## АВТОРСЬКИЙ ПОГЛЯД НА АКТУАЛЬНІ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ ПИТАННЯ

**УДК** 811.161.2
**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.17721/APULTP.2021.43.97-124

***Irina A. Chernukha***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9780-0877*
***Mariia G. Rozhkova***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0891-8225*

# ON SOME SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF TEACHING VERSATILE TRANSLATION AT HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS

***Abstract.*** *The general theory of translation is an interdisciplinary area, predominantly linguistic but also closely allied to psychology, ethnography, area studies, etc. It is based on the application of linguistic theory to a specific type of speech behavior, i.e. translation. Translation has a subject-matter of its own (the process of translation) and uses the data of contrastive linguistics merely as a point of departure. Translation may be viewed, as an interlingual communicative act in which at least 3 participants are involved: the sender of source information (the author of the SL message), the translator who acts in dual capacity – as the receptor of SL message and as the sender of the equivalent TL message and the receptor of the TL message (translation). In producing the TL text the translator changes its plan of expression (linguistic form) while its plan of content (meaning) should remain unchanged. That means, above all, that whatever the text says and whatever it implies should be understood in the same way by both the SL user for whom it was originally included and by the TL user. It is therefore the translator's duty to make available to the TL receptor the maximum amount of information, carried by linguistic signs, including both their denotational (referential) meanings (i.e. information about the extralinguistic reality which they denote) and their emotive-stylistic connotation. The Ukrainian legal terms such as післядипломна освіта "postgraduate education" and дошкільна освіта "preschool education" are both construed by means of affixation, or pre-fixation, to be more accurate.*

***Key words:*** *translation, analysis, interdisciplinary, subject-matter, correspondence, linguistic, message, extralinguistic, LSP-teaching, practitioner.*

***Information about the authors****: Irina Andriivna Chernukha – PhD, associate professor; associate professor of the department of foreign* *languages; Institute of International Relations; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.*

*Mariia Gennadiivna Rozhkova – PhD, professor of the department of foreign languages; Institute of International Relations; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.*

***E-mail:*** *irina.chernukha7@gmail.com ; mariia0021@gmail.com*

***Чернуха І.А.***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9780-0877*
***Рожкова М.Г.***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0891-8225*

# ПРО ДЕЯКІ ОСОБЛИВІ АСПЕКТИ НАВЧАННЯ УНІВЕРСАЛЬНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ У ВИЩИХ НАВЧАЛЬНИХ ЗАКЛАДАХ

***Анотація**. Загальна теорія перекладу є переважно лінгвістичною міждисциплінарною сферою, тісно пов'язаною з психологією, етнографією, країнознавством тощо. Вона базується на застосуванні лінгвістичної теорії до спеціального типу мовної поведінки, тобто перекладу. Переклад має власну тему (процес перекладу) та використовує дані контрастивної лінгвістики всього лише у якості своєї відправної точки. Переклад можна розглядати як міжмовний комунікативний акт, у якому залучено щонайменше три учасники: відправник інформації-джерела, перекладач, який виступає і у якості одержувача інформації-джерела, і як відправник еквівалентного повідомлення цільової мови, тобто перекладу. Відтворюючи тест цільової мови, перекладач змінює його план вираження (лінгвістичну форму), а план змісту (значення) має залишитися незмінним. Це означає, перш за все, що будь-який текст повинен бути зрозумілий і сприйнятий однаковою мірою як відправником інформації-джерела, так і одержувачем такої інформації. Таким чином, завданням перекладача є передача одержувачу інформації-джерела за допомогою лінгвістичних знаків, включаючи як денотативне значення (тобто інформацію про екстралінгвістичну реальність, яку вони позначають), так і їх емоційно-стилістичну конотацію. Все це повною мірою стосується викладання англійської як мови для спеціальних цілей. У статті наголошено на дефінітивній логіці розрізнення професійних термінів 'післядипломна освіта' / 'postgraduate education' та 'дошкільна освіта' / 'preschool education', що неоднозначно сприймаються у світовому науковому контексті.*

***Ключові слова:*** *переклад, аналіз, міждисциплінарний, власна тема, відповідність, лінгвістичний, екстралінгвальний, повідомлення, викладач-практик, викладання мови для спеціальних цілей.*

***Інформація про авторів***: *Чернуха Ірина Андріївна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент; доцент кафедри іноземних мов; Інститут міжнародних відносин; Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.*

*Рожкова Марія Геннадіївна – кандидат юридичних наук; викладач кафедри іноземних мов; Інститут міжнародних відносин; Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.*

***Електронна адреса:*** *irina.chernukha7@gmail.com ; mariia0021@gmail.com*

***Чернуха И.А.***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9780-0877*
***Рожкова М.Г.***
*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0891-8225*

# О НЕКОТОРЫХ ОСОБЫХ АСПЕКТАХ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ РАЗЛИЧНЫХ ВИДОВ ПЕРЕВОДА В ВЫСШИХ УЧЕБНЫХ ЗАВЕДЕНИЯХ

