lolita* in Translation". In: Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds.) 2013: 79-90.

Dictionaries

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2003. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary by A. S. Hornby. 1995. (Fifth edition). Ed. J. Crowther. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sources of additional examples

Auden, Wystan Hugh. 1988. *Poezje*. Selected and edited by Leszek Elektorowicz. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Barańczak, Stanisław (ed.). 1993. *Od Chaucera do Larkina. 400 nieśmiertelnych wierszy 125 poetów anglojęzycznych z 8 stuleci*. Selected, translated, and edited by Stanisław Barańczak. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
Benedictus, David. 2009. *Return to the Hundred Acre Wood*. London: Egmont Books Ltd, New York, NY: Dutton's Children's Books.
Benedictus, David. 2010. *Powrót do Stumilowego Lasu*. Translated by Michał Rusinek. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
Carroll, Lewis. 1972. *Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Carroll, Lewis. 1988 [1955]. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Antoni Marianowicz. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
Carroll, Lewis. 1990. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Wydawnictwo Lettrex.
Carroll, Lewis. 1997. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Jolanta Kozak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Plac Słoneczny 4.
Carroll, Lewis. 1998. *The Complete Illustrated Lewis Carroll*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.
cummings e e (Cummings, Edward Estlin). 1983. *150 wierszy*. Translated by Stanisław Barańczak. Kraków – Wroclaw: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Dickens, Charles. 1994. *The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit*: Edited by Michael Slater. London: J.M. Dent, and Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle – Everyman.
Doyle, Arthur Conan. 1994. "A Scandal in Bohemia". In: *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. London: Penguin Books, 3-29.
Doyle, Arthur Conan. 1972. "Skandal w Czechach". Translated by Irena Doleżal-Nowicka. In: *Przygody Sherlocka Holmesa*. Warszawa: Iskry, 3-28.
Frost, Robert. 1992. *55 wierszy*. Selected, translated, and edited by Stanisław Barańczak. Kraków: Wydawnictwo ARKA.
Gorki / Горький Максим. 1913-14. *Детство*. Available at: http://ilibrary.ru/text/1539/p.1/index.html 1913-14 [accessed 1 December 2013].
Gorki / Gorky, Maksim. 1915. *My Childhood*. Translated by Ronald Wilks. Available at: http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/g/gorky/maksim/g66my/chapter1.html [accessed 1 December 2013]
Gorki, Maksym. 1974. *Dzieciństwo*. Translated by Krystyna Bilska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy (Biblioteka Klasyki Polskiej i Obcej).
Heine, Heinrich. 1980. *Das Glück auf Erden*. Ausgewählte Gedichte. Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen. Moskau: Verlag Progress.
Joyce, James. 1978 [1922]. *Ulysses*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Joyce, James. 1972. *Utwory poetyckie – Poetical Works*. Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Joyce, James. 1973. *Finnegans Wake* – Fragmenty. "Anna Livia Plurabelle". Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Literatura na świecie 5 (25), pp. 42–53.
Joyce, James. 1982a [1939]. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber & Faber.
Joyce, James. 1982b. "*Finnegans Wake* (sześć pierwszych akapitów)". Translated by Tomasz Mirkowicz. Literatura na świecie 8 (133), pp. 352–354
Joyce, James. 2012. *Finneganów Tren*. Translated by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Kraków: Korporacja Ha!art.
Lem, Stanisław. 1966. *Dzienniki gwiazdowe*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Lem, Stanisław. 1976. *Maska*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Lermontov / Лермонтов, Михаил Юрьевич. 1976. *Поэзия*. Москва: Детская литература.
Lutz John. 1990. "It's a Dog's Life". In: Adrian, Jack and Robert Adey (eds.). *The Art of the Impossible. An Extravaganza of Miraculous Murders, Fantastic Felonies & Incredible Criminals*. London: Xanadu, 98-107.
Marsh, Ngaio. 1958. *Scales of Justice*. London and Glasgow: Collins – Fontana Books.
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1980. *Lolita*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1991. *Lolita*. Przełożył z angielskiego i rosyjskiego Robert Stiller. Warszawa: PIW.
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1997. *Lolita*. Translated by Michał Kłobukowski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Da Capo.
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1998. *Лолита*. Перевод с английского: Владимир Набоков. Downloaded from http://lib.ru/NABOKOW/lolita.txt [accessed 9 July 2009].

Poeci języka angielskiego, Volume III. 1974. Selected and edited by Henryk Krzeczkowski, Jerzy S. Sito, and Juliusz Żuławski. Warszawa: PIW.
Pratchett, Terry. 1986. *The Light Fantastic*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett, Terry. 1987a. *Equal Rites*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett, Terry. 1987b. *Mort*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett, Terry. 1991. *Moving Pictures*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett, Terry. 1998. *Jingo*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett, Terry. 2000. *Ruchome obrazki (Moving Pictures)*. Translated by Piotr W. Cholewa. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
Pratchett, Terry. 2002. *Mort*. Translated by Piotr W. Cholewa. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
Pratchett, Terry. 2003. *Night Watch*. London: Corgi Books.
Pratchett**,** Terry. 2008. *Straż nocna (Night Watch)*. Translated by Piotr W. Cholewa. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
Pratchett, Terry. 2009. *Księgi nomów: Nomów księga wyjścia, Nomów księga kopania, Nomów księga odlotu (Truckers, Diggers, Wings)*. Translated by Jarosław Kotarski. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy REBIS.
Rabelais, François. 1980. *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Translated by Jacques Le Clercq. Fragments in: *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*, Vol. 1. General Editor: Maynard Mack. New York & London: W. W. Norton: 1237-1277.
Rabelais, François. 1988. *Gargantua i Pantagruel*. Translated by Tadeusz Żeleński (Boy). Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
Shakespeare, William. 1958. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Ed. by G. B. Harrison. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
Shakespeare / Szekspir, Wiliam. 1973. *Dzieła Dramatyczne*. Tom 5. *Tragedie*. Translated by Józef Paszkowski and Leon Ulrich. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
Shakespeare, William. 2005. *Romeo i Julia*. Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Warszawa: Elipsa Sp. z o.o. (Biblioteka Gazety Wyborczej; książka z płytą DVD).
Van Dine, S.S. 1991. *Piosenka śmierci (The Bishop Murder Case)*. Translated by Janina Sujkowska. Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Cultural Barriers in Translation

Janusz Wróblewski

University of Łódź

jzwrob@gmail.com

Abstract: Even though traditional definitions of translation talk about the replacing of a text in one language by an equivalent text in another language (cf. Catford 1965: 20, Newmark 1982: 7), there is no doubt that translation involves more than just linguistic operations, that apart from purely linguistic barriers, translators often face cultural barriers. This chapter discusses various aspects of translation as a cross-cultural transfer and of cultural untranslatability. It presents some classifications of culture-specific words and phrases (the flora and fauna indigenous to an area, local types of food and drink, items of clothing, local forms of music and dances, games, including card-games, social, political, and administrative terms, quotations and allusions connected with the literature of the given source-language country, allusions to the country's history and culture, etc.), and then enumerates typical procedures for translating them (reproduction without, and with, explanations, syntagmatic, i.e. literal translation without, and with, explanations, using an established equivalent or a functional equivalent, using a hyperonym, i.e. a superordinate word, using descriptive equivalents, omitting the given item, etc.). All the procedures are illustrated with quotations from various books, both fiction and non-fiction.

Keywords: untranslatability, linguistic untranslatability, cultural untranslatability, cross-cultural transfer, *Skopos* theory, the cultural turn in Translation Studies

1. Introduction

Although traditional definitions of translation talk about the replacing of a text in one language by an equivalent text in another language (cf. Catford 1965: 20; Newmark 1982: 7), no one is likely to question the statement that translation involves more than just linguistic operations, that apart from purely linguistic

barriers, translators often face cultural barriers. Catford himself is fully aware of that when he says, discussing the limits of translatability:

> Translation fails – or untranslatability occurs – when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the TL text. Broadly speaking, the cases where this happens fall into two categories. Those where the difficulty is *linguistic*, and those where it is *cultural*.
> (Catford 1965: 94; emphasis in the original).

He then proceeds to explain that linguistic untranslatability stems from the differences between the *languages* in question (for example, it can involve shared exponence, when two or more lexical or grammatical items have the same exponent, as in the phrase "Time flies", being on one hand an observation on the passing of time and, on the other hand, at least technically, a request to measure the velocity with which the said flies fly), whereas cultural untranslatability occurs "when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely absent from the culture of which the TL is a part" (Catford 1965: 99).

Actually, this kind of cultural awareness dates back somewhat earlier. In the 1950s, the French theorist Edmond Cary wrote that translation "n'est pas une opération seulement linguistique" ("is not a strictly linguistic operation") and that it is connected with the whole cultural context (after Mounin 1982: 234). Mounin himself stresses the necessity for a translator to study not only the given foreign language but also the ethnography of the community that uses the language (*ethnography* seems to be Mounin's word for what the Germans call *Landeskunde*, and what might otherwise be termed *Life and institutions*). He concludes his argument by saying: "No translation will be fully adequate if this double condition is not fulfilled" (1982: 236; translation mine – JW). Also Jean-René Ladmiral talks about the relationship between each language and its cultural context and postulates that translation theory should incorporate the extralinguistic (or "paralinguistic") perspective of anthropology (1979: 17-18). He mentions the difficulty (if not impossibility) of rendering into French the vocabulary of the Japanese tea ceremony or the technical expressions connected with baseball, and cites Henri Meschonnic (1973), who suggested that the linguistic notion of language could be expanded into "*langue-culture*" ("language-culture") (Ladmiral 1979: 18).

In Germany, one of the major opponents to the idea that translation was mainly a linguistic operation was Hans J. Vermeer, who saw translation as a cross-cultural transfer, and who, in his paper entitled "Übersetzen als kulturelller Transfer", defined translation as "ein Informationangebot in einer Sprache z der Kultur Z, das ein Informationangebot in einer Sprache a der Kultur A funktionsgerecht imitiert" ("an information offer in language z of culture Z,

which imitates functionally an information offer in language a of culture A"). (Quoted after Snell-Hornby 1988: 46, translation mine – JW). Vermeer's definition is obviously related to his *Skopos* theory, which says roughly that each translation is produced for a specific recipient with specific purpose(s) in a given situation, and that therefore what counts in translation is not any kind of equivalence towards the source text, but rather whether the translation performs the function that is expected of it in the target culture (cf. Snell-Hornby 1988: 46-47, who, incidentally, fully subscribes to Vermeer's opinions).

Soon the impact of cultural studies on translation studies became so great that in 1990 Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere coined the phrase "the cultural turn in Translation Studies" and stated that within the cultural turn "neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational "unit" of translation" (after Munday 2009: 179). This means that we do not translate words as individual words, or even words as parts of a text, but that we look at the words as performing a certain role in a certain culture and translate them accordingly. For example, in the novel *Shares in Murder* by Judah L. Waten one of the characters begins his day by "writing up his day book" and the author then adds: "it was the size of a telephone directory". While "a telephone directory" might pose a serious problem for a translator into a language-culture which does not know telephones, far less directories, it is not a difficult word to translate into a European language – it has obvious one-to-one equivalents in virtually all the European (and all major world) languages. The context in which it appears also seems fairly simple, and yet, translating that novel into Bulgarian, Sidor Florin decided that he had a problem with rendering the word: he realised that the key word in that passage was not the *telephone directory* but *size*. And in Bulgaria at that time, even the Sofia telephone directory was not very impressive. Consequently, he replaced the original telephone directory with an encyclopedia (Florin 1983: 130) – seemingly a dramatic mistranslation at word level, but an appropriate translation at the level of culture.

Today, as Koskinen puts it, "it has almost become a platitude to state that one does not translate across languages but across cultures" (2004: 144) and the more remote geographically, historically or politically the given cultures are, the more problems the translator is likely to face. Thus a translator of the Bible into a language which does not have a word for *bread* will have a serious problem with the last word of the line "Give us this day our daily bread" from the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:11). Theoretically, he or she could borrow the word from Greek, Latin or English, etc., but it will be meaningless without a footnote, and a footnote in the Lord's Prayer is not a desirable thing. At the level of culture, however, the translator may simply replace *bread* with, for example, *fish*, if the target culture has fish as its staple daily meal (Prunč 2001: 118), as the word

bread in this prayer is used not so much for its denotation as for its symbolic value of daily food. On the other hand, it would be wrong to replace *sheep* and *lambs* with *seals*, because of the all-important symbol of the Lamb of God, or to dispense with such words as *cross* and *crucifixion* even if the target cultures do not know them – for obvious reasons (Nida and Taber 1974: 111).

Needless to say, there are certain problems surrounding the cultural approach to translation. The first one concerns the definition of culture. Initially, the word was used to refer to the intellectual and material achievements of the "civilized" societies (for example, in the arts and architecture). Later, it began to signify the way of life of various societies, including – or even focusing on – "primitive" societies. Still later, the word acquired a third meaning, "related to forces in society or ideology" (Katan 2009: 74). Today, the definitions of culture probably run into hundreds, if not thousands, but, as will be seen in the subsequent paragraphs, some words which translation theorists discuss as culture-specific have relatively little to do with any of those definitions.

The second problem concerns the fact that some scholars consider language a part of culture; if this view is accepted, then, by definition, every linguistic barrier is also a cultural one.

