

KINGA KLAUDY

LANGUAGES

IN

TRANSLATION

LECTURES ON THE
THEORY, TEACHING AND PRACTICE
OF TRANSLATION

*With illustrations in English, French,
German, Russian and Hungarian*



Scholastica

To the memory of my Mother

Translated by

KRISZTINA KÁROLY
THOMAS J. DEKORNFELD

Translation revised by

ISTVÁN BART
PÁL HELTAI

Examples revised by

English
VERONIKA GSPANN

French
PÉTER ÁDÁM

German
GYÖRGY HELL

Russian
ANDRÁS SOPRONI

KINGA KLAUDY

LANGUAGES

IN

TRANSLATION

**LECTURES ON THE
THEORY, TEACHING AND PRACTICE
OF TRANSLATION**

*With illustrations in English, French,
German, Russian and Hungarian*



2007

Copyright: Klaudy Kinga 2003

Unchanged reprint: 2007

ISBN 963 206 839 4

Printing history of the Hungarian original

1st ed. 1994.

Klaudy Kinga: *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítás-technikai példatárral.* (The Theory and Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, German, French and Russian).

Budapest: Scholastica. pp. 383.

ISBN 963 04 4060

2nd ed. unchanged reprint, 1994.

Klaudy Kinga: *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítás-technikai példatárral.* (The Theory and Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, German, French and Russian). Budapest: Scholastica. pp. 383.

ISBN 963 04 4060

3rd extended and revised edition, 1995.

Klaudy Kinga: *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítás-technikai példatárral.* (The Theory and Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, German, French and Russian). Budapest: Scholastica. pp. 417.

ISBN 963 85281 33

4th extended and revised edition, 1997. (in two volumes)

Klaudy Kinga: *Fordítás I. Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe, Fordítás II.*

Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába. Angol, német, orosz fordítás-technikai példatárral.

(Translation I. Introduction to the Theory of Translation, Translation II.

Introduction to the Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English,

German and Russian). Budapest: Scholastica. Vol.I. pp. 247, Vol. II. pp. 285.

ISBN 963 85281 92

5th revised edition, 1999. (in two volumes)

Klaudy Kinga: *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe, Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába.*

***Angol, német, orosz fordítás-technikai példatárral.* (Vol I. Introduction to the Theory of Translation. Vol II. Introduction to the Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, German and Russian). Budapest: Scholastica. Vol I. pp. 208. Vol II. pp 285.**

ISBN 963 85912 77

CONTENTS

Preface

Part I.

The Theory of Translation

1. The origins of a linguistic theory of translation	23
1.1. The nature of the translator's activity	23
1.2. The medium of the translator's activity	23
1.3. The object of the translator's activity	24
1.4. Is there continuity in the theory of translation?	24
1.5. Translation as a profession	25
1.6. Translation as a subject in training	26
1.7. Translation as an object of research	26
1.8. The ratio of literary translations to non-literary translations	26
1.9. The appearance of linguistics	27
1.10. The literary and the linguistic approach	27
1.11. Translation theory and contrastive linguistics	28
1.12. Differences between the theory of translation and contrastive linguistics	29
1.13. Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics	30
1.14. Linguistic and extralinguistic elements of the situation of translation	30
1.15. Translation theory as an interdisciplinary field of study	31
1.16. Translation theory as a useful field of study	31
1.17. Translation theory as applied linguistics	32
1.18. The definition of translation theory	32
1.19. Factors influencing translator's decisions	32
1.20. The first era of linguistic translation theory	35
2. Translation theory and sociolinguistics	38
2.1. The reproduction of individual speech styles	38
2.2. The reproduction of regional dialects	39
2.3. The reproduction of social dialects	39
2.4. The translation of lexis without equivalence	40
2.5. Translatability and untranslatability	41
2.6. Realia and untranslatability	41
2.7. What can translation studies offer to sociolinguistics?	42
2.8. What can sociolinguistics offer to translation studies?	43
2.9. New challenges for the sociolinguistics of translation	43

3.	Translation theory and psycholinguistics	45
3.1.	Perception and production in translation	45
3.2.	Translation and bilingualism	46
3.3.	Simultaneous interpreting as a psycholinguistic experiment	46
3.4.	The simultaneity of listening and speaking	47
3.5.	The active nature of perception	47
3.6.	Experiments independent of interpretation	48
3.7.	Probability prediction	49
3.7.1.	Types of hypotheses	50
3.7.2.	The nature of hypothesis generation	51
3.8.	The unit of translation/interpretation	51
3.9.	Difficulties in data collection	52
3.10.	The personal traits of interpreters	52
3.11.	The “internal speech” of translators	53
4.	Translation theory and text linguistics	54
4.1.	Text-centredness in translation	54
4.2.	Disregarding the text-level	54
4.3.	Returning to the text	55
4.4.	The internal text structure approach	57
4.5.	The text type-typology approach	58
4.5.1.	The translation of content-focused texts	58
4.5.2.	The translation of form-focused texts	59
4.5.3.	The translation of appeal-focused texts	59
4.5.4.	The translation of audio-medial texts	60
4.6.	The typology of specialised texts	62
4.7.	Integration of the two approaches	63
4.8.	Research on quasi-correctness	64
4.9.	Skepticism regarding the discourse-level approach	64
4.10.	The central role of text linguistics in translation studies	65
5.	Linguistic models of the process of translation	66
5.1.	Analysis and synthesis	66
5.2.	The transfer phase	66
5.3.	The modelling of the process of translation	67
5.4.	The denotative (situational) model	68
5.4.1.	The advantages and disadvantages of the denotative model	68
5.5.	The transformational model	69
5.5.1.	The antecedents of the transformational model	70
5.5.2.	The process of translation in the light of the transformational model	71
5.5.3.	The advantages and disadvantages of the transformational model	72
5.6.	The semantic model	73
5.6.1.	The antecedents of the semantic model	73
5.6.2.	The process of translation according to the semantic model	74
5.6.3.	Melchuk and Zholkovsky’s semantic model	74
5.6.4.	Lexical functions	75
5.6.5.	The advantages and disadvantages of the semantic model	76

5.7.	Komissarov's model: levels of equivalence	76
5.7.1.	The advantages and disadvantages of the equivalence level model	78
5.8.	Translation as the joint functioning of two languages	79
6.	The concept of equivalence in the theory of translation	80
6.1.	The equivalence perception of readers, translators, and researchers	80
6.2.	Approaches to equivalence	80
6.3.	Catford's view on equivalence	81
6.4.	Nida's view on equivalence	83
6.5.	Other views on equivalence	85
6.6.	What „should” be preserved in translation?	86
6.7.	Komissarov's view on equivalence	87
6.8.	The conditions of communicative equivalence	89
6.9.	Rejection of the concept of equivalence	91
6.10.	The importance of the concept of equivalence	91
7.	New trends in translation theory at the turn of the century	93
7.1.	A new name	93
7.2.	New social tasks	94
7.3.	New centres of research	95
7.4.	New journals	97
7.5.	New book series and encyclopaedias	98
7.6.	New research methods (empirical methods)	100
7.6.1.	The cloze test	101
7.6.2.	The questionnaire method	101
7.6.3.	Quasi-correctness and the testing of reader perceptions	102
7.6.4.	The testing of explicitation strategies	103
7.6.5.	The introspective method	105
7.7.	New research methods (corpus analysis)	105
7.7.1.	The development of corpus linguistics	106
7.7.2.	The use of bi- and multilingual corpora	107
7.8.	A new auxiliary science: intercultural communication	107
7.9.	New topics – media translation	108
7.10.	How are new topics born?	110
7.11.	The second and third periods of linguistic translation theory	111
7.12.	The development of linguistic translation theory in Hungary	112

Part II.

The Teaching of Translation

1.	The study of translation – the teaching of translation	117
1.1.	The relationship between the study and the teaching of translation	117
1.2.	What can be of use in teaching?	118
1.3.	The role of contrastive linguistics in the teaching of translation	118

1.4.	The translational “behaviour” of languages and transfer operations	120
1.5.	The transfer competence of translators	121
1.6.	Modelling the process of translation	121
1.7.	The characteristics of the “C” system of rules	122
1.8.	The dilemma of translator training	123
1.9.	The benefits of linguistic awareness-raising	124
2.	Designing translator training courses	126
2.1.	Organising principles in designing translation courses	126
2.2.	The inductive approach	127
2.3.	The deductive approach	128
2.4.	Types of translation course materials	129
2.5.	Integrative teaching materials	130
3.	Methodological issues in the teaching of translation	133
3.1.	Pedagogical translation – real translation	133
3.2.	Creating lifelike situations in the teaching of translation	134
3.3.	Teacher vs. editor or reviser	134
3.4.	Different approaches to error correction	135
3.5.	Different strategies in error correction	136
3.6.	Types of translation tasks	137
3.6.1.	Text-preparation tasks	138
3.6.2.	Lexical preparation	138
3.6.3.	Suggested translation with variants	139
3.6.4.	Guided translation	139
3.6.5.	Revising	140
3.7.	Translation pedagogy as a new field of research	140
4.	Teaching translation and translator training in Hungary	142
4.1.	Teaching translation in Hungary between 1973 and 1990	141
4.1.1.	Teaching translation on postgraduate courses	141
4.1.2.	Special language translator training	143
4.1.3.	Translation training in faculties of humanities	143
4.2.	Changes in the 1990s	143
4.2.1.	Changes in postgraduate training	144
4.2.2.	Changes in special language translator training	146
4.2.3.	Changes at faculties of humanities and teacher training colleges	147
4.3.	The present situation	147
4.4.	Future tasks in Hungarian translator and interpreter training	148

Part III.
The Practice of Translation

1.	The system of transfer operations	153
1.1.	The concept of transfer operations	153
1.2.	The history of the term	153
1.3.	Transfer operations and the process of translation	155
1.4.	Transfer operations as mental transformations	156
1.5.	Translation as a decision-making process	157
1.6.	A case study of selection criteria	157
2.	The classification of transfer operations	162
2.1.	Obligatory and optional transfer operations	162
2.2.	Automatic and non-automatic transfer operations	162
2.3.	Classification according to level of operation	163
2.4.	Classification according to the scope and cause of the operation	163
2.5.	Classification according to the manner of operation	165
2.6.	What can be considered a transfer operation?	165
2.7.	The operational typology developed in this book	166
2.8.	Main types and types	167
2.9.	Subtypes	168
3.	Transfer operations from the point of view of the translator	169
3.1.	The principle of following the targetlanguage norm	169
3.2.	The principle of cooperation	170
3.3.	The principle of following the translation norm	170
3.4.	General transfer strategies	171
3.5.	Explicitation as a general transfer strategy	171
3.6.	Specific transfer strategies	174
3.6.1.	Language-specific transfer strategies	174
3.6.2.	Culture-specific transfer strategies	175
3.7.	Individual transfer strategies	175
4.	A framework for an Indo-european-Hungarian transfer typology	176
4.1.	Language-typological reasons	176
4.2.	Experience as a practising translator	176
4.3.	Evidence of the corpus	177
4.4.	The difficulties of a joint investigation	178
4.5.	The framework of an IE-Hungarian transfer typology	178
4.6.	The sources of the examples	179

Part IV. Lexical Transfer Operations

Introduction to lexical transfer operations	183
1. Narrowing of meaning (differentiation and specification)	187
1.1. Specification of parts of the body	188
1.2. Specification of reporting verbs	191
1.3. Specification of inchoative verbs	195
1.4. Specification of semantically depleted verbs	197
2. Broadening of meaning (generalisation)	201
2.1. Generalisation of parts of the body	202
2.2. Generalisation of times of the day	203
2.3. Generalisation of realia	205
2.4. Generalisation of reporting verbs	210
2.5. Generalisation of semantically rich verbs	211
3. Contraction of meanings	214
3.1. Contraction of kinship terms	215
3.2. Contraction motivated by word formation potential	216
3.3. Integration of inchoative verbs into the main verb	217
3.4. Integration of adverbs of manner into reporting verbs	218
3.5. Merging change of state verbs with adjectives	220
3.6. Merging semantically depleted verbs with nouns	220
4. Distribution of meaning	223
4.1. Distribution of meaning in kinship terms	224
4.2. Distribution of meaning in complex nouns	225
4.3. Distribution of meaning in paraphrasing translation	227
4.4. Distribution of meaning in inchoative verbs	228
4.5. Separation of adverbs of manner	229
4.6. Distribution of meaning in reporting verbs	230
4.7. Distribution of meaning in change of state verbs	231
4.8. Distribution of meaning in semantically rich verbs	232
5. Omission of meaning	236
5.1. Omission of brand names	237
5.2. Omission of toponyms	239
5.3. Omission of toponyms and ethnonyms used in attributive function	240
5.4. Omission of institutional names	242
5.5. Omission of forms of address	243
5.6. Omissions of references to SL	245
5.7. Omission of names of parts of the body	246

6.	Addition of meaning	249
6.1.	Addition in the case of brand names	250
6.2.	Addition in the case of toponyms	250
6.3.	Addition in the case of institutional names	255
6.4.	Addition in the case of historical realia	257
6.5.	Addition of names of parts of the body	260
7.	Exchange of meanings	262
7.1.	Exchange of action for result	264
7.2.	Exchange of result for action	265
7.3.	Exchange of action for object	266
7.4.	Exchange of object for action	266
7.5.	Exchange of action for place	266
7.6.	Exchange of place for action	267
7.7.	Exchange of action for actor	267
7.8.	Exchange of actor for action	267
7.9.	Exchange of state for action	267
7.10.	Exchange of cause for action	268
7.11.	Exchange of sound for action	268
7.12.	Dynamic vs static and static vs dynamic exchanges	268
8.	Antonymous translation	272
8.1.	Negative-positive inversion	272
8.2.	Positive-negative inversion	277
8.3.	Conversive translation	278
8.4.	Antonymous translation in situative utterances	280
8.5.	Antonymous translation in dialogues	280
9.	Total transformation	282
9.1.	Total transformation of names of food and beverages	283
9.2.	Total transformation of names of children's games	285
9.3.	Total transformation of proper names	286
9.4.	Total transformation of address forms	288
9.5.	Total transformation of names of historical realia	291
9.6.	Total transformation of idiomatic expressions	292
9.7.	Total transformation of situative utterances	294
9.8.	Total transformation of measurements	296
9.9.	Total transformation of intralingual references	298
10.	Compensation	301
10.1.	Types of losses	301
10.1.1.	Serial (multiple) losses	301
10.1.2.	Losses in translation of metalinguistic information	307
10.2.	Local compensation	310
10.3.	Global compensation	313

Part V.