***Аннотация.*** *Общая теория перевода – это междисциплинарная сфера, в основном, лингвистическая, но также тесно связанная с психологией, этнографией, страноведением и т.д. Она основана на применении лингвистической теории к специальному типу речевого поведения, т.е. перевода. У перевода есть своя собственная тема (процесс перевода), и он использует данные контрастивной лингвистики всего лишь как отправную точку. Перевод можно рассматривать, как межязыковой коммуникативный акт, в который вовлечены, как минимум, три участника: отправитель информации-источника, переводчик, который выступает в двойном качестве – как получатель информации-источника и как отправитель эквивалентного послания целевого языка, т.е. перевода. Воспроизводя текст целевого языка, переводчик меняет его план выражения (лингвистическую форму), а план содержания (значение) должен остаться неизменным. Это означает, прежде всего, что любой текст должен был понят и воспринят одинаково как отправителем информации-источника так и получателем такой информации. Таким образом, это задача переводчика передать получателю информации-источника ее максимум с помощью лингвистических знаков, включая как денотационные значения (т.е. информацию об экстралингвистической реальности, которую они обозначают) и их эмоционально-стилистическую коннотацию. Все это в полной мере относится и к преподаванию английского как языка для специальных целей. В статье подчеркивается дефинитивная логика различия профессиональных терминов 'последипломное образование' / 'postgraduate education' и 'дошкольное* *образование' / 'preschool education', которые неоднозначно воспринимаются в мировом научном контексте.*

***Ключевые слова:*** *перевод, анализ, междисциплинарный, собственная тема, соответствие, лингвистический, экстралингвистический, сообщение, преподаватель-практик, преподавание языка для специальных целей.*

***Информация об авторах:*** *Чернуха Ирина Андреевна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент; доцент кафедры иностранных языков; Институт международных отношений; Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко.*

*Рожкова Мария Геннадьевна – кандидат юридических наук; преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков; Институт международных отношений; Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко.*

***Электронный адрес:*** *irina.chernukha7@gmail.com ; mariia0021@gmail.com*

**The Subject-Matter of the Theory of Translation.**

The theory of translation is subdivided into general theory, dealing with the general characteristics of translations regardless of its type, and special branches concerned, with a theoretical description and analysis of the various types of translation, such as the translation of fiction, poetry, technical and scientific literature, official documents etc. The general theory of translation has a clearly defined subject-matter: the process of translation in its entirety, including its results, with due regard to all the factors, affecting it. Each special branch specifies the general theory for it is the job of the general theory to reflect what is common to all types and varieties of translation, while the special branches are mainly concerned with the specific features of each genre.

The general theory of translation is an interdisciplinary area, predominantly linguistic but also closely allied to psychology, ethnography, history, politics, law, economy and art area studies. It is based on the application of linguistic theory to a specific type of speech behavior, i.e., translation.

It differs from contrastive linguistics in that the former seeks to compare different language systems with a view to determine their similarities and distinctive features, while the theory of translation has a subject-matter of its own (the process of translation) and uses the data of contrastive linguistics merely as a point of departure.

**The Main Directions in the Contemporary Linguistic Theory of Translation.**

The earliest linguistic theory of translation was developed by scholars Rezcker and Fedorov who pioneered in proposing a linguistic analysis of translation problems. Their theory came to known as the theory of regular correspondences.

Translation is inconceivable without a sound linguistic basis, and this basis can be provided by a contrastive study of linguistic phenomena and the establishment of certain correspondences between the language of the original and that of the translation. The authors of the theory were mainly concerned with a typology of relationship between linguistic units (equivalents-permanent correspondences, not sensitive to context, such as the League of Nations – Ліга Націй and context-sensitive variant correspondences, such as slander – наклеп, звинувачення but also investigated some translation technique, such as autonomic translation, thus mapping out some ways of dealing with translation as a process).

In the -60s some linguists – V.J. Roencveig (the USSR) and E. Nida (the USA) – proposed a theoretical model of translation based on generative or transformational grammar. E. Nida subdivided the process of translation into three stages: analysis where an ambiguous surface structure is transformed into non-ambiguous kernel sentences to facilitate semantic interpretation (the foundation of a school – (somebody) founded a school or – a school has a foundation), transfer where equivalents in the target language are found, at the kernel or near-kernel level and restructuring where target-language kernel sentences are transformed into surface structures. It is true that in some cases it is necessary to paraphrase the SL (Source Language) structure to facilitate its translation. Such transformations came in handy when the SL structure is ambiguous or when it has no parallel in the TL (Target Language), e.g. He stood with his feet planted wide apart – Він стояв, його ноги були широко розставлені; Він стояв із широко розставленими ногами.

Transformations in terms of generative grammar are not the only types of paraphrases used in translation. What is more, in some cases when close parallel exists between the SL and TL structures they are not even necessary.

The situational model of translation is based on situational analysis in linguistics developed by V.Gak (USSR) and J. Catford (UK) and others. It is based on the assumption that languages use somewhat different sets of semantic components (elements of meaning) to describe identical extralinguistic situations. Ukrainian verbs of motion contain the component of mode but not always the direction of movement while their English equivalents are often neutral with regard to the mode but always specify the direction (cf. Вот он идет. Here he comes. /Here he goes). The situational model provides some interesting insights into the mechanism of translation, especially when a situation is described in different semantic categories (bottle fed child – штучник) but does not seem to apply to sentences going beyond a mere description of a situation.

Different translation models complement each other and should therefore be combined in analyzing translation as a process.

**The Nature of Translation.**

Translation may be viewed, as an interlingual communicative act in which at least three participants are involved: the sender of source information (the author of the SL message), the translator who acts in dual capacity – as the receptor of the SL message and as the sender of the equivalent TL message and the receptor of the TL message (translation). If the original is produced not with a foreign language receptor in the mind, there is one more participant the source-language receptor for whom the message was originally produced. Translation consists in producing a text (message) in the TL equivalent to the original text (message) in the SL. Translation as an interlingual communicative and includes two phases communication between the sender and the translator and communication between the translator and the receptor of the newly produced TL text. In the first phase the translator acting as a source-language receptor analyzes original message, extracting the information contained in it. In the second stage the translator acts as a target language sender producing an equivalent message in the TL and redirecting it to the TL receptor.