Of course, even if language and culture are kept separate, it is not always easy to classify a translational problem as linguistic or cultural; for example, the fact that *death* is masculine in English and German and feminine in Polish and Russian is certainly a linguistic issue (see the preceeding chapter), but also, to a certain extent, a cultural one. Conversely, as Catford aptly demonstrates, when looked at from a specific angle, some cultural barriers can be regarded as linguistic. For instance, the Japanese word *yukata* means roughly something like a "loose robe bound by a sash, worn by either men or women, supplied to guests in a Japanese inn or hotel, worn in the evening indoors or out of doors in street or café, worn in bed ..." (Catford 1965: 100). This in itself is already a problem in translation, but the situation becomes even more complicated when the text says *hoteru-no yukata*, because, while the Japanese phrase is a natural, high-probability collocation, all the potential English equivalents (hotel dressing-gown, hotel bath-robe, hotel nightgown) are rather low-probability collocations. Let us now visualize that phrase in a sentence: "After his bath he enveloped his still-glowing body in the simple hotel bath-robe and went out to join his friends in the café down the street." (Catford 1965: 102). There is no doubt that the reader experiences a cultural shock here – a bath-robe worn in the street – but it is also indisputable that the collocation *hotel bath-robe* sounds strange. This leads Catford to the conclusion that what we are dealing with here is not so much a cultural shock as collocational shock, that the untranslatability of the Japanese word can be attributed to a purely linguistic feature: unusualness of collocation (Catford 1965: 102).

The third major issue is the importance of the cultural filter in translation – should it be applied to every text type in every situation, or should it operate selectively? (Katan 2009: 75-76). In other words, should there be a difference in the approach to the translation of business letters, training booklets for the local representatives of a foreign company and all sorts of promotional materials on one hand, and the translation of literary texts on the other? Theoreticians argue, but there seems to be little doubt that for some texts the cultural filter is more important than for others. For example, it is common knowledge that letter writing conventions differ from country to country, and therefore a literal translation of a business letter may turn out to be unacceptable for the given target culture. Similarly, if someone born and educated in the Polish People's Republic wrote a very traditional socialist-style CV ("Urodziłem się w roku … w rodzinie inteligenckiej / robotniczej") and wanted it translated into English so that he could send it to an international company now, it would be a very bad service if the translator did not insert a cultural filter into his or her work and did not follow the format of standard modern CVs. On the other hand, if the above was the first sentence of an autobiography or a novel, then perhaps a more literal version would be in order, perhaps with a footnote explaining the cultural significance of the first sentence.

Additionally, I remember a discussion on an Internet forum for translators (the thread seems to be gone now) about translating a sales-team training booklet for a large American company that was expanding into Germany. The text discussed some ways of approaching customers in a store, and the problem was that almost all the practices mentioned were dramatically wrong for Germany, because in German shops sales clerks usually leave customers alone, except for asking them if they can be of help. The direct American approach and the literally translated conversational gambits would probably draw curious looks from any potential customers. Obviously, the text had to be adapted to German social practices, because, as Korzeniowska and Kuhiwczak put it, "adequate translation is a matter of successful **linguistic** and **cultural** transfer" (1994: 15 – emphasis in the original).

Also works of fiction which concern (appropriate) human behaviour in various situations might not lend themselves easily to translation. When translated literally, passages which involve culture-specific behaviour might look odd or even offensive to the target readers. It is for such cases that Vinay & Darbelnet have postulated their last translational procedure, namely adaptation. They argue that while it is perfectly normal for an English father to kiss his daughter on the mouth, it would be very unnatural for a French father to do such a thing; apparently, even mentioning such an action would be culturally unacceptable in a French text, and, consequently, that action must be replaced with simple em-

bracing, and the relevant sentence becomes *Il serra tendrement sa fille dans ses bras* ('he tenderly embraced his daughter in his arms') (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995: 68). On one hand, this is highly disputable, mainly on the grounds that a translator should not be a censor and that target language readers have the right to get acquainted with source language manners and not have them filtered through the "bon goût" of the translator, but on the other hand, culture-specific behaviour **is** a translational problem, and perhaps a simple novel is not the best place to propagate cultural diversity. To put it quite simply, when translated literally, some culture-specific expressions will sound puzzling.

Let me illustrate this problem with two simple Polish words connected with what might be termed Polish table manners: "Smacznego" (as used at the beginning of the meal) and "Dziękuję", as used at the end. While the word "Smacznego" does not have an English-**language** equivalent, it is perfectly translatable into English by means of the French phrase "Bon appétit", and, although the distribution of this expression in English is somewhat different than that of the Polish word (the Polish word is probably used in more situations), this difference is not so significant as to cause any raising of the eyebrows, let alone any serious communication breakdowns. (Of course, in some contexts, the Polish word "Smacznego" will be better rendered as "Enjoy your meal" or "I hope you like it" – for instance, when uttered by the lady of the house encouraging her guests to eat).

The problem becomes more interesting with the second word, the typical equivalent of which is the English phrase "Thank you". Let us visualise for a moment a traditional Polish milk bar or a canteen in "Dom wczasowy" – and people sitting together at a meal; the meal being over, they all stand up and say "Dziękuję" (or, one of them, having finished eating first, stands up, says "Dziękuję" and leaves) – natural? Yes, of course. Let us now consider the same situation described in English: people, sometimes perfect strangers, leaving the table after a meal and saying "Thank you" – puzzling? Well, slightly... At least to the degree which prompted the authors of the Berlitz phrasebook *Polish for Travellers* to offer the following comment about eating in Poland: "When people leave the table in Poland, it's a custom to say *dziękuję* (dzhehn**koo**yeh – thank you) to one another. They aren't thanking the cook or their host, but thanking each other for eating together." (Berlitz 1984: 40-41).

The Polish custom of saying "Dziękuję" at the end of a meal is a translational problem not only between Polish and English. Lewicki (1993) offers interesting comments on the rendering of this word (microtext) into Russian. Adapting his discussion of the Russian examples into English, we can say that regardless of whether the passage:

– Dziękuję! – Popławski podniósł się od stołu.

gets rendered literally (semantically, at the level of linguistic signs) as something like:

"Thank you," Popławski got up from the table.

or whether the translator adds a short explanatory phrase:

"Thank you for the company," Popławski got up from the table.

the text still betrays its foreign origin. It is only when the translator uses a non-equivalent microtext, when instead of "Thank you", he has Popławski say something like, "Well, I'll be going," i.e., when he employs adaptation, that the passage will look natural and not have any connotations of foreignness (cf. Lewicki 1993: 45-46).

Of course, there will be cases where the source-language microtext is really equivalentless, and where the translator's best choice will be to omit the text altogether. For instance, the Russians are apparently apt to utter all sorts of jocular congratulatory phrases on the occasion of some totally irrelevant events, phrases which when translated into English or Polish, would sound puzzling or idiotic, or they would have some very odd undertones. One of such expressions is "С покупкой!" (literally: With [a/the/your] purchase!) (Lewicki 1993: 96). Going beyond the semantics of the words, this expression would mean something like "Congratulations on your purchase!", but will this phrase be interpreted correctly? Let us imagine that we have a book set in the 1960s, 1970s, or 1980s in the Soviet Union, with a scene in which two neighbours meet in front of their block of flats. One of them is returning from the corner shop with a jar of jam. After the obligatory exchange of greetings, the conversations turns to the purpose of the first neighbour's going out, the information about the visit to the shop and about the jam is duly provided, at which point the second neighbour says "Gratulacje z okazji zakupu!" ["Congratulations on your purchase!"]. The problem is that if a Pole of my generation (or older) read this, I am fairly sure, we would probably assume that the expression in question referred to the scarcity of jam in the shops, but we would be dramatically wrong. The shortages of various goods under socialism notwithstanding, pragmatically, this phrase is really only a kind of acknowledgement which could probably be rendered simply by means of "Aha" or a similar noncommittal exclamation. As far as rendering it into English is concerned, perhaps "Good for you!" would be an adequate translation, provided that the jocular nature of this utterance is understood.

Which leads us back to the general problem of cultural untranslatability and of cultural elements in translation.

2. Various classifications of culture-specific elements

It must be remembered that the notion of cultural elements or culture-specific language items includes also elements related to nature rather than culture, but it is nature as reflected in a given language and culture.

According to Vlahov and Florin (1980), culture-specific words and phrases (actually, the authors prefer to call them realia), can be classified into the following categories (the original examples were in Russian; many were internationalisms, and I have taken a few of those and given them in English; I have copied and/or transliterated a few less common Russian words, and I have added a few English and Polish examples):

A. Geographical realia:
Names of objects connected with physical geography and meteorology: e.g., *steppe, prairie, pampa, Puszta, fjord, wadi, samun* or *simoom, the mistral, tornado*.
Names of objects connected with man's activity: e.g., *polder, grid, aryk* ("a small aqueduct for the irrigation of farmland"), *chaltyk* ("a rice field").
Names of endemic species: e.g., *kiwi, the Abominable Snowman, Yeti, sequoia*.

B. Ethnographical realia
Daily life
food and drinks: *pie, spaghetti, empanadas, bigos, knedle, mate, kumis, cider*; places for eating: *tavern, saloon, drug-store, bistro, brasserie*;
clothing etc.: *kimono, sari, sarong, moccasins, sombrero, jeans*;
places and furniture: *yurta,, igloo, wigwam, bungalow, hacienda*;
transportation: *rickshaw, troika, palanquin* (*litter* / *sedan chair*), *pirogue*;
others: (Polish) *sanatorium, dom wczasowy*.
Work:
people: *farmer, gaucho, concierge, fellah*, (Polish) *przodownik pracy*;
tools: *machete, boomerang, lasso*;
organization of work: *kolkhoz, ranch, latifundium*.
Art and culture:
music and dances: *kozachok, krakowiak, tarantella*;
instruments: *balalaika, tamtam, gusle, castanets, banjo*;

folklore: *saga, runes, qasida*;
theatre: *kabuki, noh, happening, commedia dell'arte, Harlequin / Arlecchino, Colombina, Pulcinella / Punchinello*;
other arts: *ikebana, Makonde art, Chinte*;
performers: *Minnesingers* / *Minnesänger, troubadour, skald, bard, geisha*;
customs: *vendetta, Ramadan, Śmigus-Dyngus*;
holidays: *Easter, Christmas*;
games: *baseball, cricket, tarot*;
mythology: *Santa Claus, trolls, Valkyrie, elves, gnomes, Baba-Yaga, werewolf, жар-птица = zhar-ptitsa* ("the Fire-bird");
cults: *lama, bonze, Huguenots, Mormons, Quakers, dervish*; buildings and objects connected with religious cults: *mosque, pagoda, church, synagogue, hermitage, crucifix, prayer wheel*.

Ethnic characterizations:
ethnonyms: *Apache, Navajo, Bantu, Hutsuls, Copts*;
ethnic slurs: *кацап / kacap* ("Ukrainian / Polish derogatory term for a Russian"), *Cockney; bosch, Fritz, Jerry, Kraut; Jap, Nip; Cholo, Dago; Polack; Gringo; Yankee*;
names of people according to their place of residence: *Berliners, Londoners, Mancunians* ("the inhabitants of Manchester"), *Liverpudlians* or *Scousers* ("the inhabitants of Liverpool"), *Cariocas* ("the inhabitants of Rio de Janeiro").

Measures and money:
units of measure: *inch, foot, yard, mile, kilometre, acre, hectare, pint, quart, gallon*;
money: *lev, stotinka, rouble, kopeck, złoty, grosz*;
colloquial names of banknotes and coins: *twopence, threepence, dime, nickel*.

C. Realia connected with politics and society

Administrative and territorial organisation / structure:
administrative and territorial units: *губерния = guberniya* ("a major administrative subdivision of the Russian Empire, a governorate, or a province"), *state, county, borough*; *region, province; department, arrondissement, canton; principality*; *prefecture* (in Japan); *województwo, powiat* (in Poland);
local settlements: *аул = aul* ("a fortified village in the Caucasus"), *станица = stanitsa, хутор = khutor*; *bidonville, favela*;
details of a settlement: *bazaar, souk, promenade*.

Authorities (institutions and people):

institutions: *National Assembly*, *the House of Commons*, *the House of Lords*, *Bundestag*, *Storting* / *Stortinget* (Norway), *Folketing* / *Folketinget* (Denmark), *Riksdag* / *Riksdagen* or *Sveriges riksdag* (Sweden), *Eduskunta* (Finland), *Knesset* (Israel), *the Cortes Generales* ("General Courts"; the Parliament of Spain), *Duma* (Russia); *Sejm* (Poland), *Senate*;

people: *Chancellor, Khan, Czar, Shah, Sultan, Doge, Pharaoh, Lord Mayor, sheriff, vizier, alcalde, satrap*;

Social and political life:

political activity and activists: *the Bolsheviks, Trockyists, Peronists, Tupamaros, Ku Klux Klan, Whigs, Tories, Roundheads, Presbyterians, Independents, Levellers*;

patriotic and civic movements and their members: *partisans, hayduts* ("freedom fighters and sometimes robbers mainly in the Balkans"), *the Carbonari, the Maquis, klepths* ("brigands and anti-Ottoman insurgents in Greece and Cyprus"); *Occidentalists, Slavists, Slavophiles*;

social phenomena and movements (and their representatives): *Prohibition, publicity, business, military-industrial complex, New Economic Policy (NEP), lobby, lobbyist, Tifosi* ("fans of a football club or supporters of Scuderia Ferrari in Formula One"), *swingers, hippies*;

degrees and titles, forms of address: *docent, doktor habilitowany, nauczyciel mianowany, nauczyciel dyplomowany* (Polish); *zasłużony działacz kultury* (Russian → Polish); *knyaz / kniaź; prince, Graf* (German), *duke, earl, baron, lord, Mister, Sir, Madam, Herr* (German);

institutions: *Наркомпрос = Narkompros* (Народный комиссариат просвещения = People's [or National] Commissariat for Education, predecessor of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic), *Urząd Stanu Cywilnego* (Polish; "Register office"); *The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*;

educational and cultural institutions: *szkoła podstawowa, gimnazjum, liceum* ("primary school", "junior high school" and "high school", respectively, in Poland); *collège* and *lycée* ("junior high school" and "high school", respectively, in France), *college, madrasa, campus*;

social classes and castes (and their members): *nobility, bourgeoisie, merchantry*; *Junker, Junkerdom*; *Grandees of Spain* / *Grandes de España*; *Pariah* (*Paraiyar*), *samurai, fellah*;

class signs and symbols: *Red Banner, five-pointed star, the Star of David* (*Magen David*), *fleur-de-lis; the crescent, swastika, the Union Jack*; *the "Stars and Stripes"*, "*Old Glory*", and "*The Star-Spangled Banner*".