Grammatical Transfer Operations

Introduction to grammatical transfer operations	319
1. Grammatical specification and generalisation	321
1.1. Automatic specification of gender	322
1.2. Automatic generalisation of gender	324
1.3. Intentional specification	327
2. Grammatical division	333
2.1. Separation of sentences	333
2.2. Elevation of phrases	337
2.2.1. Elevation of participial phrases	339
2.2.2. Elevation of infinitival phrases	343
2.2.3. Elevation of nominal phrases	346
3. Grammatical contraction	351
3.1. Conjoining of sentences	351
3.2. Lowering of clauses	354
3.2.1. Lowering of clauses to the level of participial phrases	356
3.2.2. Lowering of clauses to the level of infinitival phrases	358
3.2.3. Lowering of clauses to the level of nominal phrases	359
4. Grammatical addition	361
4.1. Addition of “adjectivisers” in left-branching constructions	362
4.2. Addition of missing subject	363
4.3. Addition of missing object	366
4.4. Addition of possessive determiners	367
4.5. Filling the gap in elliptical sentences	368
4.6. Addition of text-organising elements	371
4.7. Addition of text connectors	372
5. Grammatical omission	377
5.1. Omission of “adjectivisers” in right branching constructions	378
5.2. Omissions at the beginning of the sentence	379
5.3. Omission of the subject	380
5.4. Omission of the object	381
5.5. Omission of the possessive determiner	382
5.6. Omission of the indefinite article	383
5.7. Creation of elliptical sentences in translation	385
6. Grammatical transpositions	388
6.1. Obligatory transpositions	389
6.1.1. Left-positioning of modifiers	389
6.1.2. Right-positioning of modifiers	392
6.1.3. Left-positioning of focus	394

6.1.4. Right-positioning of focus	398
6.1.5. Obligatory topicalisation in H-IE translation	399
6.1.6. Transpositions at the beginning of the sentence	401
6.2. Optional transpositions	402
6.2.1. Contextual variants	402
6.2.2. Fronting time and place adverbials	403
7.2.3. Fronting the subject	404
6.2.4. Defronting of sentence initial conjunctions	407
6.2.5. Transposition of interruptions	408
6.2.6. Transposition of reporting clauses	409
7. Grammatical replacements	413
7.1. Replacements within the category of tense	414
7.2. Replacements within the category of number	416
7.3. Replacements within the category of voice	420
7.3.1. Activisation	422
7.3.2. Passivisation	425
7.4. Replacements on the level of parts of speech	427
7.4.1. Verbalisation	428
7.4.2. Nominalisation	431
7.5. Replacements on the level of sentence elements	432
7.5.1. Predicativisation	433
7.5.2. Depredicativisation	433
7.6. Replacements on the level of text	434

Appendix

1. References	439
2. Sources	454
3. Author's index	470

Preface

Languages in Translation is based on my lectures on the theory, practice and teaching of translation delivered over the last twenty years at the Interpreter and Translator Training Centre of Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest and at the University of Miskolc.

This English version is the translation of a two-volume textbook *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe* (Introduction to the Theory of Translation) and *Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába* (Introduction to the Practice of Translation), first published in 1994. The history of this book and its English translation is closely connected with the development of translation studies in Hungary.

The history of the Hungarian original

The training of professional translators and interpreters in Hungary began in 1973 with the foundation of the Interpreter and Translator Training Centre at Eötvös Loránd University Budapest. The establishment of an academic translator training institution also opened the way for research in the field of non-literary translation. As a founding member of the institution, I was involved in teaching both theory and practice of translation, and also in research activity. This led to the first PhD dissertation on a translation-related topic in Hungary, investigating differences in the topic-comment structure of authentic and translated Hungarian texts, and introducing the term “quasi-correctness” for describing the peculiarities of the latter (Klaudy 1981, 1987).

In 1978 (with István Bart), I compiled a reader in translation theory, the first attempt to introduce this new field of research to a Hungarian audience. The collection – *Fordításelméleti Szöveggyűjtemény* (A Reader in the Theory of Translation) was published in 1980 by National Textbook Publishers, Budapest. It contained Hungarian translations from the works of leading translation scholars such as Eugene Nida, John Catford, Roman Jakobson, V. N. Komissarov, Georges Mounin, L. S. Barkhudarov, Ya. I. Retsker, I. I. Revzin, V. Yu. Rozentsveig, A. Shveitser, Otto Kade, Albrecht Neubert and Katharina Reiss.

In 1986, the collection was re-published under the new title *A fordítás tudománya. Válogatás a fordításelmélet irodalmából* (The Science of Translation. Selected Papers from the Literature on Translation Theory) and with a slightly different content: the section on machine translation, for example, was updated. While writing the foreword for the second edition and giving a short overview of translation studies in the 60s and 70s, it became clear that a more comprehensive introduction to the field, a rather new one in Hungary at that time, would be welcome.

In 1987, I signed a contract with the same National Textbook Publishers for a book under the title of *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata* (The Theory and Practice of

Translation). The manuscript was completed and submitted to the publisher in the last days of 1989, which were also the first days of a new age in the history of East-Central Europe.

The favourable changes in the history of Hungary in 1990 had a deep impact on Hungarian publishing. Predictably, with all government subsidies suspended, state-owned publishing houses floundered, while newly established houses initially lacked the funds necessary to take over their roles. Finally, *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata* (The Theory and Practice of Translation) was brought out in 1994 by a newly-founded house, Scholastica. The first edition was printed in the spring of 1994, to be followed shortly by a second edition, in the autumn of 1994, and by an extended and revised third edition in 1995.

For the fourth edition in 1997 I separated the sections on theory and practice and the book came out in two separate volumes: Volume I. *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe* (Introduction to the Theory of Translation) and Volume II. *Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába* (Introduction to the Practice of Translation). The first volume now also included a section on the teaching of translation and an Appendix, the Hungarian Terminology of Translation Studies containing some 150 items. The section on teaching was left out of the fifth edition (1999) while the two-volume format was preserved. This last edition has been reprinted several times, in an unchanged form. The English translation is based on the fourth edition.

The history of the English translation

The need for an English translation of my work became apparent at international conferences. My lectures there were mainly based on the research I conducted on the operational part of translators' activity. I made an attempt to give a systematic description of transfer operations taking place when translating from four Indo-European languages (English, French, German and Russian) into a Finno-Ugric language (Hungarian) and vice versa. As the results of my investigations were only available in Hungarian, I was unable to provide the audience with a list of further reading.

Introduction to the Practice of Translation was translated into English by Thomas J. DeKornfeld in 1997, but only the parts concerning Hungarian and English. The rest – concerning French, German and Russian translations – remained my task, and it took four summer holidays (1998–2001) to accomplish it. In the meantime, helped by generous financial support from PHARE (a fund of the European Union), in 1999 I was able to have *Introduction to the Theory of Translation* translated into English (for this work I am indebted to Krisztina Károly). The final editing and harmonising of the two translations was done in the summer of 2002.

Apologies

This is the story of the birth of my *Languages in Translation*. Why do I feel it necessary to tell this story in advance? Because the years that have passed since its first inception to the publication of this English version certainly have left their mark on the work, especially on the first, theoretical part.

The theory of translation itself has developed by leaps and bounds during the last ten years of the 20th century, and this is only partly reflected in the manuscript. I have made renewed attempts to update the references in each subsequent new Hungarian edition, particularly in the seventh chapter of the first part, which is about new trends in the theory of translation; this has proved to be an almost impossible task, however. I am sadly aware that a short mention cannot do justice to many of the works I make references to.

The second part of the book, the system of transfer operations, has been less affected by the passage of time. It is based on the analysis of an ever-growing corpus of data, culled by my students from published translations of literary works. They always find it a very challenging task to identify transfer operations made by previous generations of translators and to take part in a joint effort to reconstruct the complex mental processes behind translational solutions.

New approaches

It may sound paradoxical, but perhaps it is the very traditional nature of the subject matter that might save the second part of the book from becoming outdated. The translational comparison of languages has never ceased to intrigue people. The classic work of Vinay and Darbelnet, first published in 1958 in French and reprinted many times since, was published in English in 1995, more than 30 years later. At the turn of the 21st century, while modern technology is revolutionising data collection and methods of analysis, it is still the secrets of the joint functioning of languages that we are searching for.

The approach I developed in this book is novel in the field of translation-specific comparison of languages in three respects: (1) it is a multilingual comparison, involving five languages, (2) it has a dynamic character, and (3) the emphasis is on the operational aspects of the translator's activity. The procedure I followed started with data collection: I amassed a large body of multilingual translational data, and then analysed it to discover the rules, regularities and principles governing the seemingly subjective decisions of translators by describing, classifying and explaining the transfer operations behind them.

(1) *It is a multilingual approach* designed to provide a systematic description of translational relations for five languages and ten translation directions. The five languages include four Indo-European languages and one belonging to the Finno-Ugric language family. Unlike previous comparisons, based on the use of data for cognate languages only, this work addresses the problems of translation between non-cognate languages.

(2) *It is a dynamic approach* designed to provide a description of the joint functioning of languages in translation. It concentrates on so-called dynamic contrasts, i.e. on differences in encoding strategies characteristic of different languages, which become manifest only when these languages clash in the process of translation. I call these differences in strategy, metaphorically, the translational behaviour of language, which can be "friendly" or "unfriendly". What I describe, then, is not a static inventory of differences between source and target language, and is, in this way, different from the traditional type of contrastive analyses carried out at the level of *langue*, and also from the *parole*-level comparisons practised in contrastive

stylistics, e.g. in the classic work of Vinay and Darbelnet, *Stylistic comparée du français et de l'anglais*.

(3) *It is an operational approach* designed to describe how translators handle the problems arising from the translational behaviour of specific language-pairs in relation to each other. I also attempt to trace the complex mental processes behind translational solutions, that is, the decision-making and problem-solving strategies that translators develop to handle cultural imponderables and those differences between the Indo-European languages involved and Hungarian which remain hidden until these languages come into contact in the process of translation.

The relative lack of this kind of investigation is noted by Wolfram Wilss in the entry “*Decision making in Translation*” in the *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998: 57–60):

We need to be able to describe decision-making behaviour in terms of an interaction between the translator’s cognitive system, his/her knowledge bases, task specification, and, last but not least, the ‘problem space’ which plays a decisive role in determining decision-making behaviour. All four factors profoundly influence decision-making performance in translation and require considerably more attention that we have given them so far (Wilss 1998: 60).

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband, *István Bart*, the translator of a vast number of English and American literary works, from Walter Scott to Bret Easton Ellis. It was his competence in literary translation I set out to describe 30 years ago, by means of linguistics. As a literary translator he was never really enthusiastic for theoretical approaches, yet he patiently suffered my efforts to describe, classify, and explain what he was doing while translating.

I should also like to thank my colleagues at the Translator and Interpreter Training Centre at the University of Budapest: *Gyula Ferenczy, Krisztina Szabari, Zsuzsa Láng, Ágnes Kurián, Zsuzsa Boronkay-Roe*, and at the Department of Applied Linguistics at the University of Miskolc: *Sarolta S. Fenyő, Csilla Dobos, Ágnes Salánki, Ildikó Bodnár, Anikó Urbán* for the friendly and cooperative atmosphere which surrounded me during the last twenty years, and without which no creative work is possible. I am grateful also to those colleagues from the Translation Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Science, with whom I had the opportunity to discuss translation related topics: *György Hell, Pál Heltai, Sándor Albert, Zsuzsa Válló, Anikó Sohár, Erzsébet Cs. Jónás, Endre Lendvai*, and the late *János Kohn* and *János Gárdus*.

I am very much indebted to two leading Hungarian scholars of applied linguistics, *György Szépe* and the late *Ferenc Papp*, who first encouraged me at the beginning of my career and never ceased to support my work.

I should also like to thank the late *Victor Rozentsveig, Alexandr Shveitser, Vilen Komissarov* and *Leonora Chernyahovskaya*, not only for their seminal works, which first introduced me to the study of translation, but also for the time they gave me discussing their work.

I am especially grateful to those colleagues of mine, who helped me after 1990 to join to the international translation studies community: *Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit*, who invited me to the 1989 conference in Savonlinna, where I first had the opportunity to meet leading scholars in translation studies, and *Gideon Toury*, who kindly kept me on the mailing list of his excellent newsletter, TRANSTT, and *José Lambert*, *Geoffrey Kingscott* and *Cay Dollerup*, for their invaluable help in organising the 2nd international translation studies conference “*Transferre necesse est ...*” in Budapest, 1996.

I am also greatly indebted to *Mona Baker*, who in 1993 invited me to contribute to the *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, and also to the advisory board of *The Translator*. Work on corpus-based research of translation, initiated by *Mona Baker*, might open up further perspectives for my work on transfer operations.