In producing the TL text the translator changes its plan of expression (linguistic form) while its plan of content (meaning) should remain unchanged. In fact, the production of an equivalent message implies that the message produced is equivalent to the original in the plan of content. The message produced by the translator should evoke practically the same response in the TL receptor as the original message in the SL receptor. That means, above all, that whatever the text says and whatever it implies should be understood in the same way by both the SL user for whom it was originally intended and by the TL user. It is therefore the translator's duty to make available to the TL receptor the maximum amount of information, carried by linguistic signs, including both their denotational (referential) meanings (i.e., information about the extralinguistic reality which they denote) and their emotive-stylistic connotations.

**Linguistic and Extralinguistic Aspects of Translation.**

However, the information conveyed by linguistic signs alone, i.e. the meaning overtly expressed in the text, would not be sufficient for adequate translation. Some linguists distinguish between what they call translation, based solely on the meanings expressed by linguistic signs and interpretation, involving recourse to extralinguistic information. In fact, the two are very closely intertwined, and in most cases effective translation is impossible without adequate knowledge of the speech-act situation and the situation described in the text. The phrase "Two of the aisle" – Два місця ближче до проходу – would hardly make much sense unless it is known that the conversation takes place at a box-office (speech-act situation). The translation of technical and scientific text requires a certain amount of technical and scientific knowledge. A successful translator is always a bit of an ethnographer, historian, politician, economist, lawyer, diplomat, art dealer, etc.

**Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of Translation.**

The role of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic relations. Semiotic (the science investigating the general properties of sign system) distinguishes the following types of relations: semantic (sign to object), syntactic (sign to sign) and pragmatic (sign to man). One of the most essential requirements imposed on translation is that two texts (the original and its translation) should be semantically equivalent. In other words, they should be characterized by equivalent sets of relationship between the linguistic signs and their denotation (referents). The goal of translation is to produce a text bearing the same extralinguistic situation as the original. Semantic equivalent of message does not necessarily imply the semantic identity of linguistic sign. Semantically equivalent utterances include not only those made up of semantically identical signs (as, for instance: He lives in Paris. – Він живе в Парижі.) but also utterances comprising different sets of signs which in their totality yields the same type of relationship to the extralinguistic word denoting the same extralinguistic situation, e.g., Wet paint! – Увага! Пофарбовано! – Semantic relations affect translation both in the initial stage of analysis and in producing the TL text.

As distinct from semantic relations, syntactic relations are important only at the stage of analysis since relations between linguistic signs are essential for their semantic interpretation (cf. Bill hit John and John hit Bill). But although they may be occasionally preserved in translation, the translator does not set himself this goal. Very often syntactically nonequivalent utterances prove to be semantically equivalent: He was considered invincible – Його вважали непереможним.

Pragmatic relations are superimposed on semantic relations and play an equally important role in analyzing the original text and in producing an equivalent text in the target language.

Semantically equivalent messages do not necessarily mean the same thing to the source and target receptors, and therefore are not necessarily pragmatically equivalent. The phrases "He made a fifteen-yard and ran" – Він зробив 15-ярдовий ривок – are semantically equivalent for they denote the same situation but the

American reader, familiar with American football, will extract far more information from it than his Russian or Ukrainian counterpart who would neither understand the aim of the maneuver nor appreciate the football-player's performance. The pragmatic problems, involved in translation, arise from three types of pragmatic relations: the relation of the SL sender to the original message, the relation of the target-language receptor to the TL message and the relation of the translator to both messages.

**The Effect of the Pragmatic Motivation of the Original Message.**

The first type of relations amounts to the sender's communicative intent of the pragmatic motivation of the original message. The translator, in other words, should be aware whether the message is a statement of fact, a request, a command, an entreaty or a joke. Very often the speaker's communicative intent differs from what the message ostensibly purports: e. g. "I don't know" – may be not only a statement of fact in which case it would be translated as "Я не знаю" but also an expression of hesitation "Подивимось". "What gives" – in American slang may be either a question "Як справи?".

**The Effect of the Receptor to Text Relation.**

A. Neubert (Germany) has proposed a classification of text depending on their orientation towards different types of receptors: texts intended for "domestic consumption" (local advertising, legislation, home news, etc.), texts intended for foreign consumption (propaganda and advertising for foreign receptors), texts intended primarily for source language receptors but having also a universal human appeal (belles-letters) and texts without any specific, national addresses (scientific literature). Typically, in written translation a translator deals with texts not intended for target-language audiences and therefore subject to pragmatic adaptations. Allowances are made for social-cultural, psychological and other differences between SL and TL receptors, particular differences in their background knowledge. According to E. Nida snow white was translated into one of the American languages as "white as a feather of a white heron".

Pragmatic factors may affect the scope of semantic information, conveyed in translating. Differences in background knowledge call for addition or omission of some information.

Some cultural realies may be translated according to their functional analogues. Allowances should be made for the receptor's professional status and his familiarity with the subject. In texts intended for specialists sources culture realia are more frequently rendered by transcription or transliteration while in texts for layman explanatory or descriptive translation is preferred: e. g., impeachment – expression of non-trust to a high-ranking official, absenteeism – non-participation in elections.

**The Effect of the Translator's Angle of View.**

Another pragmatic factor relevant to translation is the socio – psychological and ideological orientation of a translator himself. As far back as in 1936 K. I. Chukovsky wrote that "every translator translates himself, i. e. deliberately or inadvertently reflects his class affiliations. And in doing so he does not necessarily set himself the task to falsify the original". This view may be somewhat oversimplified but it is true that although ideally the translator should identify himself with the author, this is not always the case. What is more, sometimes it is impossible. Therefore, classics are retranslated as each generation rereads them from its own vantage point. Chukovsky cites an instructive example: in translating Shakespeare's "Coriolanus" the Russian translator Druzhinin tried to reproduce the original accurately. Yet he advertently adapted the tragedy to his own political views of a liberal opposed to the revolutionary raznochinzi of the 1860s.