Military realia:

military units: *legion, phalanx, centuria, horde, cohort*;
weapons: *arquebus, musket, scimitar, yataghan, Katyusha*;
uniforms etc.: *chainmail, shako, pelisse, lanyard* ("a rope or cord fixed to the hilt of a sword and worn around the wrist"), *gymnasterka / gymnastiorka* ("a Russian military shirt-tunic");
military personnel (including commanders and rulers): *ataman, hetman, centurion, sebastokrator* ("venerable ruler", a senior court title in the Byzantine Empire), *Sirdar* ("an Indo-Iranian title of nobility, synonymous with *Amir*"), *Gardes-Marine, janissary, bashi-bazouk* ("irregular soldiers of the Ottoman army, adventurers noted for their disorderliness and lack of discipline"), *Feldwebel, dragoon, cuirassier, plastun / plastoon* ("a Cossack foot scouting unit").

(Cf. Vlahov and Florin 1980: 49-55)

Vlahov and Florin propose three more classifications of realia.
One is **place-based**:

a) on the plane of a single language, realia can be divided into
- native,with three subgroups:
  - *national* [cf. *samovar* in Russian, *lend-lease* in English, *concierge* in French, *Schnaps* in German, *spaghetti* in Italian, or *województwo* in Polish],
  - *local* [the authors illustrate this category by means of the "Russian" word *lautar*, which means a singer-musician from the then Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and
  - *microrealia* [as examples, the authors offer here the phrase *the 4th kilometre* and the word *Karlukovo*, both used by people from Sofia as a euphemism for "a mental hospital", because there is a famous psychiatric hospital around four kilometres away from Sofia and another one in the village of Karlukovo; in the same way the inhabitants of Łódź use the word *Kochanówek*][1]
- and foreign (*international*, which are known almost universally, such as *cowboy*, and *regional*, which may have crossed the boundaries of one country, but which are not fully international; eg. *kolkhoz* from Russian),

[1] Historically, the name was *Kochanówka*.

b) and on the plane of pairs of languages – into internal and external (for example, for the pair Norwegian and Polish, the word *fjord* is internal for Norwegian, but external for Polish, while the word *prairie* is external for both).

The next classification is **time-based**, i.e. realia can be **current** (e.g. Polish *wuzetka*) or **historical** (e.g. Polish *kontusz* and *żupan*). Additionally, the time-based classification can be combined with, or superimposed on, the place-based one, giving such categories as national-historical or foreign-current, etc.

Finally, realia could be classified according to the **translational procedures** used to deal with them, but this classification seems the least useful, as one word can be rendered by means of various translational procedures (Vlahov and Florin 1980: 56-77).

A slightly different classification appears in Newmark 1988:

Ecology
- Flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills: e.g. *honeysuckle*, *pomelo*, *avocado*, *common snail* (*helix aspersa*), *koala*, *panda*, *wallaby*, *sirocco*, *llanos*, *veld*, *tundra*, *selva*

Material culture (artefacts)
- Food: *zabaglione, sake*
- Clothes: *anorak, sarong, dirndl*
- Houses and towns: *chalet, low-rise, hacienda*
- Transport: *rickshaw, cabriolet, tilbury* ("an open two-wheeled carriage")

Social culture – work and leisure: *the proletariat; boules, pétanque*

Organisation, customs, activities, procedures, concepts
- Political and administrative: *the White House, Palais de l'Élysée, Hôtel Matignon, 10 Downing Street*
- Religious: *dharma, karma*
- Artistic: *Art nouveau, Jugendstil*

Gestures and habits
- "Cock a snook" ("to thumb one's nose", "to place one's thumb on one's nose with the fingers spread, and to wiggle the fingers back and forth as a gesture of derision"), spitting as a blessing, giving a thumbs-up to signal OK.
- (See Newmark 1988: 95ff and 103)

It might be added here in passing that several years later Newmark proposed a completely different classification, but it includes roughly the same terms; they are just organized differently:

Ecology – the geological and the geographical environment.
Public life – Politics, Law and Government.
Social life – including the economy, occupation, social welfare, health and education.
Personal life – food, clothing, housing.
Customs and pursuits (such as cricket and football).
Private passions – religion, music, poetry.
(See Newmark 2010: 175)

Of course, it will be seen immediately that many of the examples given above – and many other cultural words and expressions – are easily translatable, at least into Polish. For example, although the culture of the Wild West is both geographically and temporally remote from modern Polish culture, such words as *cowboy, prairie, Colt revolver, Winchester rifle, sheriff, (federal) marshal, wigwam, tipi / teepee, pueblo, tomahawk*, etc. have well-established equivalents because of the immense popularity of the western as a film genre. (If, however – for whatever reason – a country was isolated from this aspect of American culture, then those seemingly semi-international words might prove extremely difficult to translate into the language of that country.) On the other hand, it is also clearly visible that the list of cultural elements that might prove difficult to translate is far from complete.

Looking at the problem of culture-bound items from a more practical point of view, Hejwowski states that the following culturally marked words and phrases are likely to cause problems to translators: some proper names, words and expressions connected with the organisation of life in the source culture country (i.e. with the political system, the system of education, the health service, law, etc.), names and phrases connected with various customs and traditions (e.g., culinary traditions, customs connected with eating, festivities and rituals, the ways of welcoming and saying goodbye), quotations and allusions connected with the literature of the given source-language country (novels, plays, poetry, including poems for children, well-known songs, operas, operettas, musicals), allusions to the country's history and culture (music, film, painting, etc.) (Hejwowski 2004a: 71-72, 2004b: 128). Incidentally, in view of the complexity of the phenomenon of culture-bound items, Hejwowski rejects the term realia, which he says are mostly associated with daily life (2004a: 72).

3. Procedures for translating culture-specific elements

Culture-specific elements are obviously difficult to translate and may require more thought and work than plain language, but this does not mean that they are untranslatable. For one thing, it will have been observed that in numerous instances the problem is not so much with their denotation as with their connotations, that is, a given phrase can be rendered into another language fairly easily, but it will not evoke the necessary associations. For example, the Polish phrase "lub czasopisma" can be translated literally into English as "or magazines" or German as "oder Zeitschriften", but readers of the respective translations are not likely to recognize the reference to the words removed from the draft of an amendment to the Polish Law on Radio and Television, words which symbolize the corruption of Polish political life at the beginning of the 21st century (see Bogucki 2007: 21). As to how various culturally marked elements can be dealt with in order to produce a relatively comparable effect on the target-culture audience, let us look at some different approaches to this problem.

Hervey and Higgins, for example, postulate: "We shall use the general term **cultural transposition** as a cover-term for the various degrees of departure from literal translation that one may resort to in the process of transferring the contents of a ST into the context of a target culture" (1994: 28 – emphasis in the original). Generally speaking, translations can have a source-culture bias, or a target-culture bias, and the degrees of cultural transposition can be seen as points along a scale between the extremes of *exoticism* and *cultural transplantation:*

> Exoticism – Cultural borrowing – Calque – Communicative translation – Cultural transplantation
> (Hervey and Higgins 1994: 28).

Exoticism consists in importing grammatical and cultural features of the source text and may be one of the main reasons why readers read and like the given text / translation; for instance, Icelandic sagas deprived of the local colour would not be the same and would hardly deserve reading.

Cultural borrowing is transferring a source-text expression into the target text. It is different from the previous procedure, because it does not involve any adaptation. Words and phrases such as *Weltanschauung, 'langue and parole', 'joie de vivre'* are so well-established in a number of European languages that there is really no need to translate them. "Unless special consideration of style can be invoked, there is little reason not to render such terms verbatim in an

English TT. On occasion it may even seem perverse not to do so" (Hervey and Higgins 1994: 31). The authors add that this procedure can be used even with less common foreign words (in historical, legal, sociological or political texts), provided that the first time the foreign word occurs, it is defined properly in the target text.

Calque is a procedure which involves not single words, but phrases, and it consists in translating those phrases more or less literally into the target language. Thus if the source-text phrase 'cherchez la femme' gets rendered in the target text as 'cherchez la femme', then we are dealing with cultural borrowing; if, on the other hand, the phrase is translated into English as 'look for the woman', then this is a **calque** (Hervey and Higgins 1994: 33).

Hervey and Higgins's next degree of departure from literal translation is called **communicative translation**. The term comes from Newmark's model of translation (1982: 39):

SOURCE LANGUAGE BIAS — TARGET LANGUAGE BIAS
LITERAL — FREE
FAITHFUL — IDIOMATIC
SEMANTIC / COMMUNICATIVE

and it reflects Schleiermacher's dichotomy between foreignizing and domesticating translation as well as Nida's distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964: 159), but in fact it could be traced back to Cicero's division between translating as a translator / interpreter and as an orator, and is in turn reflected in similar dichotomies proposed by other translation theorists; for example, Juliane House (1977, 1997: 29) prefers to speak about overt and covert translation, Christiane Nord (1988, 1997: 47-52) distinguishes between documentary and instrumental translation, while Venuti (1995) uses such terms as resistant and fluent translation (after Pym 2010: 32-33; the first term in each pair refers to the more literal translation, i.e., translation which is closer to the original, whereas the second term in each case describes the freer rendering, i.e. translation which tries not to look like a translation).

In Newmark's words, communicative translation tries "to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original", while semantic translation presents, "as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original" (Newmark 1982: 39), and the former is really obligatory for rendering clichés, proverbs and stock phrases; thus although semantically the German and French notices "Bissiger Hund" and "Chien méchant" could be rendered as "Savage [or, Vicious] dog", communicatively they correspond to the English

sign "Beware of the dog!" and have to be rendered as such, unless there are specific contextual reasons for not doing so (Newmark 1982: 39, Hervey and Higgins 1994: 31-32).

The translator may have a certain problem with communicative translation of certain proverbs. As is commonly known, at least among polyglots, proverbs in different languages are often different, and sometimes there is no corresponding proverb at all in the target language for a given source-language proverb. For example, Hungarian has a proverb about morning rain: "Nem baj! Reggeli vendég nem maradandó". This means literally: 'Never mind! The morning guest never stays long', and there are no similar proverbial expressions in English or Polish, which makes fully communicative translation impossible. A literal translation may be misunderstood, unless the translator signals it by means of an introductory remark: "You know the proverb / the saying...", and the communicative paraphrase "Never mind! It'll soon stop raining" is acceptable, but readers will not be aware of the proverbial nature of the original utterance (Hervey and Higgins 1994: 32-33).

Cultural transplantation consists in replacing source-culture elements (for instance, names) with target-culture elements. For example, the famous series of comic strips about Tintin by Hergé features two similar-looking detectives Dupont et Dupond. In the English translations, they have become Thompson and Thomson (Hervey and Higgins 1994: 29) and in the Polish translations they are called respectively Tajniak and Jawniak.

Some advice for dealing with culture-specific language items can also be found in Mona Baker (1992). She does not focus specifically on culturally marked words and phrases, but rather discusses general procedures for achieving equivalence at word level in the case of various lexical gaps in the target language and culture, but obviously some of those gaps are connected with culture. Thus what Hervey and Higgins call cultural transplantation, Baker calls "Translation by cultural substitution". It should be pointed out, however, that although she defines it more or less in the same way ("replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target-language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader" – 1992: 31), her examples show that sometimes the source-culture item gets replaced not with a target-culture item, but simply with another source-culture element, one which the translator believes will be understood by target readers. For example, the Greek translator of A *Brief History of Time* by Stephen Hawking decided to replace Bertrand Russell with Alice in Wonderland and modify the whole introductory paragraph, because, apparently, Alice is better known in Greece than the scientist (Baker 1992: 31-32). Disputable as the translator's decision was in this case, it is certainly useful to re-

member that sometimes it is possible to replace a relatively unknown source-culture item with another, better-known source-culture item.

To quote an example of a somewhat less disputable replacement of an unknown source-culture item with another source-culture item, in Raymond Chandler's short story "Trouble Is My Business", the narrator signals his disbelief by saying "She blushed – and I have a dinner date with Darryl Zanuck" (Chandler 1977a: 8). Undoubtedly, there are some Polish readers of Chandler who are also film fans and who have heard of Darryl F. Zanuck, the famous film studio executive and producer, but perhaps the majority of mystery readers in Poland have not, and therefore Michał Ronikier decided to replace Darryl Zanuck in the Polish translation with Gary Cooper: "Zarumieniła się – Akurat! Tak jak ja jestem umówiony na kolację z Gary Cooperem" (Chandler 1977b: 6).

It might be added here that sometimes an unknown source-culture item gets replaced with an item coming from a different culture, but recognizable in both the source culture and the target culture. For example, in one scene of the Czech TV serial *Nemocnice na kraji města*[2] (1977-1981), dr Cvach (played by Josef Vinklář), an incompetent orthopaedic surgeon, tells his colleagues about the latest medical article that he read during the weekend and then adds that he presumes they have read it too, to which Dr Josef Štrosmajer (Miloš Kopecký), answers immediately: "Já ne, já jsem si celou neděli četl *Káju Maříka*" ("I haven't, I spent the whole Sunday reading *Kája Mařík*."). The reference is to the book *Školák Kája Mařík* by Felix Háj (the pen name of Marie Wagnerová, née Černá; 1887-1934), i.e. *The Schoolboy Kája Mařík*. This book (actually a whole series of books) is obviously well-known in the Czech Republic, but not in Poland, and therefore the translator or the dialogue editor of the Polish voice-over decided to replace *Kája Mařík* with *Winnetou* – the novel by the German writer Karl May, popular both in Poland and in the Czech Republic.[3]

A more detailed classification of translational procedures for rendering culture-specific language items is offered by Hejwowski (2004a and 2004b), who discusses nine such procedures.