I should like to thank my translators, *Thomas J. deKornfeld*, and *Krisztina Károly*, who also revised the second part of the manuscript for their work, and *Pál Heltai* for revising the whole English manuscript and his critical remarks.

Finally, very special thanks go to all those students from the University of Budapest, Miskolc and Pécs, who took part in the data collection and, by their enthusiasm, inspired me, too.

Part I.

**THE THEORY
OF TRANSLATION**

1. The origins of a linguistic theory of translation

How are we to account for the fact that, although humankind has been thinking and contemplating about translation for over two thousand years now, the **science of translation** (Translationswissenschaft, Übersetzungswissenschaft, science de la traduction, nauka o perevode), or, in other terms, the **theory of translation** (Translationstheorie, Übersetzungstheorie, théorie de la traduction, teoriya perevoda) did not emerge before the second half of the 20th century?

Let us start by investigating the first part of the question. What is the reason for the constant enthusiasm of translators to create theories, why do they feel compelled to explain their choices in translation and to draw general conclusions from their work?

1.1. The nature of the translator's activity

The first reason lies in the very nature of translation as an activity. If creative activity is defined as one that allows for one or more free choices, then translation may be considered as a par excellence **creative activity**. The translator faces a number of choices in the translation of every single sentence, and the outcome of his activity, the target language text, is the result of numerous choices and numerous decisions. These decisions are subjective, but not entirely. When comparing different translations of the same source language text, one will always find both identical and different solutions. In other words, some of the translator's subjective choices are based on objective factors. It is exactly this objective basis behind the subjective choices that translators have been searching for for centuries, in an attempt to justify their choices, to refute criticism and fend off charges, or simply to hand down their experience to posterity.

Thus their ambition to explain translation phenomena and create theories is closely related to the very nature of this activity, regulated, on the one hand, by **certain objective rules**, and permitting, on the other, a **number of subjective choices**.

1.2. The medium of the translator's activity

The second reason is related to the medium of the translating activity, that is, to the fact that the translator works with **two languages**. Although it is a tempting simplification to claim that translation is the same as monolingual communication, except that it is carried out in two languages, in fact there is a significant difference between the two. It may sound trivial, but communicating in two languages

at the same time can never be as instinctive and unconscious as communicating only in one.

In translation, even the most instinctive translator will develop ideas about the relationship between the two languages, their similarities and differences, their relationship with reality, the similarities and differences in the way the two languages segment reality linguistically, and naturally he/she will state these ideas explicitly.

1.3. The object of the translator's activity

A third reason for translators' strong desire to put forward theories is related to the object of the translator's activity, namely to the **text**. It is a well-known fact that every text, be it a piece of literature or a scientific research article, an advertisement or an editorial, allows for **several possible interpretations**. Thus the translator often has to defend his **own** interpretation of the text against the potentially differing interpretations of critics, readers, and the public at large.

1.4. Is there continuity in the theory of translation?

If the desire to invent translation theories, motivated by the three reasons described above, has existed for over two thousand years, is it correct to claim that we can only speak about translation theory since the 1950s? Will such a statement do justice to early translation theories? Could we not regard the ideas put forward by Cicero, St. Jerome, Luther or Goethe as the forerunners of today's translation studies? Or, moving on to Hungarian translators and philosophers, could the "rules" proposed by János Batsányi and the essays on translation written by Ferenc Toldy, János Arany, Sámuel Brassai, Károly Szász, Antal Radó and other writers in the 18th and 19th centuries be regarded as the foundations of present-day translation studies, from which the latter is directly descended? (About the Hungarian tradition see Radó in Baker 1998: 448–453.)

For centuries, thinking about translation involved merely spontaneous observations. János Arany made a number of brilliant comments on translations of Shakespeare which, in today's terminology, might very well be regarded as acute sociolinguistic observations. His response to the question "whether Shakespeare should be presented to the Hungarian audience in his very lascivious, often obscene reality" is that "it is to the credit of the Hungarian audience that their chastity rejects, even in art, the liberties that great writers and painters often take. And then the formative years, the ladies' parlor and the salon table require forbearance." And although he considers the chastity of Hungarian people stronger than that of the English, he still finally recommends translation without curtailment (Arany 1862 in 1975: 895–896).

Reviewing the translation of *The Merchant of Venice* by Zsigmond Ács, he also voices some "sociolinguistic" reservations. He disapproves of the translator's decision to make all the heroes speak using the same eloquent literary style. "In many cases, just a quick line would help, saying 'how is this expressed in the language of casual conversations?' ..." (Arany 1862 in 1975: 901). He also criticises the inconsistent use in this translation of the formal personal pronoun "Őn" ('you' in plu-

ral) and the informal one “*Té*” (‘you’ in singular): “... the translator must follow the conventions of Hungarian conversations – as it is to be done in comedies – so friends and engaged couples should address each other using the informal pronoun, in the same way as in addressing the master’s servant, ... and strangers should use the formal version.”

Arany’s following remark also reflects his keen power of observation: “I wish to emphasise the word *well!*, which is often translated into Hungarian as *jó* (‘good’) even in cases where another Hungarian particle would express the same shade of meaning. *Jó!* in Hungarian expresses *acquiescence* or agreement”. In some cases Arany considers the expression *értem* (‘I see’) as the correct equivalent (Arany 1862 in 1975: 902).

However, it would never have come into the heads of János Arany, or Sámuel Brassai or Károly Szász, who also made a number of apt observations on translation, that they would have to test their claims on a number of text samples, or a “randomly selected corpus”.

And what about the experience of plain “everyday” translators? As has already been mentioned, the simultaneous or alternate use of two languages for several years and decades will inevitably lead translators and interpreters to certain general views about the similarities and differences between the systems and use of the two languages.

Practising translators will often make **spontaneous contrastive linguistic observations**, such as this one: “Hungarian prefers verbs as opposed to Indo-European languages which prefer nouns.” They will also make **spontaneous text-linguistic observations**, such as the following: “The sentences of Indo-European languages start with a longer introductory part than the corresponding Hungarian sentences and have to be shortened in the Hungarian translation” or “English, German, and Russian texts are more impersonal than Hungarian texts.” They will make **spontaneous stylistic observations**, like the one stating that “English scientific texts are like small talk compared to German scientific text,” or **spontaneous sociolinguistic observations**, like, for example, “Russians like diminutive suffixes better than Hungarians”.

Curiously enough, however, the idea that these spontaneous observations, derived from the practice of translation, could be confirmed or refuted on the basis of a science, and that this science was linguistics, did not emerge until the middle of the 20th century. The brilliant observations made by great author-translators and the experience of ordinary translators were not pooled for centuries. Tempting though it may be to draw up a picture of uninterrupted and organic development, we must reject this idea, and for several reasons.

1.5. Translation as a profession

For centuries, translation was mostly done for pleasure by writers, poets, statesmen, priests, and scholars to satisfy their individual literary, political, and scientific ambitions. In the second half of the 20th century, however, translating became a **mass** activity, the source of earning a living for hundreds of people. In other words, it has become a **profession in its own right**, taught at courses, colleges, and universities, and **the needs of teaching** set new requirements for theory formulation.

1.6. Translation as a subject in training

In the second half of the 20th century, a large number of translator and interpreter training institutions were established; foreign language departments in universities and colleges launched several translator training programmes. The fact that they started to teach translation within an **institutionalised framework** produced two important outcomes.

Since in educational institutions achievement is required within set time limits, training cannot be based upon the slow accumulation of practical experience. In this way, translation cannot be taught merely by practising the activity, some kind of **theoretical training** is also necessary. Theoretical training, however, will require certain generalisations on the basis of experience gathered by translators over the centuries, and consequently the formulation of some objective rules.

The need for theoretical training and materials design also requires the practitioners of this profession to create a universally accepted terminology and conceptual apparatus, i.e. to use a terminology which means the same to everybody. This raises the need for theoretical research aimed at providing a principled basis for the teaching of translation.

1.7. Translation as an object of research

While in previous centuries theorising was the privilege of non-professional translators, as referred to above, such as writers, poets, statesmen, priests, scientists and the like, in the second half of the 20th century translation scholars separated from practising translators. While writers and poets continued to put forward their ideas about translation, linguists doing research into translation without actually practising it also appeared on the stage.

While earlier thinkers tried to generalise their experience and to formulate general principles to defend their own solutions and to transmit their experience to future generations, today's scholars are also interested in **the very process of translation**. They intend to model this activity and to describe regularities, i.e. besides conducting **applied** research with practical applicability (which may even be used in translator training), they also do **basic research**, the results of which will become apparent only in the future, in improved practices in translator training and improved translations quality.

1.8. The ratio of literary translations to non-literary translations

The main reason for the three changes mentioned above is probably the radical shift in the ratio of literary to non-literary translation and the rapid increase in the amount of non-literary translation. The fact that translating activity is no longer confined to works of art and translators today will handle such diverse texts as political speeches, international contracts, court records, business letters, recipes, price lists, etc. has also brought about **the separation of the science of translation from theories of literature**. The rules of translation, since they apply to a

great variety of text types (technical specifications for engines, advertisements, user's manuals, etc.), cannot be described any more using the terminological and conceptual apparatus of literary theory.

This also explains why thinking about translation has shifted from literature to the science of linguistics.

1.9. The appearance of linguistics

The shift referred to above does not mean that thinking about translation has been totally abandoned by writers, poets, critics and people of letters in general. Translator workshop studies continue to appear and literary criticism has continued to study translation using its own conceptual apparatus. By referring to a shift we only wish to call attention to the fact that linguistics has also been recruited to the study of translation, i.e. the translating activity and its product, the translated text.

The appearance of linguistics in the study of translation was the result of social needs, and it brought about a **radical change in the possibilities of empirical research on translating as an activity**. With its fresh insights, new research methods not yet used in the study of translations, and terminological apparatus promising greater precision than other approaches, the science of language revolutionised thinking about translation. In our opinion, we can only speak about translation studies or translation theory in its own right from this time on.

The experience and sometimes brilliant observations of translators and critics of translation, many of which are regarded as valid even today, added up to an independent field of study only in the second half of the 20th century, when, due to the rapid increase in the demand for translation, general principles had to be abstracted from the practical experience of previous generations which could then be applied to a wide variety of translation situations. This could only be achieved with the help of linguistics, since it required the study of translations under **laboratory** conditions. Translation phenomena and translation strategies had to be taken out of their natural context to find rules for translation **independent** of language pair, text type, genre, cultural background and so on.

1.10. The literary and the linguistic approach

The differences between the “traditional” literary and the “new” linguistic approaches can be summarised as follows.

(1) While the literary approach studies the translation of works of art, i.e. the works of outstanding writers and poets, the linguist is interested not only in the translation of texts that have literary value, but also in a wide variety of text types, such as **technical and scientific texts, advertisements, users' manuals**, as well as literary texts.

(2) While the literary approach examines the work of **outstanding** translators, linguistics is (also) interested in the everyday work of **great masses** of translators and interpreters.

(3) While the literary approach focuses on **individual**, sometimes even unusual, original and surprising solutions, linguistics considers “mass” solutions worthy

of inquiry too, trying to describe and explain all of the operations (transformations) carried out by the translator.

(4) The literary approach concentrates merely on the **product** of translation, while linguists also explore the **process** of translation, i.e. what goes on in the mind of the translator during translation.

(5) The literary approach tends to be **normative** (prescriptive) by nature, describing what a good translation should be like, what a good translator should do, while the linguistic approach tends to be **descriptive**, describing what the translation is like and what the translator does while translating.

(6) Following from the above-mentioned differences, the literary approach often contains **evaluation**, while the linguistic approach tries to **avoid evaluation** and regards everything that is intended as a translation by the translator or the publisher as a legitimate object of study.

The above differences are of course general tendencies: normative approaches can also be found within linguistic translation theories, and literary approaches often study the social and historical circumstances of translations as well as the product itself. The comparison may, however, give a general idea of the differences between the two approaches and also show that both approaches are legitimate.

While the legitimacy and importance of literary approaches to translation is generally recognised, the relevance of linguistics is often questioned even today. It is often claimed that the linguistic approach can only provide relevant information about the two languages concerned in the translation, identifying, in this way, the linguistic theory of translation with contrastive linguistics.

1.11. Translation theory and contrastive linguistics

Equating the linguistic theory of translation with contrastive linguistics is not surprising, since the birth of the former almost exactly coincided with that of the latter. In the second half of the 20th century, it was not only translation that became a mass activity: the teaching and learning of modern languages also came to affect the lives of massive numbers of people. Language teaching required the **non-historical (synchronic)** comparison of the **present state** of the language pairs concerned, which was impossible using the research methodologies and conceptual apparatus of traditional comparative linguistics, developed for the study of the **historical (diachronic)** comparison of **cognate** languages.

This is how a new field of study was born. Contrastive linguistics developed research methods for the **synchronic analysis of non-cognate languages**, but not excluding the synchronic comparison of cognate languages, either. The projects in contrastive linguistics launched at the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s – on German and English (Gerhard Nickel), Polish and English (Jacek Fisiak), Finnish and English (Kari Sajavaara and Jaakko Lehtonen), Swedish and English (Jan Svartvik), Danish and English (Claus Faerch), Romanian and English (Dimitru Chitoran), Serbian-Croatian and English (Rudolf Filipovic), Hungarian and English (László Dezső), French and English (René Dirven), Dutch and English (Michael Sherwood Smith) brought spectacular results within a relatively short period of time (James 1980). A significant amount of knowledge

was accumulated in the field of the morphological, syntactic, and lexical comparison of particular languages (cf. e.g., German-English: PAKS 1968, 1969, 1970; English-Hungarian: Dezső-Nemser 1980, Dezső 1982, Stephanides 1986; 1989, German-Hungarian: Juhász 1980; Russian-Hungarian: Papp 1984, etc.). As it was obvious that these differences play an important role not merely in the teaching of languages but also in translation, scholars naturally turned towards contrastive linguistics and many equated it with the theory of translation.