**Nonuniqueness of the Translator's Decisions.**

Translation is a process determined by quite a number of factors. In addition to conveying the semantic information contained in the text, the denotational meanings and emotive-stylistic connotations, a translator has to take into account the author's communicative intent, the type of audience for which the message is intended, its socio-psychological characteristics and background knowledge. A process, governed by so many variables, cannot have a single outcome. What is more, the synonimic and paraphrasing potential of language is so high that there may be several ways of describing the same extralinguistic situation, and even though they may not be quite identical, the differences may be neutralized by context. It should also be remembered that the translator's decision may vary depending on the receptor (c. f. the translation of realia for the specialist and for the layman) and the purpose of the translation.

**The Problem of Translatability.**

Conflicting views have been expressed by linguists concerning the problem of translatability ranging from an entire negative stand typical of W. von Humbolt, who considered each language an embodiment of national spirit and the nation's world view and therefore regarded translation as an impossible task, to unqualified positive attitude, found in many contemporary writings on translation. The very fact that translation makes interlingual communication possible is an argument in favor of translatability. Yet it is an oversimplification to claim that every meaningful element of the text is translatable. In his preface to "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" Mark Twain says that he reproduced in the book painstakingly and with the support of personal familiarity the colouring of a number of dialects (the Missouri Negro dialect, the backwoods South-Western dialects, the Pike-County dialect, etc.). Naturally none of these fine distinctions can be reflected in the translation.

Yet by using colloquial and substandard form a translator can give an adequate impression of the character's social and educational status and will thus render the most essential functional characteristics of these dialect features. As compared to the determining semantic and functional properties of the text which are perfectly translatable the untranslatable elements are marginal and relatively unimportant. Besides, as we shall show in the next lesson, most of the losses can be to some extent compensated for. Therefore, we may speak of sufficient (though not necessarily complete) translatability to permit effective interlingual communication and adequate rendering of communicatively relevant information.

**Adequate, Literal and Free Translation.**

There is fundamental difference between formal equivalence, on the one hand, and semantic and pragmatic equivalence, on the other. Formal equivalence may accompany semantic and pragmatic equivalence but is by no means mandatory. It has been pointed out that a translator does not set himself the task of preserving the syntactic relations of the original. Nor does he aim at formal equivalence between the original and the translation. Usually formal equivalence results from similarity of pragmatical forms and lexical items of the two languages. But it does not arise out of a deliberate effort. Adequate translation may be defined therefore as that which is determined by semantic and pragmatic equivalence between the original and the TL text. Cases of formal equivalence without semantic or pragmatic equivalence are usually described as literal translation. Literal translation reproduces the linguistic form of the original without any regard for semantic-pragmatic equivalence. It may reproduce the morphological and sound form as, for instance, in Chukovsky's famous example: Черри Орчард (Cherry Orchard). It may also reproduce lexical items, overlooking the integral meaning of the phrase.

In other words, literal translation reproduces the form at the expense of the meaning and distorts the original. In some cases it may violate stylistic norms as, for instance, in the reproducing of the syntactic torn of the original message.

Free translation, on the other hand, consists in pragmatically unmotivated additions and omissions of semantic information. In literal translation a translator distorts the message by slavishly reproducing the form while in free translation he distorts it by overstepping his authority and assuming the role of a co-author. For instance, Irinarch Vvedensky sometimes added pages of his own to Dickens' novels. He translated the phrase "She burst out crying as Сльози покотились по обличчю прекрасної малятки". And the word "refugee" as "притулок, де насолоджувався я щастям мирних дитячих років".

**The Ways of Adequate Translation.**

Grammatical and lexical parallelism between the SL and the TL makes it possible in some cases to retain formal equivalence without departing from semantic and pragmatic equivalence. Otherwise various lexical-grammatical transformations are used: transposition, replacement, addition and omission.

**Losses and Their Compensation.**

It will be recalled that some marginal elements of information may be lost in translation. Some of them may be compensated for by use of different devices, sometimes in a different portion of the message, for instances the Russian vernacular "рисковая работа" (Sholokhov) may be translated as "but, your job is damn risky" where the use of a low colloquial lexical item (damn) compensates for a substandard morphological form (рисковое). In the phrase "підкинути ідейку" derogatory connotation is expressed by the Russian suffix. In the English phrase 'to sell the idea' the noun is neutral but the derogatory connotation is shift to the verb.

**Grammatical Equivalence in Translation.**

The grammatical structure of language is an important part of its overall system, no less important, in fact, than its lexicon or vocabulary. The elements of the grammatical structure, such as affixes, forms of inflection and derivation, syntactic patterns, word order, function words, etc. serve to carry meanings which are usually referred to as grammatical or structural meanings, as distinct from lexical meanings. The rendering of these meanings in the process of translation is an important problem relating to the general problem of translation equivalence which must be considered at length.

Grammatical forms of different languages only very seldom coincide fully as to the scope of their meaning and function. As a RULE, there is only partial equivalence, that is, the grammatical meanings expressed by grammatical forms, though seemingly identical of two different languages, coincide only in part of their meaning and differ in other parts of the same meanings. Thus, for instance, the category of number of nouns in English and in

Ukrainian seems to coincide and, indeed, does coincide in very many cases of its use: cf. table – стіл, tables – столи, etc. However, there are many instances where this is not the case, in other words, where an English plural form is rendered through a Russian singular form and vice versa; this is especially common among the so called Singularia and Pluralia Tantum, that is those nouns that have only a Singular and Plural form whose distribution is often arbitrary and motivated only historically. Compare: oats – вівса, peas – горох, onions – цибуля, cherries – вишня, (used collectively), outskirts (of town) – околиця, billiards – більярд, measles – кір, money – гроші, ink – чорнило, information – інформація, etc.