The first is **reproduction without explanations**, i.e. copying the element from the original, occasionally with some spelling adjustments. Interestingly enough, in the English version of his book, Hejwowski uses the term *transfer* (2004b: 136), but in the Polish text he argues that this operation should not be

[2] English: Hospital at the End / Edge of the City, written by Jaroslav Dietl and directed by Jaroslav Dudek.

[3] Another good choice would have been the book *Dzieci z Bullerbyn* (Swedish: *Alla vi barn i Bullerbyn*, English: *The Six Bullerby Children*) by the internationally known Swedish writer Astrid Lindgren.

called *transfer*, because transfer would be purely mechanical, whereas reproduction can involve some small changes in the spelling of the word, and if the SL uses a different alphabet or non-alphabetic writing, it necessarily involves transliteration or transcription (2004a: 76).[4]

This procedure corresponds to "*l'emprunt"*, literally 'borrowing', the first of the seven translational procedures listed by Vinay & Darbelnet, and, as the authors point out, in the case of culture-specific language items, *l'emprunt* can be used not only when there is a lexical gap in the target language, but also when the translator wants to retain a specific item for local colour. In time, many of such words will become part of the standard vocabulary of the language; e.g. *datcha* and *apparatchik* from Russian, or *tequila* and *tortilla* and from Spanish (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995: 32).

As far as some literary examples involving reproduction are concerned, Hejwowski says that translating Namba Roy's novel *Black Albino*, he was able to preserve all the Jamaican words, such as *bakra* ('white people'), *pikni* ('a child') and *asunu* ('an elephant'), presumably because the context made it clear what they meant (Hejwowski 2004b: 136). Also the Polish translator of Michael Crichton's novel *Congo* retained the Bantu words in the Polish version; the original says:

> "No men come here," the headman said. "This is *kanyamagufa*."
> "Then what crushes the skulls?"
> *"Dawa*," the headman said ominously, using the Bantu term for magical forces. "Strong *dawa* here. Men stay away."
> (Crichton 1981: 3)

The Polish text reads:

> – Ludzie tu nie przychodzić – padła odpowiedź. – To jest *kanyamagufa*.
> – Więc kto rozbija czaszki?
> – *Dawa* – odparł złowieszczo tragarz, używając słowa określającego w języku Bantu "magiczną potęgę". – Tu silna *dawa*. Ludzie zostać.
> (Crichton 1994: 15)

[4] In transliteration, each **letter** of the foreign word is replaced with a native-alphabet letter, whereas transcription involves the replacement of each **sound** of the foreign word with a native-alphabet letter; for example, the surname of the renowned Russian translation theorist Фёдоров (in standard spelling without accents written as Федоров) appears in Polish as Fiodorow (transcription), and in English as Fedorov (transliteration; fairly remote from the Russian pronunciation of this surname).

On the other hand, Polish readers of Martin Amis's novel *Money* are not likely to know what the translator meant by the word *palimonia* (after Hejwowski 2004b: 136), because, unfortunately, the word is simply meaningless. It is evidently based on the word *palimony*, which is a blend of *pal* and *alimony* and which means "An allowance for support made under court order and given usually by one person to his or her former lover or live-in companion after they have separated" (*The Free Dictionary*[5]), but in Polish, the first part evokes associations with impalement rather than with friendship (the word *pal* means "a long wooden pole or stake"), and the part *alimonia* does not evoke any associations at all (the Polish equivalent of *alimony* is *alimenty*).

The second procedure is **reproduction** (or transfer – see the argument above) **with explanation**, for instance, in the form of a footnote, or incorporated into the main text. Regardless of how it is provided, it is important that the explanation be kept short; otherwise the text begins to lose its basic character and turns into a handbook of the "source-culture life and institutions" (Hejwowski 2004b: 137). Incidentally, Mona Baker in her list of procedures for achieving equivalence at word level refers to those two procedures as "Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation", and illustrates the first by means of the phrase "the Cream Tea expert" which got rendered into German as "'Cream-Tea'-Experten", and the second one by means of the word *cap* (referring to plastic caps for covering the hair to increase the effectiveness of hair treatment) – hardly a culturally marked term, but apparently difficult to render into Arabic, so that the translator reproduced the word and added an explanation: (back-translated from Arabic) "the hair is covered by means of a 'cap', that is a plastic hat which covers the hair" (please note that the borrowed words frequently appear in inverted commas). It is worth adding here that once the translator has explained the borrowed word the first time it occurs in the text, later on he/she can use reproduction without explanations (Baker 1992: 34-36).

The next procedure is **syntagmatic** ("literal") **translation without explanations** (Hejwowski 2004a: 78). For example, in *Through the Looking-Glass*, Alice says: "But it certainly *was* funny [...] to find myself singing 'Here we go round the mulberry bush'" (Carroll 1998: 167). Słomczyński renders the title of this children's song and game simply as "Wokół drzewa morwy tańczymy w krąg" (Carroll 1972b: 53) and Stiller as "Wokół krzaku morwy idziemy w tan!" (Carroll 1990b: 145), because the context makes it clear that this is a song.[6] On the other hand, when Eeyore says in *Winnie-the-Pooh*: "Gaiety. Song-and-dance.

[5] http://www.thefreedictionary.com/palimony [accessed 8 September 2013].

[6] Incidentally, Jolanta Kozak replaced the song with "Chodzi lisek koło drogi" (Carroll 1997b: 60).

Here we go round the mulberry bush." (Milne 1980: 65), the context is not that obvious, and hence the syntagmatic translation by Irena Tuwim "Szaleństwo. Śpiew i taniec... Ot, przechadzamy się teraz wśród morwowych krzewów..." (Milne 1962: 64) is somewhat obscure.[7] Analogously, when "Ploughman's lunch with Stilton" becomes "obiad oracza ze stiltonem" (from the Polish translation of the novel *Nice Work* by David Lodge), Polish readers can probably guess that the phrase in question refers to some kind of food, but its significance escapes them (Hejwowski 2004b: 138). Similarly, many English-speaking readers might misunderstand the significance of the syntagmatic translation of the sentence "Piotr nie żyje, zabity na ulicy w grudniu siedemdziesiątego roku" (from the novel *Weiser Dawidek* by Paweł Huelle) as "Piotr was killed in the street in December 1970", because they may lack the necessary knowledge of Polish history (Hejwowski 2004a: 78, 2004b: 139). Also Mona Baker reports an interesting example of syntagmatic mistranslation: in Britain, the size of a house or a flat is typically discussed in terms of the number of bedrooms; in Switzerland – in terms of the total number of rooms; Consequently, when Lady Bracknell's neutral question about Jack's country house "How many bedrooms?" from *The Importance of Being Earnest* by Oscar Wilde got rendered into German as "Wieviel Schlafzimmer?", the text was misunderstood to contain sexual innuendo (Baker 1992: 239). Clearly, in some cases, syntagmatic translation without explanations can be as unintelligible or as misleading as reproduction without explanation.

It is perhaps safer to use **syntagmatic translation with explanation**. For example, the line "Wrona orła nie pokona" from *Raport o stanie wojennym* by Marek Nowakowski was translated into French as "Le corbeau ne vaincra pas l'aigle", and the translator provided a footnote explaining the significance of "Le corbeau" (technically, it should be "la corneille"; nor was the footnote fully precise, but on the whole the explanation was acceptable). Also the English translation of "Wrona orła nie pokona" – "CROW may try but eagle flies high"[8] – had a footnote, again not fully precise, but on the whole acceptable (Hejwowski 2004a: 79).

The fifth procedure (with somewhat limited availability) is **using an established equivalent** (of course, if there is one). When the already mentioned novel *Weiser Dawidek* by Paweł Huelle mentions "wizerunki Czarnej Madonny", it seems only natural to render this phrase as "pictures of Black Madonna" (even

[7] Monika Adamczyk replaced the original song with "Mało nas, mało nas do pieczenia chleba" (Milne 1986: 59).

[8] It will be observed that, strictly speaking, this is not a syntagmatic translation; evidently, the translator decided that in this case rhyme was more important than the literal meaning.

though one English dictionary refers to it as the statue...). Similarly, if a foreign book was translated into the target language, then the translator should use the established title. Of course, the translator may face an additional problem, when the given book was translated more than once and if it is known under two or more titles. In some cases, the decision may be relatively simple – thus *Kubuś Puchatek* will always be preferred over *Fredzia Phi Phi* (as the equivalent of *Winnie-the-Pooh*) – but in some, the choice may be a bit more complex: for example, should Shakespeare's play *Love*'*s Labour*'*s Lost* be referred to in Polish as *Stracone zachody miłości* (Leon Ulrich's traditional version) or as *Serc starania stracone* (Maciej Słomczyński's alliterative translation)? (Cf. Hejwowski 2004a: 79).

Similarly, when someone decides to translate *Night of the Jabberwock*, a brilliant murder mystery by Fredric Brown (1983) into Polish, they will have to make a decision as to how to render the name of the creature which Brown borrowed from Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*. Should the translator borrow from Maciej Słomczyński and write *Noc Dżabbersmoka* (see Carroll 1972b: 22) or from Robert Stiller and render the title as *Noc Żabrołaka* (Carroll 1990b: 123-124)? Or maybe he or she should refer to Stanisław Barańczak (1993: 362) or Jolanta Kozak (1997b: 22-24) and use such titles as *Noc Dziaberłaka* or *Noc Dziaberlaka*, respectively? Or maybe the translator has access only to the translation by Antoni Marianowicz and Hanna Baltyn (Carroll 2005) and Brown's novel will appear as *Noc Dziwolęka*?[9] And possibly he or she might not be allowed to use some of these names for copyright reasons?

The situation may be even more difficult with titles of films. Generally, films are referred to by the title of their first cinema release in the given country. Unfortunately, quite a number of films were given idiotic titles, which have little to do with the plot of the film or with anything. For example, in 1955 Kirk Douglas starred in an André De Toth western entitled *The Indian Fighter*. This phrase refers to the fact that the protagonist once fought Indians, and therefore it should have been translated into Polish as *Pogromca Indian*. Unfortunately, the original title was misinterpreted by someone to mean "an Indian warrior" and was rendered as *Indiański wojownik*. Any reference now to Kirk Douglas playing *The Indian Fighter* is likely to put a knowledgeable translator in a quandary: should he/she use the misleading Polish title and run into problems with details

[9] Some other translations of "Jabberwocky" that I have seen would give us *Noc Żubrowołka* (Juliusz Wiktor Gomulicki), *Noc Bełkotliszka* (Aleksy Schubert), and *Noc Dżabrokłapa* (Bogumiła Kaniewska).
See http://home.agh.edu.pl/~szymon/jabberwocky.shtml [accessed 8 September 2010].

of the plot, or should he/she correct the idiotic mistake and run the risk of the title not being recognized? Perhaps a solution would be to use the correct title and to add a footnote providing the original title and an explanation: "Known in Poland under the erroneous title …"

To cite another famous example from that decade: the 1958 film *The Horse's Mouth*, the title of which refers to the popular English idiom, was shown in Poland as *Koński pysk*. This rendering caused quite a stir at the time the film was shown in our cinemas: numerous people who had seen it wrote to daily newspapers and film magazines and asked what the title referred to (the film did not feature a single horse). If a history of British cinema now (or a biography of one of the actors) mentions the film and states that it is based on the novel by Joyce Cary of the same title, the translator faces an additional problem, because the novel itself is known in Poland under the correct title *Z pierwszej ręki*.

Of course, the translator has to be aware of the existence of an established equivalent, which is not always the case. For example, in the Polish translation of the novel *Brandbilen som försvann* (literally *The Fire Engine That Got Lost*; the Polish title is *Jak kamień w wodę*) by Maj Sjöwall and Per Wahlöö, Martin Beck is reading Raymond Chandler's *Lady in the Lake*, referred to as *Kobieta w morzu* (Sjöwall and Wahlöö 1990: 41). One of the problems is that the Swedish word *sjö* can mean both "sea" and "lake", but another problem is that Chandler's novel is known in Polish as *Tajemnica jeziora*. In the novel *Ostatnia bitwa templariusza* (*La piel del tambor*) by Arturo Pérez Reverte, translated by Joanna Karasek, the protagonist mentally compares one of the characters to a dog from the film *Dama i włóczęga* (Reverte 2003: 297), which is a nice literal translation of *The Lady and the Tramp*, except that that 1955 Walt Disney animated film was shown and is known in Poland as *Zakochany kundel*. There are, unfortunately, more examples like these, but they will not be quoted here for reasons of space.

The sixth procedure is **using a functional equivalent**. For example, the translator of *Nice Work* by David Lodge replaced the reference to "Debbie's cockney accent" by the phrase "Debbie powtarza w kółko «no» i «kurde»", which probably tells Polish readers more about Debbie's social class and background than any literal translation would. In contrast, the translator of *Therapy* by the same writer translated the phrase "had a Cockney accent" as "mówił jak cockney" (Hejwowski 2004a: 81-82, 2004b: 140-141), which is both slightly misleading and really empty: misleading, because "he spoke / talked like a Cockney" does not mean exactly the same as "he had a Cockney accent", and empty, because the word *Cockney* is not Polish and is not widely known outside the circles of students and graduates of what used to be called English philology and is now usually referred to as English Studies.