Contrastive linguists often worked (and still work) on translated materials, because the effects of the two principal categories of contrastive linguistics, “transfer” (Jakobovits 1969, Selinker 1972), influencing the process of foreign language learning positively, and “interference” (Juhász 1970), influencing it negatively, can easily be detected in translations. One of the most frequently applied methods of contrastive linguistics, “error analysis” (Corder 1973) was also often conducted on translations, but mostly on trainees’ translations.

1.12. Differences between the theory of translation and contrastive linguistics

Even though it is true that studies on contrastive linguistics often use translations (constructed translations, trainees’ translations and published translations) to illustrate the similarities and differences between languages, and that research in the theory of translation undeniably often starts out from claims made by contrastive linguistics, there are still a number of differences between the two disciplines in terms of their subject of inquiry, aims and methods (cf. Shveitser 1988: 11–15).

(1) Contrastive linguistics contrasts the **systems** of the two languages, whereas the theory of translation, or translational comparison involves the actual **realisations** of the two linguistic systems, i.e. **texts**.

(2) Contrastive linguistics contrasts the **total system** of the two languages, while translation theory is **selective** and it only deals with phenomena that truly pose problems in the practice of translation. (E.g., although the system of verb tenses in English is different from Hungarian, since it does not cause problems in translation, it does not form part of the research on translation.)

(3) Contrastive linguistics compares elements in the two languages occurring on the **same** level of language (e.g., infinitives in German and Hungarian), while translation theory does **not necessarily focus on elements on the same level**. What is more, the opposite case is more frequent (e.g., the comparison of infinitives in German and finite clauses in Hungarian).

(4) Contrastive analysis may be **bidirectional**, whereas comparison in translation theory is **generally unidirectional**, comparing elements occupying different levels in the two languages. The latter does not intend to identify equivalencies valid in both directions: instead, it deals with text-dependent and context-dependent equivalencies. From a methodological point of view, “back-translation” is absurd since the back-translation of a given target language text would yield a completely different source language text.

(5) Due to the fact that in translational comparison it is not abstract linguistic systems but specific source language and target language texts that are contrasted,

translation theory will have its **own categories**, many of them unknown in contrastive linguistics, such as the concept of “realia”.

(6) As regards practical implications, contrastive linguistics intends to provide relevant information for teachers of foreign languages, while translation theory primarily aims at helping the work of translators and interpreters.

1.13. Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics

Today we can no longer claim, though, that contrastive linguistics only compares linguistic systems, since the appearance of text linguistics was soon followed by the appearance of contrastive text linguistics. One result of this development was that several scholars equated the theory of translation with contrastive text linguistics (Barkhudarov 1975a, Hartman 1981). However, one also needs to note the differences here. Studies in contrastive text linguistics are generally based on texts that are not the translations of one another. Research on contrastive text linguistics compares independent texts in languages **A** and **B**, that is, the **independent realisations** of the systems of languages **A** and **B**. Translation theory, on the other hand, contrasts the **realisations** of two linguistic systems that **depend upon each other**. This is an enormous difference. The compulsion to render an idea formulated in language **A** in language **B** may produce equivalence relations between texts and parts of texts in languages **A** and **B** whose relationship could not have been predicted by any research independent of translation.

Therefore, the fact that translation theory studies texts related via equivalence relations represents a qualitative difference that distinguishes it from contrastive linguistics, including contrastive text linguistics as well.

The theory of translation is more than contrastive text linguistics not only because it compares texts that are each others' translations and therefore stand, or may be brought to stand in equivalence relations, but also because it does not merely contrast texts, i.e. it does not only draw conclusions about the process of translation on the basis of the two texts, the original one and its translation. It is also interested in the study of all of the **linguistic and extralinguistic** elements accompanying the situation of translation.

1.14. Linguistic and extralinguistic elements of the situation of translation

The theory of translation, besides the above-mentioned linguistic elements of the situation of translation, i.e. besides the **two languages** (source language and target language) and the **two texts** (source language text and target language text), also investigates the **extralinguistic factors** of the situation. It explores the role of human participants in the situation: the source language sender, the target language receiver and the translator, who is a source language receiver and a target language sender at the same time. It also investigates the broader context of the translational situation, that is, the geographical, historical, cultural, political, religious, etc. circumstances of the birth of the source language and the target language text.

1.15. Translation theory as an interdisciplinary field of study

The linguistic and extralinguistic elements of the translational situation define certain fields of study closely intertwined with translation theory, on the results of which translation theory can rely, from which it can borrow research methods, and which it can also enrich via its own research results.

To explore the relationship between the two languages, the source language and the target language, translation theory might start out from the results of **contrastive linguistics**. In comparing the two texts, the source language text and the target language text, **text linguistics** can help translation theory, for example by “lending” its terminology (anaphors, cataphors, deixis, ellipsis, etc.) developed for the study of coherence.

To reveal the behaviour and mental processes of people participating in the situation of translation, especially those of translators and interpreters, translation theory may rely on the empirical investigations and experiments conducted within **psycholinguistics**. In providing a precise description of the historical, cultural and social circumstances of the situation of translation, the field of **sociolinguistics** is an appropriate point of departure.

1.16. Translation theory as a useful field of study

The practical usefulness of translation theory is not evident for everybody. Its usefulness is questioned by language teachers, translators and interpreters, and, from a completely different point of view, by translation scholars.

Language teachers usually claim that someone who knows a language really well will also be able to do translation and interpretation, and for those whose command of the language is poor no theory can be of help.

Many **practising translators** argue that translation theory has not yet taught anyone how to go about translation, and that the majority of translators and interpreters can manage perfectly well without any knowledge of translation theory.

Finally, **translation scholars**, for whom the process of translation is interesting by and for itself, claim that linguistics has never taught anyone how to speak either, still no-one questions its legitimacy. Then why should translation theory be expected to be of immediate practical use to contribute to the improvement of the quality of translations?

Everybody is right, of course, in the sense that translation theory does not directly facilitate the work of translators and interpreters and does not directly lead to better quality in translation. But it is also true that translation theory has not processed and analysed the data that the practice of translation has accumulated over the past two thousand years. Translators have to start from scratch even today. This applies to both literary and non-literary translators. This is a craft that has to be invented again by each and every practitioner. There is practically no other profession with such a lack of historical continuity, in which the experience of successive generations is not synthesised and each practitioner can only build on their own experience.

This is why it is a remarkable achievement that in the second half of the 20th century a new scientific discipline was born, which may be called translation theo-

ry or translation studies, and it set out to elaborate, systematise, and generalise theoretically the practical experiences of translators and interpreters, past (Störig 1969, 1973, Lefevre 1977, Kelly 1979) and present. The usefulness of this undertaking is unquestionable.

1.17. Translation theory as applied linguistics

Since **applied** sciences are distinguished from theoretical sciences, among other things, on the basis of their social usefulness and interdisciplinary nature (Szépe 1986), translation or translation studies may be regarded as a typically applied field of study.

Although, as has already been pointed out, the process of translation and interpretation **itself** is a major field of interest for translation scholars and there is considerable basic research conducted in the field, most of this research is applied by nature. Translation theory is an **interdisciplinary** field of study as it applies the results, terminology, research methods, etc. of various linguistic disciplines or other social sciences to investigate the processes, products and functions of translation. It is also a **useful** science, since its results – even if in an indirect sense – may be applied widely: in designing curricula for translator and interpreter training institutions and developing materials for interpretation and translation, in devising criteria for the assessment of translations, in unifying the documentation of multinational companies, in forming the professional profile of translators and interpreters, in designing market strategies for translator and interpreter agencies, in calculating prices for translation and interpretation, in producing translator desks and interpreter booths, etc.

1.18. The definition of translation theory

Based on what has been said above, a definition may now be proposed for translation theory. Translation theory is a subdiscipline of applied linguistics that studies the processes, products, and functions of translation, taking into account all of the linguistic and extralinguistic elements of the situational context of translation.

The linguistic components of the situation of translation are the following: the source language (SL), the target language (TL), the source language text, and the target language text.

The extralinguistic components of the situation of translation are the following: the source language sender, the target language receiver, the translator (who, in one person, combines the function of source language receiver and target language sender), and the historical, geographical, social, and cultural context of the source and the target language.

In the current book the term “translation” refers to all kinds of translation, that is

- (1) **written** translation of a **written** text
- (2) **oral** translation of a **written** text (sight translation)

- (3) **oral** translation of a **spoken** text (interpretation)
 - a) simultaneous translation of a spoken text (simultaneous interpretation)
 - b) consecutive translation of a spoken text (consecutive interpretation)
- (4) **written** translation of a **spoken** text

In other words, the various forms of interpretation are not outside the scope of translation studies research, although, as theoretical research on interpretation has intensified, the terms “**interpretation studies**” or “**interpreting studies**” have also appeared (about the differences see Gile 1995), indicating that this new discipline is gradually becoming independent of translation theory.

In this book, research on interpretation is treated as part of translation studies. Thus, in speaking about the “**translator**” and “**translation**”, we shall be referring to **linguistic mediation** (Sprachmittlung) and **linguistic mediator** (Sprachmittler) in the broad sense of the word, and not merely to written translation. The terms “**interpretation**” and “**interpreter**” will only be used when referring exclusively to oral mediation (e.g. in the chapter on psycholinguistics).

1.19. Factors influencing translators’ decisions

One reason for the fact that even today many researchers have doubts about translation theory as a discipline in its own right is that the object investigated is exceedingly complex. Whether one looks at the process or end product of translation, one must recognise that there is a host of factors that may influence translators’ decisions. It is no wonder that translation scholars are inclined to pick one or another of the most important factors influencing translation and overemphasise it at the expense of other factors, thus playing down the importance of research conducted into other issues. In this way, those who stress the social role of translation tend to underrate the relevance of linguistic research into translation problems.

A distinctive feature of translation is that it is **secondary communication**, a feature that accounts for the fact that in translation there are many more factors influencing the selection of linguistic form than in monolingual communication. In primary (monolingual) communication, there are three factors at work in selecting linguistic forms: (1) the linguistic system, providing a set of linguistic forms, (2) usage rules (language norms), which determine the selection and use of individual elements of the set, and (3) the context of discourse, interpreted in a broad sense, which places additional constraints on communication in accordance with historical, social, geographical and other circumstances.

In secondary (bilingual) communication, the three factors described above are duplicated, to say the least. Translators’ decisions are influenced by the systems, norms and contextual constraints of both the source and the target language. In addition, the situation is further complicated: translators’ choices are also influenced by the **interrelations** between these factors and the ideas that the translator, consciously or unconsciously, develops about the interrelations between the above factors, i.e. the similarities and differences between the linguistic systems of

the two languages, the use of these systems and the historical and social conditions in which the two languages function. And there is one more factor at work in language use that must be considered: it is not only the differences in language norms between the two speech communities and the relations between them that influence translators' decisions, but also the traditions of translators' target language use, i.e. translation norms, embodying the experience of successive generations of translators. This **translational language use** has not been adequately described or analysed, and much less codified, but is handed down from generation to generation in one way or another.

The table 1 attempts to summarise the factors that influence the selection of linguistic form in primary (monolingual) and secondary (bilingual) communication.

Table 1.
Factors influencing decisions in primary and secondary communication

Level	Primary communication in L1	Primary communication in L2	Secondary communication in L2
Linguistic competence	system of L1	system of L2	systems of L1 and L2
Linguistic performance	use of L1 system	use of L2 system	usage in L1 and L2
Extralinguistic reality	context of L1	context of L2	contexts of L1 and L2
			relationship between the systems of L1 and L2 e.g. missing grammatical categories
			relationship between usage in L1 and L2 e.g. discourse structuring
			relationship between the contexts of L1 and L2 e.g. political systems, power relations
			relationship between translational use in L1-L2 e.g. experience of the previous generations of translators

1.20. The first era of linguistic translation theory

The development of translation theory was divided into periods by several scholars (Steiner 1975, Gentzler 1993). Since the first researchers of translation worked in relative **isolation** in different countries, it is hard to define the exact beginning. Interestingly, though, despite the fact that western European and American researchers hardly know the works of their Russian colleagues, they still agree on the fact that the birth of a linguistic translation theory was marked by the appearance in 1953 of Andrey Fedorov's study, *Vvedenie v teoriyu perevoda* (Introduction to the theory of translation), which was published again in 1958, 1968 and 1983 (the West only knew about this Russian book from reviews, e.g. Cary's review in *Babel* 1957/3).

Fedorov was the first to offer a systematic overview of the tasks and the history of translation theory, the problem of translatability, the lexical, grammatical, genre-specific, and stylistic questions of translation, and he did so using a predominantly linguistic terminology. It is important to note that Eugene **Nida**, the great American translation theorist, appears as early as in 1952 with his work *God's Word in Man's Language*, but his work takes a decisive turn only when he adapts Chomsky's theory to translation.

At the end of the 1950s, more and more studies appear which, even if not completely distancing themselves from the literary approach, look at translation from a broader perspective (Cary 1956, Savory 1957, Smith 1958, Vinay and Darbelnet 1958). The collection of studies *On Translation*, edited by Reuben A. Brower (1959) merits special mention. It contains, among several other studies highlighting the various aspects of translation, **Jakobson's** famous article entitled *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. In this study Jakobson distinguishes between intralingual (within the same language), interlingual (between languages), and intersemiotic (between systems of signs) translation. He was the first linguist to state that the study of language should involve the study of translation as well. The first studies dealing with the translation of scientific and technical texts distance themselves or have to distance themselves more and more from the literary approach (Jumpelt 1961).