Another example is the category of tense. Both English and Russian/Ukrainian distinguish the form of the predicate verb as Present and Past, their general grammatical meanings being on the whole, identical cf. He lives in Kyiv – Він живе у Києві, He lived in Kyiv – Він жив у Києві. However, in certain cases the Tense forms of the two verbs – English and Ukrainian – do not coincide, thus, for instance, in English there exists, a grammar RULE "Sequence of Tenses" according to which the predicate verb in the subordinate object clause following the main clause in which a Past form is used must, with a few exemptions, also be used in the Past form, where as in Ukrainian this is not so and a Present form is quite common in the same position: He said he lived in Kyiv – Він сказав, що живе в Києві.

The above-mentioned must not be taken to mean that there is absolutely nothing in common between the grammatical structures of two different languages. On the contrary, there exist in all languages the so called grammatical inverses, that is, categories that are found in all languages and without which no language can function as a means for communication.

These, however, are mainly the so called deep grammatical categories i.e. categories that are semantic rather than formal (for instance: object, process, quality, relation, actor, goal (of action) instrument, cause and effect, etc.). These can be found to exist in all languages, though the formal way by which they are manifested may be widely different. The translator's task here (as with lexical means) is, first, to assign the correct meaning to this or that form and, secondly, to find an appropriate form in the TL for the expression of the same meaning, taking into account various factors which will be described below.

Moreover, it should be born in mind that the content which in one language is expressed grammatically may be expressed lexically in another language. If no grammatical forms are available in the TL, the translator must look for lexical means to render the same semantic content.

Finally, it should be noted that there are cases when grammatical meanings are not rendered in translation at all, that is, when this or that grammatical form is not used freely, according to its own meaning but then its use is predetermined by purely linguistic factor: syntactic construction, RULEs of agreement (grammatical concord) or government, etc. In this case we can speak of the bound use of the grammatical form, as opposed to its free use. The example will show the difference: in English the choice of the tense form of the verb in an independent clause is free and depends on the proper meaning of the tense form itself: cf. He lives in Kyiv – He lived in Kyiv. In a dependent clause the use of tense form is not free and is determined by the so called "the sequence of tenses RULE", i.e., when the tense form of the main clause is Past, then in the dependent clause must also be Past: He said he lived in Kyiv.

On the whole the choice of the grammatical equivalent in the TL is determined by the following factors:

a) The meaning inherent in the grammatical form;

b) *The lexical character* of the word or word-group used in this or that form. Thus, the use of the Plural form in Ukrainian is impossible with certain nouns while possible with others: cf. workers of all industries – робочі галузі промисловості). Here the grammatical meaning of plurality has to be rendered lexically as the corresponding Ukrainian nouns lack the plural form.

c) factors of style, for instance, both English and Russian/Ukrainian have the *Passive form of the verb*. However, in Russian/Ukrainian the use of this form is mainly confined to the literary or bookish (formal) style.

d) In official language, for instance, in newspaper reports, this turn of speech is quite acceptable: cf. At the station the delegation was met by a group of students – На вокзалі делегацію зустрічала група студентів.

Another example: both English and Russian/Ukrainian make use of the so called Historical Present (the present tense used to denote past events); however it is only in English that this form is employed in newspaper headlines. Consequently, the headline "Prominent Scientist Dies" can be rendered as "Смерть невідомого вченого" taking into account the fact that Ukrainian headlines are usually nominal in character.

e) Frequency of use. Speaking about this factor, the American linguist and translator E. Nida writes: Rare forms of words may also constitute serious obstacles to a proper communication load. For example, translators often find convenient formal parallels between constructions in the SL and the TL, and, regardless of the relative frequency of such constructions in the language concerned, endeavor to match the forms more or less automatically. Both source and receptor languages may have passive forms of words but in the source language they may be relatively frequent while in the receptor language they are rare. (English and Ukrainian are precisely the case). If under these considerations one attempts to translate every source language passive by corresponding passive in the receptor language, the result will be an inevitable overloading of the communication.

Thus Ukrainian use both subordinate clauses and verbal adverb to express adverbial relations. However, if a translator does not make use of the latter, his translation will sound unnatural and too "heavy". Also, both in English and in Ukrainian subordinate and coordinate structures are used, but their relative frequency is different: English often prefers subordination whereas Ukrainian more often use of coordinate structure Therefore, subordinate syntactic structures of English, are quite commonly replaced by coordinate structures in Ukrainian translations, though from the point of view of formal grammar RULEs, such a replacement is not always necessary.

**Grammatical Transformation in Translation.**

Grammatical structures of two languages are different to such an extent that any attempt at word-for-word translation is doomed to failure. In the course of translation, it is always necessary to perform various grammatical and lexical changes of translation to achieve translation equivalence. These transformations can be divided into four types:

- transposition,
- replacements,
- additions,
- omissions.

It should be born in mind that this classification is, to some extent, arbitrary and in practice it is hardly possible to find these elementary transformations in a "pure form". In most cases they are combined with one another, so that what we observe is a combined use of more that one type of transformation: transposition and replacement, addition and omission at the same time, etc.