Choosing a functional equivalent, translators must be careful to avoid elements which are strongly connected with the target culture or third culture. A few years ago one of my students translated a text (a fragment of a novel) which stated that a character admired the hostess of an American talk show unknown in Poland and that she watched all the shows. My student wrote that the character was hooked on Ewa Drzyzga's "Rozmowy w toku", and did not see the strangeness of the situation in which an American viewer in the United States would be hooked on a Polish talk show. She said that she wanted to give the Polish reader an idea of what the character liked (and – indirectly – what she was like) and that the American name of the hostess would be meaningless to Poles. I agreed, but I explained to her that she should have replaced the unknown American talk show with one known, like *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, or *The Jerry Springer Show*, both of which had been broadcast in Poland.

Similarly, if a character in an English novel says that "Rome was not built in a day, nor in a year" (for instance, David Copperfield's aunt in Chapter 44 of Dickens's novel – 1981: 706), it would be unnatural for the Polish translator to have her say in Polish "Nie od razu Kraków zbudowano" (a functional equivalent of the English idiom; fortunately, Wila Zyndram-Kościałkowska translated that proverbial line as "Rzym nie od razu zbudowany został" – Dickens 1987, Vol. 2: 169). And obviously when the original English text talks about someone *losing money hand over fist*, the translator cannot use the Polish idiom *wyjść na czymś jak Zabłocki na mydle*, because the idiom contains a surname which is recognizably Polish.[10] As for the third culture, Hejwowski reports that the French translator of *Raport o stanie wojennym* replaced *ruskie pierogi* by *ravioli*, clearly an Italian dish, which evokes wrong associations in the minds of the readers (Hejwowski 2004a: 82, 2004b: 141).

The seventh procedure is **using a hyperonym**, i.e. a superordinate word. For example, the translator of David Lodge's *Therapy* rendered a reference to "O-level examinations" as "egzaminy «O-level»" and provided an explanatory footnote (reproduction with explanation). The translator of Lodge's *Nice Work*, on the other hand, instead of explaining the British educational system, simply rendered "A-levels" and "O-levels" as "egzaminy" – an obvious case of undertranslation, but, since the exams in question do not play a significant role in the novel, the hyperonym is perfectly acceptable in the given context (Hejwowski 2004a: 82). It might be added here in passing that "A-levels" could also be translated by means of the functional equivalent "matura" or "egzaminy maturalne".

[10] This expression was actually used in the Polish voiceover to the western *Once Upon a Time in the West*, when it was shown on Polish TV in 1990.

The next procedure involves **using a descriptive equivalent**. Since there is no word in English to express the meaning of the Polish term *cichociemni*, the translator of *Raport o stanie wojennym* into English decided to describe them as "men who were parachuted into Poland during the Occupation". This procedure works best when the given word is used only once in the source text, as repetitions of a descriptive equivalent would sound rather awkward (Hejwowski 2004a: 82-83, 2004b: 142). In a sense, it can be said that a descriptive equivalent is reproduction with explanation minus the reproduction. Of course, the translator could have used other procedures; for example, the English Wikipedia transfers the term,[11] translates it more or less literally as "the Silent-Dark Ones" or "The Unseen and Silent" (the latter equivalent coming from the first book about the *Cichociemni*, published in England in Polish and in English in 1954), then explains it, and then, throughout the article, uses the transferred Polish term.

Let us consider two more examples. In Chapter 8 of the novel *Night Without End* by Alistair MacLean, the narrator says: "Miss Ross," I said. "From now on you are Mr Mahler's personal Gunga Din." (1979: 129). The reference is of course to the "regimental *bhisti*" (i.e. a "water carrier") – the epitome of a faithful servant and protector – from the poem "Gunga Din" by Rudyard Kipling (1983: 103-105 plus the endnote on page 404). The character of Gunga Din is not widely known in Poland, and therefore the Polish translator Mieczysław Derbień replaced his name with the phrase "anioł stróż" ["a guardian angel"] (MacLean 1977: 173), a fairly sensible descriptive equivalent in this case.

In the novel *Fear Is the Key* also by Alistair MacLean, at one point the narrator comments: "Contravention of the rules of the old southern hospitality. I know. Emily Post would have something to say about this." (MacLean 1971: 23). The problem is of course Emily Post, the popular American writer on etiquette. Theoretically, the translator could have used simple reproduction; I have tested that on my students and, although they did not know who Emily Post was, most of them guessed correctly from the context that she was somehow connected with rules of savoir-vivre. Alternatively, he could have used reproduction with explanation (incorporated into the main text, rather than added as a footnote, because the novel is a murder mystery and a thriller), but he chose a descriptive equivalent; the Polish text says: "Podręcznik dobrego wychowania miałby na ten temat niejedno do powiedzenia ..." (MacLean 1975: 34). Incidentally, it would not have been a good idea to use a functional equivalent, such

[11] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cichociemni [accessed 8 December 2013].

as Jan Kamyczek,[12] because, for one thing, this name is too closely connected with Polish culture (readers might wonder why a British national appearing before an American court of law would make a reference to a Polish name), and, for another thing, I have tested this on my students too, and it turned out that to the majority of them the name meant about as much as that of Emily Post.

The last procedure is **omission**, and it is last in both senses of the word, meaning that most translators, translation theorists and translation critics agree that it should be used only as a last resort. Thus the novel *Zły* by Leopold Tyrmand has lost most of its flavour in the French translation (*Zły, l'homme aux yeus blancs*), because the translator chose to omit extensive fragments connected with culture-specific elements, such as aspects of daily life in post-war Warsaw, references to the history of the city, etc. Even less drastic omissions, such as eliminating a single cultural allusion, can be considered a serious loss, because that single allusion can symbolize a whole world, a world which readers of the translation are then deprived of, a world which is then hidden from them. For example, when the translator of Antoni Libera's novel *Madame* cut out the phrase "Wyspiański na weselu Rydla", she made it impossible for her readers to see that very significant aspect of Polish literary history (Hejwowski 2004a: 83, 96-97, and 2004b: 142-143).

Obviously, omissions occur in translations not only from Polish, but also into Polish. For example, one of the most famous Polish translators from the French, Tadeusz Boy-Żeleński, was also famous for omitting various historical or literary allusions. Thus in his translation of Balzac's *Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes* (Polish: *Blaski i nędze życia kurtyzany*, English: A *Harlot High and Low*), the following characterization of the maid-servant:

> Elle était la soubrette la plus gentille que jamais Monrose ait pu souhaiter pour adversaire sur le théâtre... perverse comme toutes les Madelonettes ensemble, elle pouvait avoir volé ses parents et frôlé les bancs de la police correctionelle.

gets reduced to:

> Był to idealny typ subretki ... Kto wie, może okradła rodziców i otarła się o ławę policji poprawczej.

with the part about the actress Monrose and about the Madelonettes Convent omitted (quoted after Borowy 1977: 216). Boy-Żeleński also omitted the –

[12] One of the pen-names of Janina Ipohorska, the one she used for her books and articles on savoir-vivre; http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Janina_Ipohorska [accessed 8 December 2013].

somewhat obscure, it has to be admitted, but loosely understandable – references to "Ces journalistes ont été cause de Jocko, du Monstre Vert, des Lions de Mysore et de mille autres belles inventions" from the novel *Mademoiselle de Maupin* (cf. the French text of Gautier 1955: 31 and the Polish Gautier 1958: 61).

It must be remembered that omission is often not connected with the relative untranslatability of certain culturally marked linguistic items, but is caused by other factors – ideological, political or religious considerations. Mona Baker reports that several extensive fragments were omitted from the Arabic translation of the book *Arab Political Humour* by Kishtainy simply because they would be regarded as offensive by Arab readers. For example, one dot changes the Arabic letter R ر into Z ز. Arabic being based on a consonantal alphabet, the addition of such a dot changes the word *rabbi* ('my God') into *zubbi* ('my penis'). The story then goes:

> Some humble person married a rich widow with whose money he built himself an imposing mansion which he piously adorned with the legend, carefully engraved over the door,'Such are the blessings of my God' (*Hada min fadl rabbi*). The local wit hastened under cover of darkness to put matters right by adding the missing dot to change the hallowed phrase into 'Such are the blessings of my penis'.

As can be seen, the joke is perfectly translatable into its original language – Arabic – and yet, the subject being taboo in Arab culture, that passage got omitted and replaced with a different, much tamer, and much less witty joke (Baker 1992: 234).

One more interesting – albeit somewhat unorthodox – procedure for dealing with culture-specific language items can be found in the said Mona Baker. This procedure is **translation by illustration**. Apparently, it is not easy to translate the phrase *tagged teabags* into Arabic, so when Lipton decided to introduce tagged teabags onto the Arab market, instead of producing a long explanatory note, they simply provided Lipton Yellow Label tea packets with an illustration of a tagged teabag (1992: 42).

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, Newmark (2010) reduces the number of those procedures down to five major ones: the first of these is the simple transference[13] (the same as Hejwowski's reproduction or transfer) – thus *der Bundestag* remains *der Bundestag*, with possibly a change of the article into *the* in English or a loss of the article in Polish; the next one is using a TL cultural (i.e. a functional) equivalent – when the Bundestag becomes the German House of Commons; the third translational procedure is using a descriptive equivalent – the Bundestag becomes the Lower or the second chamber of (German) Parlia-

[13] Mounin writes about transference that it is the ideal form of translation, "if only we could understand it..." (quoted after Newmark 2010: 176).

ment; the fourth procedure is componential analysis, "which splits a cultural term into its core or generic components, which it shares with related terms" (and which therefore results in an extended descriptive equivalent: *Methodism*, a Christian religious faith, is then described as "*a nonconformist denomination deriving from the faith and practice of John Wesley and his followers*"); finally, Newmark's fifth procedure is providing a transonym, by which term Newmark means both an established equivalent of certain proper names: popes and saints (Ioannes Paulus II = Jan Paweł II = John Paul II), or geographical names (Napoli = Naples = Neapol, München = Munich = Monachium), and an invented equivalent of literary names with special connotations (when the town of *Wrottesley*, based on the root *rot*, becomes *Pourrisley* in French, *pourri* meaning "rotten"[14]). Newmark discusses also cultural footnotes as an additional procedure, and says that they are more valuable and more justified in scholarly literature, and much less so in popular writing (2010: 176-178).

4. Other aspects of translating culture-specific elements

Of course, the choice of the actual procedure to render a given culture-specific language item depends on several factors. First of all, it obviously depends on the actual item to be translated – on what it is and on its function in the given text. Then, to a certain extent, it depends on the translator: on his/her personal taste – because there is no denying that some translators display target-language bias and prefer domesticating strategies, while others show evident source-language bias and favour foreignizing strategies – and on his/her skills and abilities – some translators are visibly more skilled and may be more aware than others of the existence of certain translational procedures and of the possibilities of rendering the given item. The next factor which influences the translator's choice is the people who commission the translation and the degree of freedom they grant the translator. This may be partly connected with the type of text and the purpose of the translation. Finally, the translator's decisions will be guided by the general linguistic and cultural norms prevailing in a given community at a given time – in short, by the general situational context of the translation process (cf. Baker 1992: 31).

This brings us back to the role of the culture filter in translation. As was stated above, there seems to be little doubt that for some texts the cultural filter is more important than for others. For example, translators of children's litera-

[14] This comes from the novel *Coming from Behind* by Howard Jacobson.

ture tend to apply it more often than translators of other types of literature (at least, this was the case in the 20th century). Specifically, foreign names get omitted or polonized: thus the three sisters from the bottom of the well, Elsie, Lacie and Tillie, are listed only as "trzy małe siostry" ("three little sisters") by Maria Morawska (Carroll 1947) and get replaced by Kasia, Jasia and Basia by Antoni Marianowicz (Carroll 1988: 126); Słomczyński and Stiller leave the original names (Carroll 1972a: 78 and 1990a: 151, respectively), but Jolanta Kozak again replaces them with Wacia, Lucia and Tycia (Carroll 1997a: 79), while Bogumiła Kaniewska offers Ela, Lala, and, not quite Polish, Tila (Carroll 2010: 102); geographical references get omitted: thus Zofia Rogoszówna in her translation of *Przygody Piotrusia Pana* (Warszawa-Kraków 1913) omits virtually all the references to the fact that the story is set in England (after Adamczyk- Garbowska 1988: 90); similarly, the original Introduction to *Winnie-the-Pooh* says: "You can't be in London for long without going to the Zoo" (Milne 1980: ix); the Polish translation by Irena Tuwim says: "Każdy, kto przyjedzie do naszego miasta, musi koniecznie pojść do Zoologicznego Ogrodu" (Milne 1962: 6; back-translated: "Everybody who comes to **our town** must visit the Zoo"); specific foods get replaced with functional equivalents: thus *custard* becomes *krem*, *śmietanka*, or *budyń* (Carroll 1988: 20, 1972a: 17, 1990a: 39, 1997a: 13, 2010: 21, respectively), while *condensed milk* becomes *marmolada*,[15] and *słodka śmietanka* (Milne 1962: 26 and 47). (For more examples, see Adamczyk- Garbowska 1988: 80-93.)

It could also be hypothesised that while in the 1960s and 1970s translators tended to avoid foreign measures, weights, etc. and tended to replace those with native units, more recent translations retain the original units. For example, in Harry Harrison sci-fi story "Toy Shop" translated by Lech Jęczmyk and published in 1970, we read: "Ponieważ wśród widzów było niewielu dorosłych, a pułkownik 'Biff' Hawton miał przeszło metr osiemdziesiąt wzrostu, mógł więc widzieć wszystkie szczegóły pokazu" (Harrison 1970: 291), with the height of the Colonel expressed in metres. The same short story translated by Radosław Kot and published twenty-four years later has: "Ponieważ w tłumie było niewielu dorosłych, a pułkownik Biff Hawton mierzył ponad sześć stóp, dobrze widział każdy szczegół pokazu" (Harrison 1994: 33), the height of the Colonel being expressed in feet.