The 1960s bring a real breakthrough in the development of linguistic translation theory. In the years 1963, 1964, 1965 works of fundamental importance on linguistic translation theory are published in various parts of the world independently of one another. **Revzin** and **Rozentsveig** publish their *Osnovi obshchevo i mashinnovo perevoda* (Foundations of general and machine translation) in 1964, containing their lectures given at the translator training department of Maurice Thorez Foreign Language Pedagogy College, Moscow between 1959 and 1961. They consider Fedorov's approach too literary and argue for a more exact linguistic description and a fully formalised account of the process of translation.

In 1965, John **Catford** publishes his work entitled *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, based on a series of lectures he gave at Edinburgh University for students of applied linguistics. Georges **Mounin** publishes his study *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction* in 1963, and Eugene **Nida** publishes his work *Toward a Science of Translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating* in 1964, a work that came to be considered the Bible of the theory of translation.

Nida's way to theory led through practice. What he wanted was to find theoretical support for his principles of Bible translation, and he found it in linguistics. The book he published in 1964 was dedicated to his colleagues working in the translation department of the American Bible Society, and was intended to provide theoretical foundations for new Bible translations addressing a wider audience than ever before. The theoretical basis he built upon was Chomsky's transformational generative language theory (Chomsky 1957, 1965). Following this theory, Nida argued that in the process of translation the translator reduces complicated source language surface structures to simple kernel structures and arrives at target language surface structures through restructuring (for more details see the chapter on the modelling of translation). In a later study published in 1976, Nida claims that he conceived of the notion of deep structure earlier than Chomsky did. About this interesting and historically still open question see Gentzler (1993).

The studies referred to above played an important role in the establishment of the linguistic theory of translation as a sovereign discipline, but its legitimacy was still a matter of debate at the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s. The German name of this new field, **Übersetzungswissenschaft**, appeared as early as 1813 in Schleiermacher (quoted in Wilss 1977); it was named **theorie de la traduction** in French, following a study by Edmond Cary, *Pour une theorie de la traduction*, published in 1962 (quoted in Radó 1981); and it is referred to as **science of translation** (Nida 1964) or **theory of translation** (Catford 1965) in English.

James **Holmes**'s role in legitimising the new discipline was remarkable. He introduced the term "**translation studies**" in a lecture on *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*, held at the 3rd AILA Congress in 1972. This term became more widely used following the publication of Bassnett-McGuire's 1980 book under the same title. In his 1972 lecture, subsequently published in a journal, Holmes proposed a structural division of translation studies into **theoretical** translation studies and **descriptive** translation studies, dividing the latter into three subfields, namely **product-oriented**, **process-oriented**, and **function-oriented** translation studies. He divided theoretical translation studies into **general** translation theory and **partial** translation theories, the latter studying the problems of translation depending on who the translation is produced by, a person or a machine (medium restricted translation theories), what language the translation is done from or into (area-restricted translation studies), what text type is being translated (text-type restricted theories), etc. Beside theoretical and descriptive translation studies he identifies a third type as well, applied translation studies, whose subdivisions are translator **training**, translation **aids**, translation **policy**, and translation **criticism** (Holmes 1972 in 1988: 67–80).

Holmes noted that at the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s theoretical research followed two directions and these two directions of research characterised the development of translation studies until the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s.

One of these directions is represented by **general** translation theory (*Allgemeine Translationstheorie*, *obshchaya teoriya perevoda*), which deals with the general problems of translation independent of language and genre, such as translatability, the modelling of the process of translation, equivalence, etc. (Kade 1968, Neubert 1968, Nida and Taber 1969, Holmes 1972, Shveitser 1973, Komissarov

1973, Retsker 1974, Steiner 1975, Barkhudarov 1975, Jäger 1975, Wilss 1977, House 1977, Koller 1979, Komissarov 1980, Bassnett-McGuire 1980, Toury 1980 and Wilss 1980).

The other direction involves **partial** translation theories (*chastnaya teoriya perevoda*), which deal with the problems of translation related to language pair, direction of translation, genre, and text type (Wandruszka 1969, Gak and L'vin 1970, Reiss 1971, Levitskaya and Fiterman 1973, Chernyahovskaya 1976, Gak 1977, Vaseva 1980, Vlakhov and Florin 1980).

It is hard to mark the end of the early stage. For the sake of simplicity, we shall cut it off with 1980, although this arbitrary decision will exclude some important authors and works, such as Peter Newmark, whose *Approaches to Translation*, published in 1982, addressed some of the most fundamental issues of linguistic translation studies.

The second and third eras of translation studies, leading up to the present day, will be discussed in Chapter I.7.

2. Translation theory and sociolinguistics

The history of thinking about translation has never failed to recognise the social importance of translation. What is more, in the history of translation in Hungary, especially in the 18th century (in the works of János Batsányi, Ferenc Kazinczy, György Bessenyei and Sándor Báróczy), thoughts on the social relevance of translation gained much more importance than the linguistic exploration of translation (on the Hungarian tradition see Radó in Baker 1998: 448–453).

What is called in today's modern terminology **pragmatic adaptation** (Neubert 1968), i.e. the adaptation of the translated work to the needs of the target language audience, has never been better accomplished than in the case of András Dugonics in 1807, who placed Voltaire's *Zadig* into a Hungarian context under the title *Cserei, egy honvári herceg*, what is more, into 10th century Hungary, the era of Taksony vezér (i.e. Chief Taksony) (Dugonics 1807, 1975).

Sociolinguistic research in the 70s of the 20th century (Labov 1970, Ferguson 1971, Fishman 1971, Giglioli 1972, Trudgill 1974) is important from the point of view of linguistic translation studies, because it provides an opportunity for the study of the relationship between translation and society to become part of broader investigations aiming to explore the relationship between language and society.

2.1. The reproduction of individual speech styles

In the case of translating literary pieces, it is an important problem to render the **individual** (social or regional) **speech style** of the characters. This particular translation problem is related to the problem of the vertical and horizontal stratification of languages, and, since it concerns the process of translation, to the problem of the differing **horizontal** and **vertical** stratification of **two languages**.

In Aristophanes' comedy, the *Lysistrata*, the Doric dialect of the Spartans is the sign of provinciality in contrast to the sophisticated Attic dialect of the Athenians. The Spartan envoy speaking a Doric dialect speaks a Scottish dialect in the English translation and a southern one in the American version, whereas in the Nigerian translation he speaks a Nigerian pidgin, commanding lower prestige (Bailey and Robinson 1973 in Shveitser 1988). It is worth looking at a few sentences uttered by the Spartan envoy and compare them with the Athenian counselor's speech in János Arany's Hungarian translation. Since it is a 19th-century translation, it is not only the Spartan envoy's speech that differs from the speech of the Athenian counselor in it, but the speech of all of the characters in the comedy differs from currently spoken Hungarian. However, the differing characteristics of the Spartan envoy's speech from that of the Athenian counselor, for example the distortion of words (*aszánai* instead of *athéni*), the use of vernacular forms (*gyűvök* instead of

jövök), clipping the endings of words (*Spártábó'* instead of *Spártából*, *ne bomó'* instead of *ne bomólj*), and frequent outbursts of temper (*'stenuccse*, *Kastor uccseg*, *Zeus uccse*), provide clear evidence for present-day Hungarian readers that he is speaking a low prestige dialect.

Making the Spartan envoy speak is a relatively easy task for the translator. No matter what century and what language it is, when translating Aristophanes' comedy, the translator only has to indicate provinciality in contrast to the literary linguistic norm prevalent in the given century and language.

2.2. The reproduction of regional dialects

Imre Makai had a considerably more difficult task when translating Solohov's *Silent Don*. He had to find the Hungarian regional equivalents of the regional words and dialect used by proud, brave, and free Cossacks. He could have chosen to do the same as the translator of the German edition, who did not even try to hint at the Don dialect, while Makai claimed that it would have been "... simply forgery: it would have falsified its Cossack and popular nature, its Don-like tone and atmosphere" (Makai 1981: 575).

Just imagine what an extraordinary task it is for a translator to find a Hungarian dialect that can reflect the novel's "Don-like atmosphere". Imre Makai offers a remarkable sociolinguistic explanation to why he finally opted for the dialect of Hajdúság (a county in Hungary):

... the two ethnic communities resemble each other both in terms of their evolution and their history. Originally they were homeless peasants and outlaws who banded together and, holding one hand on the plough tail and the other on the hilt of the sword, they became soldier-peasants. The sole difference between them was that the Cossacks first fought against the Czar, and only then did they become his servants, while the Heyducks first served the Austrian Emperor and then joined the army of the Transsylvanian Prince Bocskai. The important point is that their life styles were similar. This is where the similarity of their thinking, and consequently language, originates from: both the Cossacks and the Heyducks are characterised by a harsh and sharp-witted style, lacking the signs of sentimentalism or flourish, and crackling dialogues (Makai 1981: 574).

2.3. The reproduction of social dialects

Abundant examples of the vertical stratification of the two languages can be observed in the Hungarian translations of Russian classics. Civil servants in the lower ranks of the rigid, 14-class social ladder of Russian officialdom often use the "s" sound that originated from the words *gosudar* and *sudar* ('sir') to express respect. The servile fawning and abjectness expressed by this linguistic element in Russian is often lost in the Hungarian translations; not only because the Hungarian vocabulary equivalent *ur(am)* cannot be abbreviated to just one sound, but also because in Hungarian society the relations of sub- and superordination were different and

so were, consequently, the linguistic expressions corresponding to them. Ferenc Papp (1979) cites the abbreviation *tekintetes-téns* ('honourable') as a formal analogy, and functionally compares the use of the Russian particle "s" to the Hungarian *kérlek/kérem alásson* ('I humbly beg to'). Both of them mark a very rare and socially strongly restricted language use in Hungarian. It is also mentioned by Papp that the Russian particle "s" expressing the relations of social sub- and superordination receives an interesting role in Dostoyevskiy's novel, *Crime and Punishment*, where the pretended servility of the magistrate playing a teasing game with Raskolnikov is expressed through the constant use of the particle "s". This inversion of the relations of social sub- and superordination is crucial in this scene, but the translator could only reflect it if Hungarian also had a particle to express servility, which the translator could attach to the words of the magistrate, thus reproducing the awkwardness and the ambiguity of the situation.

2.4. The translation of lexis without equivalence

Another area where translation theory can greatly benefit from sociolinguistics is the translation of what is usually referred to as "**lexis without equivalence**", or, to use another term, "**realia**". How can we translate the names of objects typically characteristic of a particular language community (meals, clothes, dishes, dances, etc.) into another language in which these objects do not exist (Vlakhov and Florin 1980)? This question can be investigated on the surface level as a dictionary difference, but it can also be looked at from a broader perspective, based on sociolinguistic research into language contacts (Weinreich 1966).

The theory of language contacts treats the activity of two language communities aimed at exploring each other's realia as a **process**, in which various social strata and groups (in earlier times mainly travellers and literary translators, while today mostly students, scientists and scholars, journalists, reporters, etc.) have different roles. This process of exploration and denotation between two language communities takes place in different ways, depending on geographical distance and length of the contact situation: thus, e.g., Hungarian and German have been in **permanent contact** for several centuries, and Hungarian and Russian came into contact in the second half of the 20th century, while Hungarian and Japanese are geographically **remote** from each other.

The exploring-denoting activity is also different in the case of language communities on the same social-economic level, where it is a **two-way** process, and in the case of language communities with differing economic-social levels, where it is a **one-way** process. Regarding Hungarian, Endre Lendvai (1986) was a pioneer in this field, who investigated the Hungarian equivalents of typically Russian realia placed in a broader social context. The word *gimnastyorka* ('a jacket-like military shirt with a high collar', cf. Bakos 1994: 284), a commonly known word in the 1950s in Hungary, does not mean anything to young people in the 1980s. In Endre Lendvai's survey (1984–1985), students gave the following answers when asked about the meaning of the word *gimnasztyorka*: *gymnast*, *gym shirt*, *P.E. class*, *second-ary school student* (called "*gimnazista*" in Hungarian), *morning gymnastics/work out*.

2.5. Translatability and untranslatability

The sociolinguistic approach is especially important in investigating the problem of **translatability** and **untranslatability** (Mounin 1963, Catford 1965). The vacuity of the arguments put forward to support the idea of untranslatability is best shown by the tremendous amount of translations produced all over the world, refuting the thesis of untranslatability day by day, and yet every book on translation theory contains a section devoted to this problem.

The question of translatability vs. untranslatability provides an opportunity for translation scholars to express their views on the relationship between **language and reality**. It is seemingly axiomatic that reality is the same for all of us and it is only the linguistic expressions referring to the different segments of reality that are different; however, linguistics and the social sciences often point out that language also affects reality to some extent (Whorf 1956, Sapir 1956). The way, for example, we perceive the external characteristics of objects is influenced by the kind of words available in our mother tongue to describe these characteristics.

If languages segment reality differently, then every language community will have a different picture of reality, a different “world view”. Certain phenomena of reality appear in excessive detail in one language, while there is only a collective name for them in another one. Common examples of these are the great number of names the Eskimo language uses for the different types of snow and the multitude of colour names the Argentinean *gauchos* have for horses. In the Arabic language the postures of camels, in Russian the types of fish, in Italian the types of pasta, in English the objects and concepts related to navigation have numerous names.

Mounin, the eminent French translation scholar ingeniously refutes the claim that the differences above would reflect different views of the world: “... if within the same language one conducts several similar analyses, then it may be concluded that speakers even of the same language gain their experience of the world at different levels. The fact that this is reflected in the structure of lexis does not mean that we are faced with different world views. At a place where the common Frenchman sees only snow, the French ski champion can distinguish between and name several types of snow, the same way as Lapps or Eskimos living in the distant Arctic...” (Mounin 1963).