**Transpositions.**

What is known as transposition is a change in the order of linguistic elements: words, phrases, clauses and sentences in the text of translation as compared to the original. Most often this change of order is made necessary due to the necessity of preserving intact what is called functional sentence perspective, namely, the division of the sentence into two main parts from the point of view of communication: "known or theme" and "new or rheme". In Ukrainian this division of the sentence is usually expressed by means of word order: what is already known or supposed to be known to the hearer (usually from the preceeding context), that is, "theme" is placed at the beginning of the sentence whereas what is new, that is communicated for the first time and, therefore, what forms the semantically most important part of the message (rheme) is placed at the end of the sentence. In English the word order is arranged, on the whole, along the same lines; however, in certain cases the "theme" is placed at the end/and the "rheme", correspondingly, at the beginning of the sentence, due to the fact that the newness of the "rheme" is expressed differently, namely, by the use of the indefinite article (or with plural forms of nouns and with uncountable nouns of the zero article) with the noun which is the subject of sentence. Therefore, in Ukrainian word order in these cases must be reversed, i.e., the sentence subject which is the "rheme" of the sentence must be placed at, the end: cf. A boy came in – Хлопець зайшов.

**Replacements.**

Replacements are by far the most common type of grammatical transformations. Replacements can affect practically all types of linguistic units: word forms, part of speech, sentence elements, sentence types, types of syntactic relations, etc.

a) Word Forms

Replacement of word forms is quite common in translation: The struggles of the Afghan people in Panjshir. – Боротьба афганців у Панджширі.

b) Parts of Speech

This type of replacement is also fairly common. Especially typical is the replacement of English noun (derived from verbs) by Ukrainian verbs; English makes a far greater use of the so called nominalization.

The same is true about the so called. "Nomina Agentis", which in English are usually represented by nouns with the (suffix – er). Russian/Ukrainian either has no nouns of the type at all (e. g., corresponding to such English nouns as riser, packer, drinker, sleeper) or uses them to denote people of permanent occupation which denote a person who indulges in professional writing whereas in English the word "writer" may denote "a person who writes or had written something" as in the "the writer of this note". He is an early riser – Він рано встає. John is a sound sleeper – Джон міцно спить.

c) Sentence elements

This is sometimes referred to as syntactic restructuring of the sentence in the process of translation. It consists in changing the sentence functions of words in a sentence, a process which is usually due to the same tendency as is observed in transpositions, preserving the functional sentence perspective. In English, as in Ukrainian the "theme" is generally (with some exceptions) placed at the beginning of the sentence; however, this place is, of course, reserved for the sentence subject, the result being that the "theme" of the English sentence is, as a RULE, also its subject, though semantically it is not always the doer of the action expressed by the predicate verbs: it may be its object (goal) or even may denote some adverbial relation (time, place, cause, etc.). In Ukrainian the word order is relatively free, therefore, the first word or word group within a sentence (its theme) must not necessarily be at the same time its syntactic subject. See the following examples: He was met by his sister – Його зустріла сестра.

d) Sentence types

A very common transformation in the process of translation is the replacement of a simple sentence by a complex one and vice versa. Thus, while translating from English into Ukrainian it often becomes necessary to render English structures with nonfinite verbal forms by means of subordinate clauses, thus turning a simple sentence into complex, as, for instance:

I Want you to speak English – Я хочу, щоб ви говорили англійскою. I heard my mother go out and close the door – Я чув, як мама вийшла з кімнати та закрила двері.

e) Types of syntactic relations

Both English and Ukrainian have such types of syntactic relations as coordination and subordination. However, the former is more characteristic (i. e., occurs more frequently) of spoken Ukrainian than of English; hence it is often necessary or desirable to replace subordination of sentences by coordination while translating from English into Ukrainian.

From the purely grammatical point of view this transformation is optional; however, taking into consideration what was said concerning the relative frequency of grammatical forms.

Such transformations are necessary if we want to make our translation sound natural, that is, if we want to avoid undesirable heaviness in style. Likewise, both English and Ukrainian make use of syndetic and asyndetic coordinate structures, but their relative frequency differ: Ukrainian, especially spoken Ukrainian, prefers asyndetic coordination in multimember structures where English often employs the syndetic type, as, for instance: All I have in it is two dresses and my moccasins and my underwear and socks and some other things.

In the original, the conjunction "and" is used four times while in the Ukrainian translation it appears only once, before the last constituent, the rest being joined asyndetically.

**Additions.**

Additions are caused by different factors. Very often they are necessitated by what may be called structural incompleteness of certain word groups in the source language. Thus, in English in many cases words are omit- ted that can be easily resorted from the context. While in Ukrainian their actual presence in the word group is necessary, which calls for additions in translation; cf.: pay claim – вимога виплати заробітньої платні, gun license – ліцензія на носіння зброї, oil talks – переговори з нафтових питань. Sometimes additions are necessary to compensate for lack of grammatical forms in the target language. Thus, that lack of plural forms of the corresponding nouns in Ukrainian calls for lexical additions when translating such a phrase: workers of all industries – робочі усіх галузей промисловості.

**Omissions.**

Omission acts in the opposite direction as compared to addition and is used to ensure a greater degree of what is called "compression", that is, reducing the redundancy of the text by omitting words which can be easily restored from the context. Thus, the following sentence from J. Salinger's novel: "So I paid my check and all. Then I left the bar and went out where the telephones were" is translated by R. Rait-Kovaleva as: "Я заплатив, вийшов з бару та пішов до телефону". Some words are omitted because of their redundancy (they were mentioned in the preceding context). Note also other transformations here, such as unification of sentences and replacement of a complex sentence by a simple one, all of which greatly reduce redundancy of the original.

Analyzing the texts referring to English for Special Purposes, we'd like to mention that it deals with translation either. But this is a peculiar kind of translation.

As with most disciplines in human activity, ESP is a phenomenon grown out from a number of converging trends, for example: 1) the expansion of demand for English to suit specific needs of a profession, 2) developments in the filed of linguistics (attention shifted from defining formal language features to discovering the ways in which a language is used in real communication, causing the need for the development of English courses for specific groups of learners), and 3) educational psychology (learners' needs and interests have an influence on their motivation and effectiveness of their learning).