Another observable tendency seems to be that translators of murder mysteries and thrillers retain fewer culture-specific elements than translators of the so-called serious literature.

[15] At first glance, this rendering may look dubious and questionable, but the original is: "Honey or condensed milk with your bread?" (Rabbit asking Pooh; Milne 1980: 23).

For example, Mieczysław Derbień omitted both references to the American writer Damon Runyon in his translation of Alistair MacLean's *Night Without End*. In the first one, the narrator is discussing Solly Levin, a suspect in a murder case: "Solly wasn't a New York boxing manager, he was a caricature of all I had ever heard or read about these Runyonesque characters, and he was just too good to be true" (MacLean 1979: 95). What we get in Polish is: "Solly nie wyglądał na menażera z Nowego Jorku, takiego typowego menażera znad Hudsonu. Był raczej karykaturą menażera, był przeciwieństwem menażerów, o których czytałem w książkach. Był zbyt naturalny, aby mógł być prawdziwy" (MacLean 1977: 130). The second comment refers to another murder suspect: "Zagero bore no more resemblance to a boxer than Levin did to any boxing manager who had ever lived outside the pages of Damon Runyon" (MacLean 1979: 146). The Polish text says only "Zagero tak był podobny do boksera, jak Solly Levin do managera" (MacLean 1977: 195).

When MacLean writes about one of the characters in *Night Without End* that "He had a voice like a Dixie colonel too, the Mason-Dixon line lay far to the north of wherever he had been born" (MacLean 1979: 29), Derbień simply omits the whole reference (MacLean 1977: 35). Of course, it could be argued that it was his personal, rather than a general, tendency, but in another MacLean thriller, *Ice Station Zebra*, there is another reference to that borderline between the Northern and Southern United States: " "I'm sorry, Dr. Carpenter." The south-of-the-Mason-Dixon-line voice was quiet and courteous, but without any genuine regret that I could detect, as he folded the telegram back into its envelope and handed it to me" (MacLean 1963: 7), and this also got omitted in translation – this time by a different translator, Piotr Wolski – in the Polish version we read only: "- Przykro mi, doktorze Carpenter. – Głos miał cichy i uprzejmy, ale żalu w nim nie wyczułem. Schował telegram z powrotem do koperty i wręczył mi ją ze słowami: [...]" (MacLean 1990). Presumably, the reference would be retained in a scholarly book on the history of the Civil War.

Still, these are general tendencies rather than universal rules, and certainly not rules to be followed blindly. Even in murder mysteries or thrillers there is really no need to omit culture-specific references and/or to replace them with hyperonyms or with descriptive equivalents, because readers have access to various lexicons and encyclopedias (not to mention access to the Internet and all its resources) and can always check a vague reference or a quotation.

One more problem connected with culturally marked elements is that sometimes the translator himself or herself does not understand them. For example, Arkadiusz Nakoniecznik visibly did not understand the quotation from *Macbeth* in the novel *Trevayne* and thus made it impossible for his readers to really understand the passage. The original says:

> "What is that quote?" asked the President with slim humour. "'We three do meet again …' Is that it?"
> "I believe," said Hill slowly, still standing, "that the correct words are '***When*** shall we three meet again?' The three in question had forecast the fall of a government; they weren't sure even they could survive."
> (Ludlum 1989: 426)

"When shall we three meet again?" are the opening words of *Macbeth*, spoken by the First Witch (Shakespeare 1958: 1189), and "the three in question" who had forecast the fall of a government and who were not sure that they could survive are of course the three Witches. Unfortunately, in Nakoniecznik's translation we have the masculine form of the numeral *three* ("we trzech") and then a rather vague and somewhat misleading reference to "the three people who had forecast the fall of a government", which cannot really evoke any associations with the three Witches:

> – Jak to się mówi? – zapytał prezydent z niezbyt przekonującym uśmiechem. – „I znowu spotykamy się we trzech …" Czy tak?
> – Wydaje mi się, że słowa te brzmiały: „Kiedy znowu spotkamy się we trzech?" – powiedział powoli Hill, ciągle stojąc. – Tamci trzej ludzie przepowiedzieli upadek rządu. Nie mieli żadnej pewności, czy uda im się dotrwać do następnego spotkania.
> (Ludlum 1992: 452-453)

Also Martyna Pilsenko evidently misunderstood a culture-specific expression. One of the protagonists of the science fiction story "Memorare" by Gene Wolfe wants to make a career in TV, because

> "[...] they print your name on the toilet paper in the executive washroom. You think I'm kidding?"
> "Damn right I do." March opened his suit. "You've never set foot in the executive washroom."
> "Wrong. When I was talking to Bad Bill about the cooking show I had to powder my nose, and he loaned me his key. It's on the paper."
> March scowled, then chuckled. "And you used it."
> It got him the sidelong glance and sly smile he loved. "I'm taking the Fifth, Windy."
> (Wolfe 2007)

The expression "taking the Fifth" refers to the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and means that the person has the right to refuse to answer questions. In my opinion, the translator could have used simple syntagmatic translation without explanation: "Skorzystam z Piątej Poprawki do Konstytucji."

Alternatively, she could have used that plus an explanatory footnote. Also, she could have used a descriptive equivalent: "Odmawiam zeznań" (literally, "I refuse to testify"). But what we get from the translator is the phrase: "Biorę Piątkę, Windy" (Wolfe 2009: 489), which means roughly "I take five", and which does not really mean anything (I have tested that on several groups of my students).

I would like to present one more example of the translator not understanding a culture-specific element of the original. In the Polish translation (by Marek Cegieła) of the science-fiction novel *Lovelock* by Orson Scott Card and Kathryn Kerr, we find the following passage (Carol Jeanne is flirting with Neeraj in the presence of a little capuchin monkey called Lovelock, using all sorts of allusions):

> "Jak ona głupio próbuje utrzymać to w tajemnicy. Myśli, że ja nic nie wiem? Wskoczyłem na jej biurko i podbiegłem do komputera.
> „Eyewhay otnay ooze-yay ig-pay atin-Lay?", napisałem.
> Roześmiała się. […]
> – Lovelock twierdzi, że się domyśla, co nas łączy – oznajmiła."
> (Card and Kerr 1997: 235)

Of course, the line "Eyewhay otnay ooze-yay ig-pay atin-Lay?" is meaningless in Polish, because it is not Polish. It is English or, more specifically, a variety of English known as Pig Latin. The basic principle of Pig Latin is to cut off the front consonant, move it to the back of the word, and add the diphthong [ei]. Translated into standard English, the line reads: "Why not use Pig Latin?" Of course, translating Pig Latin into Polish might be tricky, but to leave it in English in the Polish text shows clearly that the translator simply did not know what he was dealing with here (my own humble suggestion would be to change the sentence into something like "Może użyjecie tajnego języka dzieci?" and then to precede each syllable with the syllable "ka", with the following result: "Kamo każe kau każy kaje kacie kata kajne kago kaję kazy kaka kadzie kaci?", which is based on a "secret" language used by children in Poland).

Two final issues – (1) In time, with a lot of translation going on between the languages, many culture-specific language items become less culture-specific and they stop becoming barriers to translating: they get borrowed (Polish words like *bigos* and *pierogi* have by now practically entered the English language), they get calqued, they acquire established equivalents. (2) In the case of some culture-specific elements an opposite process takes place: they become forgotten even in their source culture. As certain objects, problems, or phenomena disappear from our daily life, so do the words which denote them, and especially their connotations. Soon they become as obscure to the native speakers of the language as they were originally to foreigners.

Let us consider such objects as *sznurek do snopowiązałek, wyroby czekoladopodobne*, or *saturator* [a typically Polish type of a soda fountain] and *gruźliczanka* [the word resembles the name of a mineral water, but it is based on the word *tuberculosis*, in connection with the fact that the glasses in which the soda water was served were not disposable and were not rinsed very thoroughly] – the objects disappeared from our life long ago; the words still linger, but fewer and fewer people remember the associations which those words evoked (Bogucki 2007: 21-22). Also all sorts of allusions and quotations become forgotten. Who still remembers the source and the significance of "Sie panie częstują!"?[16] Who will remember it twenty years from now? The "winged words" of one generation mean little to the next one, and nothing to the one after the next.

Background reading

Adamczyk-Garbowska, Monika. 1988. *Polskie tłumaczenia angielskiej literatury dziecięcej. Problemy krytyki przekładu*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words. A coursebook on translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bogucki, Łukasz. 2007. *Zarys przekładoznawstwa dla studentów neofilologii*. Łódź: Wyższa Szkoła Studiów Międzynarodowych w Łodzi.

Borowy, Wacław. 1977 [1922]. "Boy jako tłumacz". Excerpted in: Balcerzan, Edward (ed.). 1977. *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu 1440 – 1974*. Antologia. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie: 209–227.

Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Florin / Флорин, Сидер. 1983. *Муки переводческие*: Практика перевода. Под редакцией Вл. Россельса. Москва: Высшая школа.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2004a. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2004b. *Translation: A Cognitive-Communicative Approach*. Olecko: Wydawnictwo Wszechnicy Mazurskiej.

Hervey, Sándor and Ian Higgins. (1994). *Thinking Translation. A course in translation method: French to English*. London and New York: Routledge.

House, Juliane. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Katan, David. 2009. "Translation as intercultural communication". In: Munday 2009: 74-92.

[16] From the Polish TV serial *Daleko od szosy*, directed by Zbigniew Chmielewski and starring Krzysztof Stroiński and Irena Szewczyk (1976).

Korzeniowska, Aniela and Piotr Kuhiwczak. 1994. *Successful Polish-English Translation. Tricks of the Trade*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
Koskinen, Kaisa. 2004. "Shared culture? Reflections on recent trends in Translation Studies". Target 16(1): 143–156.
Ladmiral, Jean-René. 1979. *Traduire: théorèmes pour la traduction*. Paris: Payot.
Lewicki, Roman. 1993. *Konotacja obcości w przekładzie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
Mounin, Georges. 1982 [1963]. *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
Munday, Jeremy (ed.). 2009. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
Newmark, Peter. 1982. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York and London: Prentice Hall.
Newmark, Peter. 2010. "Translation and culture (dedicated now to the dear memory of a fine translation teacher and translation critic Gunilla Anderson)". In: Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and M. Thelen (eds). 2010. *Meaning in Translation*. (Łódź Studies in Language, Vol. 19). Frankurt am Main: Peter Lang: 171-182.
Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating. With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, for the United Bible Societies (2nd edition).
Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St Jerome Press.
Prunč, Erich. 2001. *Einführung in die Translationswissenschaft. Band I: Orientierungsrahmen.* Graz: Institut für Translationswissenschaft.
Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1988. *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Translated and edited by Juan C. Sager and M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Vlahov and Florin / Влахов, Сергей и Сидер Флорин. 1980. *Непереводимое в переводе.* Под редакцией Вл. Россельса. Москва: Международные отношения.

Sources of additional examples

Barańczak, Stanisław (ed.). 1993. *Od Chaucera do Larkina. 400 nieśmiertelnych wierszy 125 poetów anglojęzycznych z 8 stuleci*. Selected, translated, and edited by Stanisław Barańczak. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
Berlitz. 1984. *Polish for Travellers*. Lausanne, Switzerland: Editions Berlitz.
Brown, Fredric. 1983. *Night of the Jabberwock*. In: 4 Novels by Fredric Brown. London: Zomba Books: 1-140.
Card, Orson S. & Kathryn Kerr.1997. *Lovelock. Trylogia o Mayflowerze – Księga I*. Translated by Marek Cegieła. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka:
Carroll, Lewis. 1947 [1927]. *Ala w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Maria Morawska. Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff.
Carroll, Lewis. 1972a. *Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Carroll, Lewis. 1972b. *O tym, co Alicja odkryła po drugiej stronie lustra*. Translated by Maciej Słomczyński. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Carroll, Lewis. 1988 [1955]. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Antoni Marianowicz. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
Carroll, Lewis. 1990a. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Wydawnictwo Lettrex.
Carroll, Lewis. 1990b *Alicja w Krainie Czarów. Po drugiej stronie lustra*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa "Alfa".
Carroll, Lewis. 1997a. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Jolanta Kozak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Plac Słoneczny 4.
Carroll, Lewis. 1997b. *Alicja po tamtej stronie lustra*. Translated by Jolanta Kozak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Plac Słoneczny 4.
Carroll, Lewis. 1998. *The Complete Illustrated Lewis Carroll*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.
Carroll, Lewis. 2005. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Translated by Antoni Marianowicz. *Alicja po drugiej stronie zwierciadła*. Translated by Hanna Baltyn. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
Carroll, Lewis. 2010. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów. Po drugiej stronie lustra*. Translated by Bogumiła Kaniewska. Poznań: Vesper.
Chandler, Raymond. 1977a. *Trouble Is My Business*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
Chandler, Raymond. 1977b. *Kłopoty to moja specjalność*. Translated by Michał Ronikier. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Crichton, Michael. 1981. *Congo*. New York, New York: Avon.
Crichton, Michael. 1994. *Kongo*. Translated by Witold Nowakowski. Warszawa: Amber.
Dickens, Charles. 1981. *The Personal History of David Copperfield*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin
Dickens, Karol.1987 [1889]. *Dawid Copperfield*. Translated by Wila Zyndram-Kościałkowska. Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Gautier, Théophile. 1955 [1835]. *Mademoiselle de Maupin*. Paris: Éditions Garnier Frères.

Gautier, Théophile. 1958. *Panna de Maupin*. Translated from the French by Tadeusz Żeleński (Boy). Warszawa: PIW.