This obviously does not mean that the average Frenchman’s world view differs from that of the French ski champion, or that the world view of the latter would be similar to that of the Lapps or Eskimos. It is more correct to say that all Eskimos come into contact with snow in one way or another, and thus the vocabulary related to snow becomes part of everyday speech, while in French it remains part of merely the technical vocabulary used by a restricted number of people.

2.6. Realia and untranslatability

The other argument for untranslatability is the translation or the impossibility of the translation of “realia” mentioned above (names for objects used only by a particular group of people), since these, in fact, cannot be translated into the language of a community which does not know it.

If realia are simply translated into the target language, then the translation will

make no sense without footnotes. If the translator tries to find some target language realia with a similar function and uses that instead, then the informative, culture-enriching function of translation is endangered, since realia contain abundant information about the culture, life style, habits, self-esteem, etc. of the given language community, and the aim of translation, sometimes, is precisely to reflect this information.

As mentioned before, it is one of the sociolinguistic disciplines that may help in resolving this dilemma. The theory of language contacts looks at the problem of the translation of realia not merely as a linguistic problem, but considers it as part of a process in which the two language communities in contact get to know each other's culture (and this process might not take place primarily through translation), and during this process both cultures **accumulate** knowledge about each other's realia. Simultaneously with the accumulation of knowledge, in fact, sometimes prior to it, the two cultures might also develop an **evaluative** relationship regarding each other's realia. This is shown by the increasing prestige of the Russian words *bolsevik* ('bolshevik'), *sztahanovista* ('stakhanovist'), *kolhoz* ('collective farm'), *kulák* ('wealthy peasant'), in Hungarian in the 1950s and their decreasing prestige nowadays.

When translating realia, translators consciously or intuitively take into consideration the knowledge-accumulating and evaluating activity of the target language society. Thus, the existence of realia does not support the theory of untranslatability, but rather the fact that to be able to translate them, i.e. find equivalences for them, one has to start out from the knowledge and evaluative relationship the target language society possesses about the given realia and not the actual source language norm. This is a sociolinguistic fact and it can be investigated with the research methods (e.g., questionnaires) of sociolinguistics.

2.7. What can translation studies offer to sociolinguistics?

The theory of translation does not only apply to the findings and research methods of sociolinguistics, but it can also provide interesting data for sociolinguistic research.

A popular theme in sociolinguistics is the research on forms of **address** (Brown and Gilman 1960, Brown and Ford 1965, Ervin-Tripp 1969, Reményi 1994), since the way people address each other gives direct information on the social aspects of language use. In English, the word *you* is used to address the second person both in the singular and the plural. The translator, in translating from English to Hungarian, uses the forms *ön*, *maga*, or *te*, (i.e. the formal and informal forms), depending on his/her experience concerning the way these are generally used in the Hungarian society for people of different ages, sexes, professions, and social status. In research on forms of address, every single literary piece translated from English into Hungarian may be regarded as a spontaneous sociolinguistic experiment.

2.8. What can sociolinguistics offer to translation studies?

As mentioned earlier, the translator, when working with two languages simultaneously, consciously or unconsciously develops a theory of some kind about the relationship between the **two languages** and acts in accordance with this theory in his translating activity. Research in contrastive linguistics can aid translation theory by providing a scientifically well-founded description of the relationship between the two languages. Based on this, some of the decisions made by translators can be considered correct, and others incorrect. However, not all of the decisions made by the translator can be accounted for by contrastive linguistics.

The same applies to **sociolinguistics**. The translator, who mediates not only between two languages but between two cultures as well, forms certain views about the relationship between the source language and **source language society** and the target language and **target language society**, and implements these views in the process of translation. Sociolinguistics, revealing the relationship between language and society independently of translation, provides **scientifically well-founded descriptions** of the relationship between the source language and source language society, and the target language and the target language society, and might thus contribute to exploring the objective rules behind the translators' decisions.

On the basis of sociolinguistic research, particular translator decisions will be considered correct and others incorrect, and still others will be explained with the help of other fields of study.

2.9. New challenges for the sociolinguistics of translation

While translation scholars are peacefully exploring problems of translation caused by cultural differences, events in real life, such as the migration brought about by the opening of frontiers, forces practising translators and interpreters to mediate – in addition to mediating between languages – between cultures and social groups as well.

Wadensjö (1992) investigates the theoretical problems of community interpreting in situations where immigrants, i.e. not only linguistically but also socially defenseless people face trial. These people expect more of an interpreter than just simple linguistic mediation without sympathy, so interpreters working in the field need to receive special training (Wadensjö 1992).

It was also “life” that gave the opportunity to Miriam Shlesinger in Tel Aviv to analyse the work of interpreters in court trials of war criminals to see what additional information needs to be mediated apart from linguistic meaning to ensure understanding at such a multilingual trial. Miriam Shlesinger's study is based on the State of Israel versus Demjanjuk case, tried in 1987–1988 in Jerusalem. The trial was conducted in six languages: English, German, Russian, Ukrainian, Yiddish, and Hebrew. Thirteen professional and one non-professional interpreters were employed, since they could not find an official interpreter in Ukrainian and Hebrew. Every form of interpretation was represented here: from consecutive and simultaneous interpreting to actually whispering in the ears. To ensure understanding among the participants of the multilingual trial, numerous pragmatic adaptations

were necessary: the translation of even such seemingly problem-free phrases as for instance “the winter of 1986” caused difficulties:

... when an American attorney questioned an Israeli policeman about the “winter of 1986”, the former was referring to the period beginning in November 1986 (by which time winter sets in the area where he lives) and lasting about April 1987, whereas the latter assumed this referred to the period beginning in January 1986 and lasting through March of the year, in line with Israeli climate. A rendering of “the winter of 1986” as “the winter of 1985” would have prevented the misunderstanding which the interpreter, deterred by the stricture of “faithfulness” and “accuracy” in translation, refrained from exercising latitude in this case (Shlesinger 1991: 149).

With the increase in the translation needs of international organisations and multinational companies, José Lambert (1993), forecasts a radical change in the relationship between culture and translation. In his view, it is not correct to investigate cultural differences **within** the framework of translation studies, restricting them to the problem of translating meals, drinks, dances, types of money, etc., that is, realia. He considers culture research to be the broader concept, of which translation studies forms a part. Translation should always be viewed within the total network of social-cultural norms, starting with finding out about the kinds of documents that international organisations, multinational firms, and international publishing companies translate and do not translate, continuing with the instructions, explicit or implicit, that they give to translators, and ending with the use they make of the translation (how widely they circulate it, etc.).

With the establishment of international political and economic organizations the rules of communication have changed. The source language and target language audiences are not binary opposites any more, since the institutional norms cannot be tied to any one country. The translating principles and strategies of a Dutch translator are closer to those of his German colleague working for the same American company than to those of a Dutch colleague who works for an English company in the Netherlands.

Lambert emphasises the importance of research on “translation policy”. According to his opinion, what really has to be examined is how the international political and economic institutions are taking over the leading role of conventional cultural frameworks defined by national languages and frontiers to form an **intercultural translation policy**.

3. Translation theory and psycholinguistics

To draw conclusions about the process of translation not solely based on a comparison of the source language and target language texts but also taking into account the translator and the processes in his/her mind, i.e. in the “black box”, psychology and psycholinguistics also need to be involved in translation theory.

3.1. Perception and production in translation

Psycholinguistics, studying the psychological processes accompanying speech activity, entered a period of rapid growth in the 1960s at the same time as sociolinguistics (Miller 1965, Adams 1972, Greene 1972). Since translation is also a speech activity, but with the difference that it is conducted in two languages, everything that psycholinguistics has stated about speech perception, memory operation, and speech production can be used to get closer to understanding the bilingual speech activity of translators. Since speech perception can be interpreted in both a narrow and a broad sense, it is important to note that here perception will be used as a cover term which involves not only speech perception but also speech comprehension. In addition, it has to be stated that perception is used to refer to the comprehension of both written and spoken texts, and production refers to the creation of both written and spoken texts. Let us now review the differences between monolingual speakers and translators in terms of perception and production.

(1) In the case of the monolingual speaker, perception and production take place in the **same language**, whereas in the case of the translator, perception and production do **not** happen in the **same language**, and there is a transcoding stage between them.

(2) In the case of the monolingual speaker, perception and production follow each other; in the case of the translators or interpreters, perception and production, despite the transcoding stage, can **overlap** and can happen simultaneously or with a negligible time difference, as in simultaneous interpreting, or with **delay**, as in consecutive interpretation, and in the latter case the ability to store information, i.e. memory gains a considerable role.

(3) The translator differs from the monolingual speaker not only in the fact that he/she has to speak two languages, but also in that he/she has to follow two completely **different strategies** in giving a linguistic structure to the ideas. Translators move from a given linguistic structure to the underlying thought and from the thought to another linguistic structure following two different strategies, and in many cases, for instance in simultaneous interpretation, they do so almost exactly at the same time. This explains why not everybody can translate or interpret well who speaks a foreign language.

(4) The road from the thought to the linguistic form is made even more difficult for the translator by the fact that he/she has to express someone else's ideas. In A. A. Leontev's terminology, translators work on the basis of an "**externally defined programme**" (Leontev 1969 in Shveitser 1988:28).

(5) As a result of the above mentioned causes, translators are also motivated differently. They do not satisfy their own communicative needs but somebody else's, while they themselves are also people, and thus cannot disregard their own interests in the process of perception and their own opinions during the process of production. Compared to monolingual speech activity (direct motivation), translation is characterised by **indirect motivation** (Zimnyaya in Zlateva 1993).

3.2. Translation and bilingualism

In contrasting translators and interpreters with monolingual speakers, we deliberately do not regard them as bilingual speakers. Researchers of bilingualism differ greatly with regard to who can be called a bilingual: only the ones who speak both languages as their mother tongues (Bloomfield 1935), or those who have different competence in both languages (dominance of one language [Haugen 1953]).

Since our approach is closer to the Bloomfieldian one, translators and interpreters are not referred to as bilingual speakers here. The most dominant feature of translators and interpreters is not that they have native speaker proficiency in two languages, but that they are professional linguistic mediators, i.e. **can mediate between two languages**. Many excellent translators cannot communicate proficiently in a foreign language, but can brilliantly perform the task of linguistic mediation between a foreign language and their mother tongue. The notion of bilingual speaker is a partly narrower and a partly broader concept than that of the linguistic mediator. It is narrower, since not all bilinguals can do translation or interpretation, and it is broader, since not all translators or interpreters can be called bilingual, either. Translators and interpreters might be claimed to represent a **specifically limited functional version** of bilingualism.

3.3. Simultaneous interpreting as a psycholinguistic experiment

Translation theory can apply the results of psycholinguistics research in monolingual speech activity, that is, it can adapt the findings of psycholinguistics to the analysis of the process of translation. Interestingly, this has been acknowledged by the researchers of oral translation (interpretation) earlier than by the researchers of written translation. The analysis of recorded speech production of interpreters reveals more about the mental processes taking place during the translation than the analysis of written translations.

Audio recordings of the discourse produced by simultaneous interpreters are more appropriate for the investigation of the mental activity of translators because the target language performance of simultaneous interpreters is not so far from **internal speech** as the corrected, proof-read, post-edited written texts of translators.

Simultaneous interpreters, working under time pressure, urged by the time constraint, and lacking better solutions, often say things into the microphone that they would never come up with in written translation. This often rough “semi-transcoded” discourse, containing seemingly unjustified insertions and omissions, vague chunks alternating with well-formed ones, the seemingly unjustified shifts between rapid speech, slow speech and pauses, reveals abundant information about the characteristic features of speech activity conducted in two languages. The activity of simultaneous interpreters may be considered as a large-scale spontaneous psycholinguistic experiment, in which the recording of the material can also be done easily. It provides tremendous possibilities for research, which have not yet been exploited.

3.4. The simultaneity of listening and speaking

Researchers of simultaneous interpreting, naturally, do not only use the data provided by such spontaneous experiments, but they also conduct planned experiments. The first experiments were aimed at finding out whether or not it is possible to **listen and speak simultaneously**. Some researchers claimed that simultaneous interpreters do not listen and speak at the same time, but they alternate between the two activities, using the pauses of the speaker as well as their own pauses, i.e. the “micro-pauses” as Shiryayev (1973) called them.

3.5. The active nature of perception

This question has been investigated by psychologists and psycholinguists independently of interpretation. Interestingly enough, the rejection of the idea of simultaneous listening and speaking is based on a correct observation. More precisely, it started out from the assumption that listening is never a passive activity, as in order to understand what has been said one has to perform a number of operations.

Miller lists the following operations: (1) hearing the utterance (2) matching it as a phonemic pattern, (3) accepting it as a sentence i.e. grammatical acceptance, (4) attributing meaning to grammatical structures, i.e. semantic interpretation, (5) understanding, i.e. attaching contextual information to what has been said (Miller 1965: 295–295).

This series of operations, although it looks like “decomposition” at first sight, is also composition. Since it is unlikely that every sentence has a separate internal representation in the mind of the listener, it has to be assumed that during listening listeners actively produce the internal representation of what is being said. This idea was formulated by Halle and Stevens in 1962, but the active nature of listening had been pointed out much earlier than that.

Blonskiy wrote the following in 1935: “The reason why one cannot speak about something else while listening carefully to somebody is that while we listen to someone’s speech we simultaneously reproduce it. Listening to speech is not simply just listening, but to a certain extent we also speak together with the speaker” (1935: 155).

As mentioned before, it was the correct observation that speech perception is not a passive process that led to the misbelief that speech perception and speech production are not simultaneous processes.