Since ESP courses are of various types, depending on a specific scientific field or profession, and have differing features, professors teaching such courses need to play diverse roles and acquire certain knowledge.

As ESP teaching is tended to use the term "practitioner" rather than "teacher" to emphasize that ESP work involves much more than teaching. ESP practitioner can have several roles.The ESP practitioner as *course designer* and *material provider.* Since it is rarely possible to use a particular textbook without the need for supplementary material – sometimes no really suitable published material exists for identified needs – ESP practitioners often have to provide the material for the course themselves. This involves selection of published material, adapting material if it is not suitable, or writing it. ESP professors also need to assess the effectiveness of the teaching material used whether it is published or self-produced.The ESP practitioner as *researcher*. Research has been particularly strong in the area of EAP (genre analysis). Regarding the research into English for Business Purposes, there is a growing interest in investigating the genres, the language and the skills involved in business communication.

Business English can be seen as mediating language between the technicalities of particular business and the language of the general public which puts it in a position between English for General Purposes (EGP) and specialist English.

**A problem in classification of business language.**

Traditionally it means language of trade and all students' books in business language aim to teach future business people to solve their professional tasks in foreign language, therefore, it is only the language for professional trade purposes. For master-level discipline named "business language" it is obligatory in almost all the curricula and university chairs of foreign languages to work out "business" for every educational direction to choose content of teaching foreign language.

Interdicipline is mandatory to study at every secondary and high school not depending on professional direction. The students are expected to become mobile specialists, which are able to raise their qualification using materials in foreign language and communicating with their colleagues from abroad.

To avoid problems all the stages of foreign language learning should be considered as a system, in which every component depends on the other. The main criterion for such a classification is the purpose of language learning and firstly it determines connections with professions, so the purposes can be individual and professional. The following classification is provided:

- Language for nonprofessional purposes (individual purposes);
- Language for academic and scientific purposes;
- Language for professional purposes.

These types reflect the spheres, in which the language will be used, and allow to show the levels of language learning from the very beginning of educational stages till the language becomes a tool in a professional life.

To know what and how to teach we have to know what tasks our learners have to solve using this language, for what purpose they begin or continue to learn a foreign language. In this connection we suggest to introduce another approach to differ directions of language using and its teaching. It could be the task-oriented approach or reflection of the term "language for specific purposes" as a purpose approach to foreign language teaching. Key points would be answers to following questions:

Who is the learner?

What does he/she learn a foreign language for?

**The methodological domain is of great importance for ESP.**

No doubt teaching of adults is another methodological sphere.

Teaching of adults is two-sided, in what both teachers and learners are active. It is a process based on experiences and autonomy of learners. Adult learners expect the immediate use of acquired knowledge and are highly motivated if they see practical results of their learning. It's an open secret, age groups are generalized and do not reflect individual features; this task can be solved through psychological investigations and questionnaires, which establish learning styles according to leading perception channels. In this sense the Theory of generations is interesting as a diagnostic means for selecting of teaching methods and technical tools. According to the Theory there are some generation groups, each of them has its distinctions formed through external conditions, historical periods.

**Professor's skills play a pivotal role in teaching ESP.**

A new task for LSP-teachers is to work out subject-specific materials. There are not enough students' books for LSP as a foreign language; practitioners use a basic book and take in addition some material from other books or from the Internet. Mostly these are texts dealing with subject studied and they do not correspond with language phenomena of the basic book. Modern LSP teachers should be able to work out relevant exercises, which demonstrate and enable to drill language use in real or in model situations.

Besides modern students use up-to-date tools, that's why, a qualified LSP teacher should be able to use them on a high level. Based on the analysis of most important LSP teachers activities possible directions of LSP teachers' training could be the following:to discuss possible target groups for study of foreign language for specific purposes; to let students specialize in some professional directions concerning both language and situations of its use; to simulate real and model LSP situations themselves and with imaginable students;to learn strategies of autonomous language learning; to demonstrate relevant methods of LSP teaching, first of all project work, case-study and forms of cooperative learning to learn possibilities of modern tools for foreign language teaching / learning; to work out relevant materials for LSP teaching.

This list is not full and could be continued or varied depending on conditions by foreign language teachers' training, but such education must be reflected in curricula at pedagogical universities in the form of an elective course or as a special block in a traditional methodological course. The main goal of such courses is not to show, how it is "correct" to teach a foreign language for specific purposes, but to develop a methodological thinking of students showing them varieties of LSP.

The theory of LSP-teaching is a perspective direction in a foreign language methodology aimed to work out principles, methods and forms how to teach learners taking in account their own expectations and needs in professional and nonprofessional spheres. Important for such a methodology is to know who is the learner, what learner's style he/she has, how old he/she is. All these factors determine a purpose approach of teaching, which should be considered by preparing for future foreign language teachers a special elective course or a module in a traditional curriculum.

Like other areas of translation, the translation of legal texts is (or ought to be) a receiver oriented. Vested with the force of law, authenticated translations enable the mechanism of the law to function in more than one language. Translations of legislation, treaties and conventions, judicial decisions, and contracts are authoritative only if they have been approved and/or adopted in the manner prescribed by law.