Harrison, Harry. 1970. "Stragan z zabawkami" ("Toy Shop"). Translated by Lech Jęczmyk. In: *Kroki w nieznane 1*. 1970. Edited by Lech Jęczmyk. Warszawa: Iskry: 291-297.

Harrison, Harry. 1994. "Sklep z zabawkami" ("Toy Shop"). Translated by Radosław Kot. In: *Złote lata Stalowego Szczura*. Warszawa: Amber: 33-39.

Kipling, Rudyard. 1983. *Poems. Short Stories*. Moscow: Raduga Publishers.

Ludlum, Robert. 1989. *Trevayne*. New York: Bantam Books.

Ludlum, Robert. 1992. *Trevayne*. Translated into Polish by Arkadiusz Nakoniecznik. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Amber & Mizar.

MacLean, Alistair. 1963. *Ice Station Zebra*. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcet Crest

MacLean, Alistair. 1971. *Fear Is the Key*. London and Glasgow: Fontana / Collins.

MacLean, Alistair. 1975. *Siła strachu (Fear Is the Key).* Translated by Mieczysław Derbień. Warszawa: Czytelnik.

MacLean, Alistair. 1977. *Noc bez brzasku (Night Without End).* Translated by Mieczysław Derbień. Warszawa: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza.

MacLean, Alistair. 1979 [1959]. *Night Without End*. London and Glasgow: Fontana / Collins.

MacLean, Alistair. 1990. *Stacja arktyczna "Zebra" (Ice Station Zebra).* Translated by Piotr Wolski. Warszawa: Amber.

Milne, Alan Alexander. 1962. *Kubuś Puchatek (Winnie-the-Pooh).* Translated by Irena Tuwim. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.

Milne, Alan Alexander. 1980 [1926]. *Winnie-the-Pooh*. London: Methuen (A Magnet Book).

Milne, Alan Alexander. 1986. *Fredzia Phi-Phi (Winnie-the-Pooh).* Translated by Monika Adamczyk. Lublin: Wydawnicwo Lubelskie.

Reverte, Arturo Pérez. 2003. *Ostatnia bitwa templariusza (La piel del tambor).* Translated by Joanna Karasek. Warszawa: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA.

Shakespeare, William. 1958. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Ed. by G. B. Harrison. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Sjöwall, Maj and Per Wahlöö. 1990. *Jak kamień w wodę (Brandbilen som försvann).* Translated by Maria Olszańska. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Wolfe, Gene. 2007. "Memorare". Available from: http://will.tip.dhappy.org/blog/Compression%20Trees/.../book/by/Gene%20Wolfe/Memorare/Gene%20Wolfe%20-%20Memorare.xhtml [accessed 8 September 2009].

Wolfe, Gene. 2009. "Memorare". Translated by Martyna Pilsenko. In: *Kroki w nieznane Tom 4*. 2009. Edited by Mirek Obarski. Stawiguda: Solaris: 474 – 565.

Cognitive Approaches to Translation

Mikołaj Deckert

University of Łódź

mikolaj.deckert@gmail.com

Abstract: The chapter starts from differentiating between some of the different uses of the term "cognitive" – in linguistics, and as it may describe translation inquiry. My main focus is on Cognitive Linguistics, and its subfield known as Cognitive Grammar, the underlying explanatory construct being that of "construing conceptual content", i.e. selecting portions of conceptual content, organizing it in one of the countless available ways and coding that particular configuration in the form of linguistic expressions.

In addition to surveying the cognitive semantics tenets, I make reference to the arbitrariness-iconicity opposition, and discuss the implications of using Cognitive Linguistics to explain translation phenomena. The chapter talks in some more detail about two models that have been showed – notably based on examples from the English-Polish language pair – to yield precise, comprehensive and principled accounts of interlingual meaning construction. In the final sections the prospects of Cognitive Linguistics as it can benefit translation research are addressed.

Keywords: Cognitive Linguistics, cognition, conceptualisation, construal, iconicity, perspective, prominence, granularity, metaphor, image schema

1. Introduction

This chapter gives an overview of selected models of translation analysis that can be labeled "cognitive". One of the vital points to be made at the beginning is that the terms "cognition" and "cognitive" can be understood in a number of differently compatible ways. The focus here will be on approaches that use the descriptive tools developed within the enterprise known as Cognitive Linguistics – differentiating that enterprise from approaches to linguistic analysis that will be characterized as "cognitive" by virtue of the fact that they view language as a mental phenomenon, which is not a strongly discerning feature. That discus-

sion will, however, first be contextualized by talking briefly about the notion of cognition as it has been used in other frameworks to guide research in the process of translation.

2. The process of translation

Since Holmes (1988) introduced the map of Translation Studies where the theoretical problem-restricted subtype can either by process-oriented, product-oriented or function-oriented the cognitive aspect of translation as a process was viewed in terms of what mental activity the translator engages in while producing a target text.

An important line of research employed psycholinguistic empirical methods to look into bilingualism where tasks requiring subjects to translate were used. That research was not primarily meant as translational but it nonetheless shed light on translation and interpreting (cf. de Groot 1997). Another empirical approach makes use of an instrument originally developed in cognitive psychology – think-aloud protocols – where the subject, in this case the translator, is asked to talk about what is going on in his or her mind while performing a task, i.e. produce "concurrent verbalizations" (Krings 1986; Lörscher 1991; Jääskeläinen 1999). The insights into the cognitive processes obtained from protocols can then be complemented by keystroke logging data. Programmes such as Translog (Jakobsen 1999; Jakobsen and Schou 1999) make it possible to follow the process of target text production as manifested by the subject's keyboard activity, and then for instance see how much time the translator spends on a particular segment or how he or she introduces corrections. Yet more information can be obtained from eye-tracking (e.g. O'Brien 2006). This method consists in analysing the reader's (translator's) eye position and movement to ascertain where he or she is looking and where the fixation is higher than elsewhere (hot spots).

3. What is Cognitive Linguistics?

In this chapter the term "cognitive" is used in another sense, to talk about a way of approaching language. But even when used to talk about linguistics the notion of "cognitive" could be misleading. In fact it can be applied to designate approaches that are to some extent conflicting. Noam Chomsky's Generative Grammar (e.g. 1957, 1965) and its later proposals within Minimalist Program

(Chomsky 1995) can be described as a cognitive approach, too. In that line of inquiry language is viewed as a self-contained unit – a module, hence the notion of modularity theory developed by Jerry Fodor (1983, 1985) – that is autonomous from other cognitive capabilities of humans. A crucial element that helps us understand the formal perspective on language is that language reflects the reality – a claim that is opposed in Cognitive Linguistics. What is more the focus of investigations in formal approaches is on syntax rather than semantics because it is assumed that meaning is not necessarily the key since the structures of language are governed by a set of rules that are not correlated with meaning. The cognitive element of Cognitive Linguistics is that it highlights "the crucial role of intermediate informational structures in our encounters with the world" (Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007: 5). The way we interact with our environment cannot be fully accounted for without considering things like the composition of our bodies.

To outline how Cognitive Linguistics differs from the broader field of cognitive linguistics let us list some of the major features of CL:

- usage and experience-based – language structure is analysed empirically as shaped by actual language use, which makes it necessary to considered in analyses factors such as frequency, whether evidenced by corpora or elicited through experimental procedures. Also, no rigid distinction between competence and performance is posited which again is against the grain of the Chomskian approach;
- perspectival – language does not mirror the state of affairs in the world in an unmediated fashion and one of the parameters that are at play here is the relationship between the speaker and the object that is spoken of; Cognitive Linguistics often uses a visual metaphor in this place to talk about a viewing arrangement, i.e. the relationship between the vantage point of a viewer (conceptualiser) and what is viewed (conceptualised); the choice of a vantage point influences meaning and rules out the attainability of total synonymy between two different linguistic expressions;
- encyclopaedic – we produce and comprehend language samples we make use of vast resources of background assumptions expectedly shared by the addresser and the addressee; this allows our linguistic exchanges to be economical as what we explicitly code in the linguistic evidence is typically only a very small portion of what we de facto intend to communicate; That is why it is often hard to come up with an interpretation of an utterance without contextual information or access to the cultural assumptions the speaker originally envisaged as necessary for arriving at the optimum interpretation.

4. Construal

The features of language outlined above are closely related to the concept of construal proposed by Ronald Langacker within the framework of Cognitive Grammar, a subsection of Cognitive Linguistics. Construal can be characterised with the use of parameters like granularity, prominence and perspective.

Granularity – also referred to as specificity and resolution – is used to describe the level of construal's detail. A schematic scene like "A person performed an action" will have a number of increasingly specific elaborations like "A woman performed an action" → "Jane climbed a mountain" → "John's wife Jane ascended Rysy in July last year".

Prominence refers to the dynamics between the trajector-landmark alignment and profiling. As far as the first component goes, the trajector is defined as the element on which attention is focused and which is described or located with reference to the more stable, and often larger participant, known as the landmark. Profiling consists in designating a structure (profile) within a superordinate construction (base). Common profile-base configurations are "finger–knuckle", "hypotenuse – right-angled triangle". An example of how prominence is distributed could be an expression like "a butterfly on a branch" where the insect functions as the trajector, a smaller, and less stationary participant profiled against the landmark.

Perspective is about the relationship of the conceptualiser (metaphorically called the viewer) and the conceptualised (viewed) object. A vital element in this arrangement is the vantage point from which a scene is conceptualised. The import of the vantage point can be seen in the semantic distinction between "Come up into the attic" and "Go up into the attic" (Langacker 2007: 436) where the first utterance construes the speaker as positioned in the attic and the second one as positioned elsewhere.

Langacker's claim is that the linguistic expressions we use are a way of "construing", or packaging, conceptual content which as a means of imposing construal on a scene. An example would be conceptual content comprising elements such as a 250 ml glass containing 125 ml of liquid. The scene's participants and relations between them can be differently organised on the conceptual level and then packed in the form of a linguistic expression in a huge range of manners. Depending on the resolution level, the glass's colour and transparency or the type and temperature of the liquid can be characterized but they might just as well be referred to more schematically as merely "container" and "liquid". Moreover, different elements of the configuration can be profiled. We can draw the receptor's attention to the glass or to the liquid but, perhaps more consequen-

tially, we have the choice as to which of the halves that comprise the container's interior will be designated, i.e. whether the liquid-holding or the air-holding half is structured as more prominent. That the choice is consequential for the process of meaning construction can be well seen in the proverbial pessimist-optimist difference between "glass half-full" and "glass half-empty".

5. Between arbitrariness and iconicity

The reasoning behind the idea that different ways of mentally organizing and linguistically coding content differently impact meaning can be associated with the notion of iconicity. To begin with, Charles Sanders Peirce (1931/1974) made a distinction between three types of signs: an icon, an index and a symbol. In icons there is a physical resemblance between the sign and what it represents and the shared quality is there in the icon irrespectively of the object. Examples of icons are photographs and diagrams and linguistic expressions like "yeeees". Sample indices include a weathercock or an expression like "here", "that" or "you" in which one can experience a property that implies the object. As for symbols – signs such a flag or Morse code – there is no semblance between the sign and object it stands for and the sign denotes an object be virtue of being interpreted as denoting it.

As for linguistic signs more particularly, in traditional formulations they are taken to be arbitrary (Saussure 1916) in the sense that there is nothing X-like in linguistic item X. In other words, the signifier (the visual or acoustic manifestation) is not paired with the signified (concept) in any motivated fashion with the exception of onomatopoeic expressions and musical forms.

Cognitive linguists argue iconicity is common in language and can be observed on many levels of linguistic organisation. The view that language form itself contributes to meaning is at loggerheads with an approach known as "truth-conditional semantics" where the meaning of sentence is seen in terms of truth conditions under which that sentence is true. In that framework "John kicked the ball" and "The ball was kicked by John" would be considered to have the same meaning. In turn, according to the Cognitive Linguistics view, the meaning of those expressions is different as they differently construe conceptual content.

6. Using Cognitive Linguistics in translation inquiry

Cognitive Linguistics has been demonstrated to offer a useful set of concepts to explore translation. In the following sections I will outline two models that draw on Cognitive Linguistics to investigate translation – one proposed by Elżbieta Tabakowska (1993) and the other one, proposed more recently, by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010).

6.1. A Cognitive Linguistics approach to poetics of translation

Elżbieta Tabakowska (1993) uses the Cognitive Linguistics framework to investigate literary translation. Tabakowska's (1993: 74) point is that "the merit of cognitive linguistics is not that it makes great discoveries about the true nature of human language (and languages), but that it makes it possible to systematize people's old and empirically well-grounded intuitions". In her explorations she makes use of Ronald Langacker's (1987) "dimensions of imagery", or "construal operations" as they tend to be referred to more recently. In her view "equivalence in literary translation should be considered, and ultimately defined, in terms of poetics" (Tabakowska 1993: 3) and her formulation of poetics rests on Jakobson's (1960) proposal where it is the language's function to structure information in a text in a particular way. Tabakowska (1993: 72) talks of stylistic equivalence and competence which have to do with the translator being able to identify "(in both the source and the target languages) linguistic minutiae: subtle semantic differences on precisely the level of imagery dimensions".

Tabakowska (1993: 78-127) illustrates the functionality of CL in the translation setting by analysing a number of case studies devoted to how particular parameters work across languages.

6.1.1. Perspective

The construct is illustrated with a contrastive discussion of articles which according to Tabakowska (1993: 82) are the main linguistic device setting up the construal's perspective. As opposed to English, Polish uses no definite and indefinite articles, therefore when rendering a text from Polish into English and introducing articles in the process the translator narrows the scope of interpretation. The choice of article implies a vantage point from which the scene is viewed. The target variant can introduce the vantage point of the narrator "who

relates scenes that had been observed prior to the time of relation" (Tabakowska 1993: 78-79). Because the events are already determined, the definite article will be used. The second option is to introduce the viewpoint of "the 'innocent' reader" to whom they are not yet known (Tabakowska 1993: 79) and because the reader is learning about them only at this point, they are paired with indefinite articles, to generate a sense of recency.