However, it is important to note that we are still not speaking about interpretation; we are still investigating the relationship between perception and production within monolingual speech activity. This is precisely why psycholinguistics is important from the point of view of translation and interpretation theory: it had completed a large number of experiments well in advance, from which research on simultaneous interpretation could start out. Before the practice of simultaneous interpretation could have proved that it is possible to listen and speak at the same time psychologists had conducted several experiments to justify the legitimacy of this claim (Yermolovich 1978).

3.6. Experiments independent of interpretation

In 1952, Broadbent conducted an experiment to see whether participants can answer a question while listening to the next one in the meantime. Poulton continued Broadbent's experiments in 1955, overcoming the problem in previous experiments that the voice of the experimenter and that of the respondent were disturbing each other. In these experiments the questions were raised via headphones, and he also tried to make sure that respondents are not disturbed in understanding the questions by giving too loud answers. The results of Poulton's experiment confirmed those obtained by Broadbent, according to which it is possible to listen and answer at the same time. By improving the conditions of simultaneous asking and answering (headphones, volume control) he also managed to reduce the rate of error.

Sokolov investigated the relationship between perception and production in the following experiment: in the first phase of the experiment, during listening, participants read out a poem, in the second phase they counted, and in the third phase they recited a poem by heart. The experiment allowed for three important conclusions. The first is that the more automatic production is (e.g., reciting a poem by heart), the more successful perception will be. The second is that perception takes place by capturing certain conceptual nodes. And finally, the third is that familiarity with topic considerably affects the efficiency of perception (Sokolov 1968).

The role of topic familiarity in understanding was confirmed by an interesting experiment conducted much earlier by David Bruce. He recorded a set of ordinary sentences and played them, in the presence of noise so intense that the voice was just audible, but not intelligible. He played it several times for the same audience. Before each playing he defined the topic of the text differently, and listeners always picked out sentences from the text which matched the given topic content-wise (Bruce 1956).

The **active** nature of listening and understanding does not therefore consist merely of constructing the sentence while listening, but it also indicates that some preliminary ideas are formed about what is going to be heard already before start-

ing to listen on the basis of the topic specified or the communicative situation. Thus we listen “accordingly.”

Summarising the findings of his experiment, Poulton also referred to the fact that his participants worked on the basis of particular hypotheses. Miller draws the same conclusion when evaluating Bruce’s experiment: “With an advance hypothesis about what the message will be we can tune our perceptual system to favour certain interpretations and reject others” (Miller 1965: 297).

3.7. Probability prediction

The sporadic references to hypothesis-forming and preliminary adjustment in psychology and psycholinguistics were applied with a great deal of originality by two Russian authors, Chernov and Zimnyaya, creating the theory of **probability prediction**. They offered an apt answer to the question whether production may happen simultaneously with perception or not, or whether it can only follow it: in simultaneous interpreting production neither follows perception nor appears simultaneously with it; in fact it **precedes** it (Chernov and Zimnyaya 1970, 1973, Chernov 1978, 1994).

The gist of the theory is this: Chernov and Zimnyaya do not share the view that interpreters work entirely on the basis of an externally motivated programme. In their opinion, translators, taking into consideration all of the linguistic and extralinguistic aspects of the situation of interpretation, form an internal programme, which consists of two types of hypotheses. On the one hand, knowing the broad context of the event (time, place, speakers, topic, aims, text-types, etc.) the interpreter has a general view of the contents of the text to be interpreted (long-range hypothesis). On the other hand, based on the actual sentence started by the speaker, he/she has a specific idea about the contents of the sentence being uttered (short-range hypothesis).

These two hypotheses make it possible for the interpreter to stop the process of listening actively to the speaker and from time to time work on the basis of a hypothesis. This hypothesis enables the interpreter to predict the structure and contents of the sentence, which is especially important in interpreting from languages such as German, in which the predicate is uttered at the end of the sentence. Periodically the interpreter switches back to active listening to check the correctness of his/her hypothesis. If it is confirmed, the interpreter continues to work on the basis of the hypothesis. If it happens to be incorrect, he/she stops the process of interpretation for a while to actively listen to the speaker until a correct hypothesis is reached again. After this he/she continues the work following this hypothesis, i.e. the separate internal programme, otherwise he/she would not be able to catch up.

Zimnyaya, Chernov and their colleagues justified their theory partly by conducting guided experiments and partly by analysing audio-recordings of conferences. Guided experiments produced data about the operation of hypotheses working at various levels.

3.7.1. Types of hypotheses

Sladkovskaya, for example, attempted to experimentally justify the operation of hypotheses formed on the basis of the **aim of utterance**. She had an eleven-sentence greeting speech interpreted by practicing interpreters. The interpreters were only informed about the fact that a UN representative was to greet the new president of the general assembly entering into office. They were not told that the greetings would be delivered by the representative of an Arab country and that the new president was the representative of a country on friendly terms with Israel. Out of the eleven sentences of the greeting, the fourth, fifth, seventh and ninth sentences carried hidden reproaches because of the new chair/president's earlier pro-Israeli policy.

These hints were transferred by only one interpreter, who was experienced enough in UN interpretation to recognise the speaker. The others either left out the hidden reproaches or altered the text. This implies that after the first three sentences they decided that it was considered an ordinary greeting speech (let us not forget that the first reproach came in the fourth sentence of the greeting), and subsequently worked based on their own hypothesis. Anything that contradicted this hypothesis they either did not hear or did not want to hear (Sladkovskaya 1971).

Danica Seleskovitch relates a similar case from her own experience. She was interpreting for a speaker who had an excellent command of English and Anglo-Saxon speech styles at a conference without knowing the speaker's nationality. During the process of interpretation she noticed with surprise that the speaker's position did not harmonise with the official English position, what is more, it sharply contradicted it. Using all her skills, she tried to evade the embarrassing places in the speech and blunt the sharpness of the anti-England phrases. Finally, it turned out that the speaker represented Denmark, but it was already too late (Seleskovitch 1968).

These examples neatly show what would be the ideal procedure of research within translation and interpreting studies. A problem is identified in the **everyday practice** of translation or interpreting (Seleskovitch), motivating a search for a **theoretical explanation** (Chernov and Zimnyaya), which is ultimately justified or rejected by **guided experiments** and not examples taken from practice (Sladkovskaya).

Seleskovitch writes down this event in 1968, which might merely seem as someone's own mistake, but in the light of the theory proposed by Zimnyaya and Chernov (1970), it may be considered as evidence for the assumption that interpreters work based on some hypothesis. Seleskovitch formed the hypothesis on the basis of the **performance** of the speaker. Sladkovskaya's participants in the experiment worked on the basis of the **misperceived aim** of the utterance (1971).

In a series of experiments, Belyayevskaya and her colleagues (1973) tried to provide evidence for the simultaneous operation of several hypotheses at the same time. They conducted experiments to demonstrate the operation of hypotheses on the level of morphemes, grammatical structure, lexical structure, and meaning. They also investigated the nature of the so called *opornije punkti* ('basic points' or 'sign-post elements'). Following Zimnyaya's and Chernov's theory, the essence of basic points is that these are the pieces of information the interpreter has to active-

ly listen to, to confirm or reject the hypothesis. Belyayevskaya and her colleagues have shown that these basic points, that is, the parts of the text with the highest information value and lowest redundancy rate, are not necessarily complete words. In many cases, it is enough for the interpreter to hear only part of the word or merely its first sound to form the correct hypothesis.

3.7.2. The nature of hypothesis generation

Despite the large number of experimental evidence, some practicing interpreters rejected the theory of interpretation based on probability prediction, saying that the interpreter has no right to translate anything that has not been uttered yet.

Others criticise the **content and structure based nature** of the hypothesis claiming that simultaneous interpreters work instinctively and not consciously; after finishing interpreting they do not even know what exactly they said and many interpreters think about completely different things while they work. In their view, interpreters generate hypotheses on the basis of the speaker's intonation, and it is more correct to refer to it as "**acoustic adjustment**".

Steier (1975) claims that interpreters cannot form content based hypotheses because in the case of simultaneous interpretation they only use their **short-term memory**, which stores words on an intuitive-associative basis, and they forget these as they move forward in the process of interpretation. They use **long-term memory** only in those cases when the normal process of simultaneous interpreting is interrupted for some reason, for instance if the information is produced either too slowly or too fast.

Although no definitive evidence has been found to decide this debate, it has been shown that recordings of discourse produced by simultaneous interpreters contain extremely valuable data for research aimed at looking into the minds of interpreters and translators. As a result of time constraints, simultaneous interpreters often opt for intermediary solutions, creating a kind of "transitional" language (interlingua, third code, translation language). This language often reflects the characteristics of both the source and the target language and allows for conclusions regarding what exactly it might be that goes on in the mind of the translator while being half way between the two languages.

3.8. The unit of translation/interpretation

Recording of discourse produced in simultaneous interpreting may also serve as the basis for investigating another important issue in translation theory, that of the "**unit of translation**".

Of course, the unit of translation/interpretation is not the word or the sentence, but looking at the written text one cannot easily distance oneself from the conventions of sentence boundaries. If, however, we do not have the written text of the speaker only the transcript of the simultaneous interpretation, then even finding sentence boundaries seems a challenging task. In simultaneous interpretation the boundaries of translation units are determined by the alteration of the rhythm of speech, by the alternation of rapid, slow and reduced speech and pauses.

It is again simultaneous interpretation, and especially one of its subtypes, relay

or retour interpretation through a pilot booth that can produce interesting data for the cross-language comparison of **redundancy** minimally necessary for understanding (Shveitser 1966).

3.9. Difficulties in data collection

There are a number of reasons for the still relatively low number of research projects in the field. One of these is that the use for research purposes of papers presented at conferences and their interpreted versions is not only a scientific but also an ethical and a legal question.

Another reason is that transcribing the discourse produced by simultaneous interpreters raises a large number of technical problems (for one solution see Durham 1996), as it involves writing down the parallel text of two pieces of discourse in two different languages which cannot be separated typographically either. József Bendik conducted interesting experiments on this topic, comparing the prosodic features of English, Russian, and Hungarian conference discourse and he also developed a special score writing system to note down these features (1987, 1996, 1997).

It is also a major problem that such an undertaking would require not only interdisciplinary but also interprofessional co-operation between psychologists, linguists, translation scholars, and last but not least, practising translators and interpreters. However, the institutional background necessary for such an undertaking is rarely available.

3.10. The personal traits of interpreters

So far we have been dealing with psycholinguistic issues of linguistic transfer, but this topic has another important aspect in which the field of psychology can be of great help: vocational aptitude. What personal traits are needed for someone to become a good interpreter? According to Sallai (1985), a successful interpreter must

- (1) react quickly,
- (2) bear monotony,
- (3) be self-confident,
- (4) be open towards the external world,
- (5) be able to divide his/her attention,
- (6) have a well trained memory,
- (7) be able to work without feed-back,
- (8) stand stressful situations,
- (9) possess the necessary general intelligence,
- (10) be able to bear being subordinated,
- (11) possess the necessary social intelligence,
- (12) be able to adjust to the partners (empathy),
- (13) be able to continuously control one's own work (self-control),
- (14) have some technical skills,
- (15) be in a good psychical and physical condition during interpretation.

According to Sallai, consideration of the above personal traits is important in several fields: (1) in selecting interpreters, in order to save applicants from unnecessary stress and failure, and intended recipients of the interpreted text from misunderstanding and annoyance, (2) in training interpreters, since these are the personal traits that have to be further developed in the training process (Sallai 1985: 19–20).

3.11. The “internal speech” of translators

Written texts produced as the result of translation reveal little about the characteristic features of perception and production in a bilingual communicative activity. A translated text, checked, revised, edited and re-edited many times, masks the mental activity of the translator.

This is especially so in the case of good translations. Bad and incorrect translations may shed light upon failure to understanding, but we are not merely interested in failures but also in the normal processes of understanding. How long did it take? In what stages did it happen? In what language did it take place? To what extent was understanding separated from formulation?

These questions could only be answered if the “internal speech” of translators were recorded, if the process of the constant search for and acceptance of options could be traced; in other words, if we could record the process of creating meaning, the process of finding the apparently best version in the given text and given communicative situation.

It was this desire that led to the idea of making translators speak during translating, and making them think aloud.

Hans Krings was the first to apply the method of introspection well-known in psychology for research in translation. He asked language learners to record everything that comes into their minds during translating. According to Krings, “thinking aloud while translating is an almost natural type of activity to which most of the criticism levelled at verbal report data does not apply” (Krings 1987: 166).

Similar experiments have been conducted with professional translators as well, but some researchers claim that the activity of professional translators is so highly automated that if they are forced to think aloud while doing their work, the pace of their activity is slowed down to such an extent that the recorded data will fail to reflect their real mental processes (Börsch 1986). These experiments are still at a very preliminary stage¹, since this is typically a field where translation researchers depend greatly on the help of psychologists and psycholinguists. The often lengthy think-aloud protocols, containing the reflections of translators, require special methods of transcription and analysis for which psychologists have already developed the necessary tools and conceptual apparatus. Therefore, it would not be worth inventing these again for the purposes of translation research.

¹ On more recent developments see Fraser 1996, de Groot 1997, Kiraly 1997, Lörschner 1996, Iääskeläinen 1998, 1999 and *META* (1996) Vol. 41.N.1. Special issue: *Translation Process(es)* ed. by Königs, F.G.

4. Translation theory and text linguistics

Back to the text! This is how one could characterise the translation theory of the 1980s. Thinking about the text has been a part of thinking about language for two thousand years, but that thinking did not give rise to text linguistics as an independent field of study, in the same way as thinking about translation did not add up to and was not called translation theory. It is worth remembering, however, that the idea that the text plays a central role in translation, however novel the topic may sound, has been present for many centuries.