The changed circumstances of the communication process and the special nature of international treaties and conventions place additional constraints on translators of international instruments, requiring them to exercise an extreme caution in their decision-making process. As shown by the disputed clause in UN Security

Council Resolution 242, an apparently harmless linguistic diversity can later lead to major differences in interpretation. The fact that the definite article was used in the French and Spanish texts (des territoires, de los territorios), as opposed to no article in the English and Ukrainian texts (from territories, z territorii), later raised the question as to whether the intention of the negotiators was to oblige Israel to withdraw its forces from all or just some of the occupied territories. The demand for flawless decision-making automatically places an additional pressure on translators, forcing them to carefully weigh each and every word, giving a special consideration to all possible interpretations and misinterpretations when formulating/shaping the text. Thus, the priority in such translations is to achieve the greatest possible interlingual concordance so as to prevent any ambiguity that could result in international disputes, unnecessary litigation or legal uncertainty.

Whenever a comparison of the authentic texts discloses a difference of meaning that cannot be removed by ordinary rules of interpretation, Article 33(4) of the Convention on the Law of Treaties instructs judges to ascertain "the meaning which best reconciles the texts, having regard to the object and purpose of the treaty." Since the Convention does not specify which methods should be used to reconcile the texts, it is left to the courts to determine how the parallel texts of treaties and conventions can best be reconciled in each case. The high degree of judicial discretion in resolving disputes arising from treaties and conventions puts a greater pressure on translators to express the uniform intent of the single instrument in language that is clear, precise, and, if possible, neutral. This is particularly important in situations where there is no judicial control and national courts from jurisdictions throughout the world are involved in the interpretation process. The failure to follow this advice has often resulted in conflicting decisions by national courts, sometimes defeating the very objective of the convention. This occurred in the case of the Warsaw Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air, where the use of common law and civil law terms in a key provision in Article 25(1) ultimately led to the failure of the Convention. In the disputed article, which determined whether the carrier's liability could be limited or excluded, the term dol in the French original is translated by willful misconduct in the English text. This unfortunate translation was approved despite warning by the English delegate that willful misconduct would include acts performed with intention, as well as acts performed carelessly without regard for the consequences. Instead of searching for a common meaning or agreeing on the intended meaning, judges of continental courts tended to rule in favor of limited liability in similar cases where American courts declared the carrier to have unlimited liability. Such conflicting decisions occurred particularly in cases involving deaths and bodily injuries resulting from acts not caused with intention. Since this key provision served as an exclusion clause enabling plaintiffs/claimants to evade the thresholds of limited liability provided by the Convention, the conflicting decisions not only frustrated the object of the treaty but also directly encouraged plaintiffs/claimants to evade the treaty and shop for a more favorable forum, thus resulting in the failure of the Convention.

The incongruity of the disputed terms was later corrected in the Hague Protocol of 1955 amending the Convention by discarding both terms and incorporating a definition of dol into both texts.

Handling a legal text in any of its forms either a contract or agreement or a court ruling, it is at a glance one may catch that such a text contains a variety of terms and terminological expressions set restrictively in a designated sequence.

For example:

(UA) Відповідно до статті 13  Міжнародного пакту про економічні, соціальні і культурні права, Конституція визнає право на освіту  за кожною людиною, незалежно від її статі, раси, національності, соціального і майнового стану, роду та характеру занять, світоглядних переконань, належності до партій, ставлення до релігії, стану здоров'я та інших обставин.

The Ukrainian legal terms and/or legal set expressions of obligation are construed by means of typical affixes and/or word order. Let's follow some of them from above: право людини на освіту  "a right to education", where the Ukrainian attribute людини in the post-position is restrictively set and cannot transfer to the pre-position even if transformed into an adjective людський ("human").

Here is another example in the form of an article wording clipped from the Constitution of Ukraine, Article 53:

(UA) Держава забезпечує доступність і безоплатність дошкільної, повної загальної середньої, професійно-технічної, вищої освіти в державних і комунальних навчальних закладах; розвиток дошкільної, повної загальної середньої, позашкільної, професійно-технічної, вищої і післядипломної освіти, різних форм навчання; надання державних стипендій та пільг учням і студентам.

The Ukrainian legal terms such as післядипломна освіта "postgraduate education" and дошкільна освіта "preschool education" are both construed by means of affixation, or pre-fixation, to be more accurate.

## REFERENCES

1. *Basic translation* (2002) / Miram, E., Daineko, Gon, A. et al. / N. Breshko, Ed, Kyiv: Elga [in English].

2. Bojović, M. (2015). *Teaching Foreign Language for Specific Purposes: Teacher* [31st Annual Conference]. https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4011.4566 [in English].

3. Chaika, O. (2018). *Language For Specific Purposes: Ukrainian Legal Terms Of Obligation* [Vostochnoslavjanskie jazyki i literatury v evropejskom kontekste]. Mogilev, 85-90 [in Russian].

4. Development. Association of Teacher Education in Europe. – 31st Annual Conference [in English].

5. Kittredge, R. & Lehrberger, J. (eds.) (1982). *Sublanguage. Studies of Language in Restricted Semantic Domains.* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York [in English].

6. Kiyak T. (2007). *Professional languages and problems of terminology.* [Fahovi movy ta problemy terminoznavstva]. *Nova filologija.* 27, 203-208 [in Ukrainian].

7. Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2006). *Synthesising Research on Language Learning and Teaching.* John Benjamins Publishing Company [in English].

8. Rosenne, S. (1983). The Meaning of 'Authentic Text'. *Modern Treaty Law* / R. Bernhardt, W.K. Geck, G. Jaenicke, H. Steinberger (eds.).

Festschrift für Herrmann Mosler, Berlin/Heidelberg / New York, Springer [in English].

9. Šarcevic, S. (1989). Conceptual Dictionaries for Translation. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2(4), 277-293 [in English].

10. Schroth, P. (1986): Translation. *American Journal,* 1, 47-65 [in English].

11. Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach.* Amsterdam, Benjamins [in English].

12. Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis; English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [in English].

**Дата надходження до редакції – 11.09.2021**
**Дата затвердження редакцією – 13.10.2021**