Translational perspective shifts can also be exemplified with the analogy of presence and proximity (Tabakowska 1993: 83). In a story the narrator can use tense distinctions to differently position the vantage point. Tabakowska discusses this on the example of translation of Tadeusz Konwicki's "Kompleks polski". The source text employs present-tense narration which temporally aligns the moment of relating events with the events themselves, thus – as in the case of articles above – contributing to an atmosphere of urgency. Additionally, this construes the narrator as the object and the subject simultaneously. The target text, in turn, is narrated in past tense, which creates distance between the speaker's point of view and the object of narration. Tabakowska (1993: 84) argues that as a result of this alteration there is no source-target equivalence and the target audience are presented with "an altogether different novel".

6.1.2. Scale

The parameter of scale is elaborated on by discussing diminutives. They are a good example of systemic differences between Polish and English because the former has a rich inventory of suffixes to produce diminutive noun, adjective and adverb forms as opposed to the latter in which different resource have to be utilised for analogous purposes. Tabakowska uses the concept of prototype-based radial categories whereby some members of a category are better, more prototypical, instances of a category (are more central members) than others which will be more towards the category's periphery. In line with this, an eagle will be a more central member of the bird category than a penguin. With respect to diminutives, Tabakowska (1993: 101) argues, the central members are those signalling smallness, and she remarks that while even in the case of those prototypical uses some degree of interpretation on the part of the translator is necessary, the translator's task gets harder when dealing with meaning extensions, for instance when scale is openly construed non-conventionally as is the case where the original author conveys irony or evaluation (Tabakowska 1993: 101-110) by manipulating the construal's scale .

6.1.3. Salience

Tabakowska also uses the notion of radial categories to talk about the particle "to" in Polish as she illustrates salience modifications in translation. "To" draws the receptor's attention to the part of the sentence the speaker assumes to be the most prominent one in a given communicative situation (Ożóg 1990: 150) and it imposes a subjective speaker-based figure/ground configuration where figure is the participant on which attention is concentrated, i.e. the one that is located, evaluated etc. relative to the less prominent entity. Prototypically, "to" points to entities, in which instance Polish-English transfer is fairly straightforward. The less prototypical members of the "to" category are for instance those communicating emotional closeness, not just the more prototypical closeness in the physical sense. In Polish-English translation, once again the structural linguistic differences surface, making the translator's task potentially more demanding.

6.1.4. Metaphor

Tabakowska's explorations of translation also include the concept of metaphor. At this point it has to be pointed out that it is a key Cognitive Linguistics notion and that the Cognitive linguists have revisited the classical understanding of metaphor to see it as more than just a linguistic device or a stylistic embellishment typical of literary discourse. In CL it is postulated that metaphor is "a major and indispensable part of our ordinary, conventional way of conceptualizing the world, and that our everyday behavior reflects our metaphorical understanding of experience" (Lakoff 2006 [1993]: 186). Metaphor is defined as a mapping between domains – a source domain which is an abstract one and a target domain which is more tangible. In other words, metaphor is about making it possible to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 5). Some well known metaphors would be: LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR or KNOWING IS SEEING. Importantly, there is a distinction between a single metaphor like KNOWING IS SEEING, which is an association on the conceptual level, and then a wide range of metaphoric expressions derived from that mapping, such as "You see what I mean", "I see your point", "I can't see any difference", "The problem can be viewed in many ways". Pertinently for the translator, as a consequence of cultural variation some cross-domain mappings will not be analogous interlingually. While metaphors like GOOD IS UP will often work in similar manners across cultures, some mappings rely on concepts that are far from universally understood by speakers from different cultures. This is just one of the challenges that translation analysts have

addressed and all in all metaphor continues to be an important point where CL and Translation Studies converge (cf. Hiraga 1991, Samaniego Fernández et al. 2003, 2013)to begin.

In Tabakowska's account metaphor is seen as an aspect of construal and she pays attention to one more crucial CL concept, known as "image schema". Image schemas are a special type of concepts, "a condensed redescription of perceptual experience" that serves the purpose of reasoning about the surrounding world and organising our knowledge (Oakley 2007; Evans and Green 2006). Common image schemas are balance, blockage, container, counterforce, restraint removal, enablement, attraction, path, centre-periphery, cycle, near-far, part-whole, merging, splitting, full-empty. Tabakowska analyses metaphors utilising the CONTAINER image schema that has to do with the differentiation between the interior and exterior as well as a delimitation of those two. Tabakowska looks into how CONTAINER metaphors found in Emily Dickinson's poems are translated into Polish by Stanisław Barańczak. Her analysis shows that Barańczak makes some the original metaphors more conventional and modifies the source construal. While Tabakowska finds it problematic to suggest a single explanation of the translator's decision, she mentions his motivation might have been to retain a particular leitmotif, to treat each poem as a separate whole, or to secure some strictly formal features of the original poems.

6.2. Translation as reconceptualisation

One of the premises behind the model proposed by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010; see also Chapter 1) is that the relation between language and the world is not a direct one. Instead, that relation is mediated by "both linguistic and encyclopaedic knowledge, speakers' intentions, their expectations and preferences" (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010: 106). The model shares the cognitive principle that language users organise their experience differently and how this is accomplished is actually guided by the language they use, by the constraints of context and discourse and by the fully subjective choices of the speaker (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010: 106).

A key concept here is that of "re-conceptualization" used to describe the process in which the source language message is reconceptualised in a number of cycles before it is expressed in the target language. Translators first absorb the source message and re-conceptualise it. Then the "transduce the mental SL model they develop on hearing or reading the SL text into one in the TL, which they consider most suitable to the TL audience and, at the same time, most faithful to

the original, intentional meaning of the message". At that point, the target expression initiates yet another cycle of re-conceptualisation in the target audience.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010: 108) makes the point that "re-conceptualization is not only possible but unavoidable in translation, as it is dictated partly by the new construal parameters in the target language form, different context (...), but also brought about by subjective preferences of the translator in choosing particular target language forms (...)".

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's (2010) list of re-conceptualisation types is as follows:

1. conventional coding
2. conventional coding with different [subjective] construals
3. language-convention induced conceptualisation by language-specific (semanticised) syntax
4. shifting on the scale of negation
5. figure/ground organization of content
6. viewpoint shift
7. subjectification
8. iconicity of syntax and semantics
9. prototypical phraseological equivalents – different effects
10. instruments, utensils
11. social, educational, etc. structures
12. class-specific conceptualisation of pragmatic events
13. culture-specific onomatopoeia
14. proper names: domestication – foreignisation
15. cross-space re-conceptualisation of proper names
16. language/concept-specific word games
17. concept replacement
18. metonymy: activation of parts of one domain onto the whole domain
19. metaphorical sayings, proverbs, compounds: different source domains (conceptual content and profiling] in target language than in source language, mapped on identical source and target language target domains
20. axiological markedness
21. quantitative re-conceptualisation: decreasing the prominence of part(s) of the scenario

22. quantitative re-conceptualisation: changing the prominence [cultural convention/religious bias]
23. footnotes as lexical gap-fillers
24. digression as imposition of the translator's ideology
25. elimination of neologism – conventionalisation
26. neologism for neologism
27. extending background knowledge
28. re-conceptualisation as an effect of foreignisation
29. domestication – re-conceptualisation in terms of familiar context
30. re-conceptualisation of a lexicalised term into a term and definitional equivalent or substitution of a Latinate term into a native term
31. different metaphors – different conceptualisations
32. literalness and granularity: metaphor-simile
33. change in the mental image; retaining the conceptual field
34. intensification: addition of granularity
35. reconceptualisation by addition
36. simplification: schematicity.

On the whole, the model's postulate is that the product resulting from the cycles of reconceptualisation is "*a blend, a hybrid*" of the author's model of a scene or event and the target audience's model (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010: 143). The receptor's interpretation emerges online and, what is important, the dynamism of meaning is observable both in the source text and in new interpretations of the translation (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2010: 143).

Some of the other approaches employing the apparatus of Cognitive Linguistics in translation description are for instance Hejwowski's (2004, 2007) proposal to use the notions of verb frames, scenes and scripts (cf. Boas 2013). In turn, Deckert (2013) looks into patterns of construal reconfiguration in interlingual subtitling across the parameters of granularity, prominence and perspective. Similarly, Jankowska (2013) used construal operations in her contrastive analysis of audiodescription scripts.

7. Conclusions

Cognitive Linguistics provides us with a set of principles and constructs that can be used in systematic description of how meanings emerge. Vitally, then, the apparatus can be implemented in translation analysis to compare how conceptual content gets structured across languages. Such analyses presuppose the analyst's high linguistic competence (Tabakowska 2002) which is linked to an important feature of those investigations, i.e. their high level of detailedness which – though potentially problematic (Hejwowski 2004: 53) – makes the translator more aware that even apparently small source-target shifts are consequential. At the same time, this is not to say that shifts should be avoided at all cost. They will be justified by a number of constraints imposed on the translator – from technical limitations (e.g. in audiovisual translation) to the availability of cultural assumptions of source and target audiences, to ensuring that the target text is not ill-formed where no unconventional language use had been intended by the original author.

What is more, the vital realisation that Cognitive Linguistics promotes is that the mere consideration of conceptual content is insufficient for a comprehensive account of linguistic meaning. An investigation of the matter has to be supplemented with looking into the manner. Just as the 'meaning' of a painting, photograph or film depends on how objects and events are represented (cf. Tabakowska 1993: 129), often much more than the objects or events themselves.

Suggestions for further reading

I. Cognitive Linguistics

Evans, V. and M. Green (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ and Edinburgh: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Edinburgh University Press.

Geeraerts D. and H. Cuyckens (2007). (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geeraerts, D. (2006). (ed.) *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

II. Cognitive Grammar

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

III. CL and translation

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2010). "Re-conceptualization and the emergence of discourse meaning as a theory of translation", in B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen (eds.). *Meaning in Translation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 105-147.

Rojo, A. and I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2013). (eds.) *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation*: *Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tabakowska, E. (1993). *Cognitive linguistics and poetics of translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

IV. Cognitive Corpus Linguistics

Gries, St.Th. and A. Stefanowitsch (2006). (eds). *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and K. Dziwirek (2009). (eds). *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

V. Translation and cognition

Gutt, E.-A. [1991] (2000). *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

References

Boas, H. C. (2013). "Frame Semantics and Translation", in A. Rojo and I. Ibarretxte-Antunano (eds). *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 125-158.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Deckert, M. (2013). *Meaning in Subtitling: Toward a Contrastive Cognitive Semantic Model*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Evans, V. and M. Green (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ and Edinburgh: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Edinburgh University Press.

Fodor, J. A. (1983). *The Modularity of Mind: An Essay in Faculty Psychology*. Cambridge, Mass. The MIT Press.

Fodor, J. A. (1985). "Precis of the Modularity of Mind", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 8, 1-42.

de Groot A. M. B. (1997): "The cognitive study of translation and interpretation: three approaches", in J. Danks, G. Shreve, S. Fountain & M. McBeath (eds). *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications, 25-26.

Hejwowski, K. (2004). *Translation: a Cognitive-Communicative Approach*. Olecko: Wydawnictwo Wszechnicy Mazurskiej.

Hejwowski, K. (2007). *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Hiraga, M. (1991). "Metaphor and Comparative Cultures", in P. G. Fendos, Jr., (ed.) *Cross-cultural communication: East and west*, vol. 3: 140–66. Tainan, Taiwan: National Cheng-Kung University.

Holmes, J. S. [1988] (2000). "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies", in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 172-185.

Jääskeläinen, R. (1999). *Tapping the Process: An Explorative Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Jakobsen, A. L. (1999) "Logging Target Text Production with *Translog*", in Gyde Hansen (ed.) *Probing the Process in Translation: Methods and Results*, Copenhagen Studies in Language 24, Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 9–20.

Jakobsen, A. L. and Schou, L. (1999). "Translog Documentation." *Copenhagen Studies in Language* (24), 149–184.

Jankowska, A. (2013) Unpublished doctoral dissertation. „Tłumaczenie skryptów audiodeskrypcij z języka angielskiego, jako alternatywna metoda tworzenia skryptów audiodeskrypcji".

Krings, H.-P. (1986). *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lörscher, W. (1991). *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lakoff, G. [1993] (2006). "Conceptual Metaphor", in D. Geeraerts (ed.) *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 185-238.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2010). "Re-conceptualization and the Emergence of Discourse Meaning as a Theory of Translation", in B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen (eds.). *Meaning in Translation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 105-147.

Oakley, T. (2007). "Image Schemas", in D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (eds). *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 214-235.

O'Brien, S. (2006). "Eye-tracking and Translation Memory Matches." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 14 (3), 185–205.

Ożóg, K. (1990). *Leksykon metatekstowy współczesnej polszczyzny mówionej. Wybrane zagadnienia.* Kraków: Jagiellonian University.

Samaniego Fernández, E., M. Velasco Sacristán, and P. Fuertes Olivera (2003). "Translations we Live by: Metaphor Translation and Cognitive Innovation". In *8th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference*, 61-81.

Samaniego Fernández, E. (2013)."The Impact of Cognitive Linguistics on Descriptive Translation Studies: Novel Metaphors in English-Spanish Newspaper Translation as a Case in Point", in A. Rojo and I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (eds). *Cognitive Linguistics*

and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 159-198.

Tabakowska, E. (1993). *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Tabakowska, E. (2002). "Aspect and Tense in the Narrative: an English Original and a Polish Translation", in W. Oleksy (ed.) *Festschrift for Professor P. T. Krzeszowski*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 152-162.