4.1. Text-centredness in translation

Translators have never translated anything else but texts, and the outcome of translating has never been anything else but text. The process of translation has never consisted of anything else but the comprehension of the original and the creation of the translated text.

If, however, text-centredness has always been part of the thinking about translation, then why do we say that translation theory has returned to, or has found its way back to the text? When did they separate? Paradoxically, it was the linguistic theory of translation that was responsible for this separation.

4.2. Disregarding the text-level

The linguistic theory of translation achieved the status of an independent discipline in the 1950s and 1960s owing to the fact that, in addition to studying literary texts, it extended the scope of its investigations to scientific, technical and other non-literary texts, using the tools of linguistics. Since linguistics at that time was focused on the sentence, the use of linguistics in translation theory shifted the focus of attention from text to sentence. Equivalences between source language and target language were studied on the sentence level and below, on the level of words, phrases, and grammatical structures.

The first sign of this approach is seen in Retsker's famous article *O zakonomernih sootvetstviyah pri perevode na rodnoy yazik* (On regular correspondences in translation into the mother tongue), published in 1950, three years before the appearance of Fedorov's fundamental work on translation theory. Retsker's study argues for the existence of "regular correspondences" (*zakonomernie sootvetstviya*), which apply irrespective of the situation, the context, or the text. This accounts for the fact that equivalences between the words and phrases of the source language and the target language can be described, systematised, and classified. Retsker distinguishes three kinds of correspondences: "constant correspondences" (*postoyanniye*

sootvetstviya), such as technical terms, geographical names, etc., “variant correspondences” (*variantnie sootvetstviya*), where the target language offers several possibilities and translators have to choose among them, and “occasional correspondences” (*okkazonal’nie sootvetstviya*), where the translator has to create correspondence on the basis of the context (Retsker 1950, 1974, Retsker in Zlateva 1993). At that time this approach was considered pioneering, since it drew attention to the fact that translation, a process seemingly consisting of a series of subjective decisions, was in fact guided by objective rules.

Following the publication of Retsker’s and Fedorov’s research, a number of manuals appeared in the former Soviet Union, describing the lexical and grammatical equivalences characterising specific language pairs: e.g., Gak and L’vin 1970 (French–Russian), Roganova 1971 (German–Russian), Levitskaya and Fiterman 1973 (English–Russian). In retrospect, the limitations of such studies seem obvious. They considered solely the two **linguistic systems involved in translation**, and saw a translating problem in every single difference between the systems. Based on linguistic differences, they tried to discover the “rules” of translation. The literature of this early period of translation theory predicts translation problems, e.g., in cases where a particular grammatical category is absent in one language and present in another (e.g., articles in Russian and English), or where the structure of semantic fields show differences.

For this reason many scholars argue that research on translation theory in the 1960s and 1970s has more to do with contrastive linguistics than with translation theory as such. Even so, however, this was an extremely productive period, with researchers accumulating large amounts of raw material that could later be used for text-centred investigations. We must add in fairness that many of these early works on translation theory contained, usually somewhere at the end of the book, when all the description and classification of lexical and grammatical transformations had been presented, a chapter in which the author discussed what they called “stylistic transformational strategies”. Here the authors cited examples demonstrating how translators’ decisions are influenced by the genre of the source language text or the particular functional style to which it belongs (Shveitser 1973, Retsker 1974).

4.3. Returning to the text

In the early 1970s, with the emergence of text linguistics, the need for a text linguistic approach was perceived in translation theory (although the declarations made to this effect did not lead to practical consequences at the time). Text linguists, in their turn, also made frequent references to the possibility of applying the results of text linguistics research in translation theory (cf. Dressler 1973: 113).

A good example of the fact that the mutual recognition of the relevance of text linguistics for translation theory had no direct consequences in translation research is provided by Nida and Taber’s book, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969). The authors compile a list of 8 universal features of text, and suggest that they should be taken into account in translation. It is well worth presenting these eight features, since they represent a research agenda as yet unfulfilled. In Nida and Taber’s view, “all languages do have certain important features which can be used,

and which in 'effective' communications are used, to mark the units larger than sentences:

- (1) the marking of the beginning and end of the discourse
- (2) the marking of major internal transitions
- (3) the marking of temporal relations between events
- (4) the marking of spatial relations between events and objects
- (5) the marking of logical relations between events
- (6) the identification of participants
- (7) highlighting, focus, emphasis, etc.
- (8) author involvement (Nida and Taber 1969: 152)

This research agenda has retained its relevance since 1969. Although, as we shall see later, there have been important advances in the analysis of translation from a textual point of view, no consistent discourse level analysis of these language-pair-specific characteristics has been carried out so far.

In the book *Perevod i lingvistika* (Translation and linguistics), published in 1973, Shveitser states that "for translation theory it is not only the comparison of systems that is important, but also the comparison of the textual realisations of the systems' differences" (Shveitser 1973: 14).

In 1975, Barkhudarov made the following statement at a conference on translation theory at Maurice Thorez Foreign Language College: "In translating, translators do not deal with abstract language systems or linguistic units, but with specific texts. The creation of a scientific translation theory is only possible with the comparative analysis of source language and target language texts. In the opposite case we can only speak about contrastive linguistics and not translation theory" (Barkhudarov 1975b: 6).

The same ideas were raised by speakers at the conference *Kontrastive Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft* in Saarbrücken in 1978. Reinhart Hartmann spoke about the interaction between translation theory and contrastive textology (Hartmann 1981: 200), while Gideon Toury emphasised the viability of a tridimensional comparison, which, in addition to the comparative analysis of the source language and target language texts, also attributes importance to the analysis of the translated text as a special form of the target language text (Toury 1981: 257).

However, all of these studies, Nida and Taber's 1969 book *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Shveitser's 1973 *Perevod i lingvistika*, Barkhudarov's 1975a *Jazik i perevod*, and even Reinhart Hartmann's or Gideon Toury's works failed to put these thoughts into practice. In other words, there are no large-scale studies comparing long stretches of source language and target language texts, drawing conclusions from such extensive analyses.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s increasing numbers of studies applied the research methods of text linguistics to the analysis of translations. In this period, two main trends can be distinguished: Chernyakhovskaya (1976) approaches the text from the **inside** and concentrates on the way the differences in the **internal** structure of the text affect the solutions of translators, while Reiss (1971) looks at the text from the **outside** and focuses on how the various **text types** influence the translators' task. Let us examine both trends in more detail.

4.4. The internal text structure approach

Naturally, research on the relationship between text coherence and translation was preceded by the study of text coherence independently of translation in the text linguistics of the 1970s. The analysis of the internal structure of continuous texts, the most important field of study within text linguistics from the very beginning (Isachenko 1965, Harweg 1968, Weinrich 1971, van Dijk 1975, Halliday and Hasan 1976, etc.), became popular with translation scholars as well.

The idea that in emotionally neutral, descriptive texts, sentences start with either generally known information or with information known from the rest of the text (theme, thematic part) and the second part of the sentence contains new information (rheme, rhematic part) is not new in linguistics (it goes back to the first half of the 20th century; see the works of the Prague circle). This is called the theme-rheme, or topic-comment (conceptual, cognitive or logical) structure of sentences. However, analysis of the text-organising role of this conceptual structuring in continuous texts and its linguistic realisations was a new area of research. The application of the results of contrastive text linguistic studies to the analysis of translation was also a new departure.

Leonora Chernyakhovskaya's *Perevod i smislovaya struktura* (Translation and the structure of sense) published in 1976 (in Russian) can be regarded as the first study not only to declare, but also to consistently apply the text linguistic approach to translation theory.

In Chernyakhovskaya's view, transformational strategies used in the course of translation are not motivated by the different lexical and grammatical systems of the two languages, but by the need to **preserve the structure of sense**. The sense structure of the sentence (*smislovaya struktura*), consisting of the part that is already known (theme/topic) and the part that is new (rheme/comment), and the emphatic part within the new information (focus) are expressed by different means in every language. It is exactly this structure of sense that must remain invariable in translation. Accordingly, every single translational operation should serve the preservation of the sense structure characteristic of the source language text.

Chernyakhovskaya's book does not stop at declarations: to support her claims, she provides analyses in which her principles are applied consistently. She examines patterns of sense structure in English sentences on the basis of a large number of newspaper articles. She explores the means English uses to signal the theme (topic) and the rheme (comment) and analyses the possibilities of marking emphasis (focus) within the rhematic part. Then she goes on to compare the different types of sense structures found in English sentences with their Russian equivalents to establish the translational operations that the translator must perform in the case of different sentence types to preserve their sense structure.

Although Chernyakhovskaya uses sentences to illustrate her ideas and not texts, we can still regard her work as an example of discourse-level translation analysis, since all the sentences are taken from the same continuous text. Both given information, i.e. information that is known from previous sentences and new information were identified on the basis of the places they occupy within the English text. The Russian translations used in the investigation were not translations prepared

by the author, but revised and edited translations made by professional translators, in which the editors' corrections were motivated by the desire to restore the sense structure where it was distorted by the translators.

4.5. The text type-typology approach

The other text linguistic trend approached translation from the direction of text types. The most outstanding representative of this trend, Katharina Reiss (1971), made an attempt to develop a translation-focused text typology (*Übersetzungsrelevante Texttypologie*).

A genre-based classification of texts to be translated had, of course, been attempted earlier as well. Fedorov, in the last chapter of his book (1953) discusses the genre-related translation problems of three groups of texts: (1) news and reviews, official and technical documents, and scientific texts, (2) political texts, newspaper editorials, and speeches, (3) literary texts. Mounin (1967) lists seven groups: religious texts, literary texts, poetry, children's literature, stage texts, movie texts, and technical texts. In earlier works, however, classification of text types was considered a minor issue, and no-one intended to describe the characteristics of the process of translation entirely on the basis of the features of the text to be translated. This latter task was undertaken by Katharina Reiss.

In her book *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik* she distinguishes four basic text types. She argues that the classification of texts is determined by the role language plays in the given text. Karl Bühler (1934, 1965) identifies three basic functions of language: *Darstellung* ('**description**'), *Ausdruck* ('**expression**') and *Appel* ('**appeal**'). In most texts, all three functions of language are present, but one of them is usually predominant. This provides a basis for Katharina Reiss to make a distinction between **content-focused** texts (*inhaltsbetonte Texte*), in which the descriptive function of language dominates, **form-focused** texts (*formbetonte Texte*), in which the expressive function of language dominates, and **appeal-focused** texts (*appellbetonte Texte*), in which the appeal function of language dominates. Besides the three text types determined on the basis of the function of language present in them Reiss identifies a fourth text type as well which reaches the receptor *not* via printed media. She refers to this text type as **audio-medial** (*audio-mediale Texte*).

4.5.1. The translation of content-focused texts

Content-focused texts involve a number of text types: press releases, commentaries, news reports, users' manuals, patent specifications, official documents, non-fiction, specialised books, essays, reports, etc. Since these texts, despite the sometimes rigid formal conventions they observe, are focused on conveying information, the translator's task is to transmit the source language **content** in full, using the most appropriate devices of the target language to make sure that the reader's attention is not distracted from the content. In other words, the fact that the translator has to concentrate primarily on transmitting information accurately does not mean that he/she does not have to be careful about matters of form, i.e. the appropriate use of target language forms characterizing the given text type.

4.5.2. The translation of form-focused texts

In the case of form-focused texts, it is not or not merely **what** the author says that really matters, but also **how** he/she says it. This text type also contains various genres: literary prose (essays, biographies, belles-lettres), imaginative prose (anecdotes, short stories, romances), and poetry in all its forms. Here, the main task of the translator is to reflect primarily **the form and not the contents**. This is no easy task, however: the form is closely tied to the source language and thus cannot be automatically transferred into the target language.

According to Reiss, in such cases the translator will not adopt the source language form, but will try to get inspiration, and stimulated by this inspiration he/she will choose the target language form that best approaches the effect in the target language reader that the source language form produced in the source language reader. Therefore, in the case of form-focused texts the task of the translator is not to produce identical content, but to create **formal analogy**.

4.5.3. The translation of appeal-focused texts

The third text type identified by Katharina Reiss is the group of appeal-focused texts. In such texts, both the content and the form are intended to provoke a particular reaction in the listener or reader. This text type may involve appeals for likes and dislikes, or for specific actions (e.g., shopping) or the ceasing of specific actions (e.g., smoking).

The most typical text types falling into this category are commercials, ads, texts related to missionary work, propaganda materials, etc. Here the aim of the translator is not to reflect the content or the form of the source language text, but to render its **function**, i.e. to make sure that the target language text will provoke the same response as the source language text. To achieve this aim, the translator may deviate from both the content and the form of the text. In the case of advertisements, for instance, the same product must be promoted using different hints and allusions in different countries in order to preserve the appeal function of the text in the target language as well.

4.5.4. The translation of audio-medial texts

In the fourth text type the message reaches the receiver (audience, listener) via a **channel** the characteristic **features** of which need to be taken into account. Such texts are the radio and television genres and theatre plays, from operettas to operas and from comedies to tragedies.

In the case of translating a libretto the translator must not insist on a faithful rendering of either the content or the form of the original libretto if in the target language it does not match the music's melody and rhythm, and cannot be sung with ease. Or let us just take the example of dubbing movies. Here the translator should watch the actor's lip movements, and instead of preserving the content and form the translator should make sure that the dubbing actor's sentence ends exactly where the original actor closes his/her mouth. Thus, in the case of audio-medial texts, translators have to take into consideration the conditions of the transmitting channel.

4.6. The typology of specialised texts

Vannikov's 1987 study is an interesting attempt to develop a detailed and multidimensional typology of specialised texts. Vannikov lists twelve features on the basis of which scientific and technical texts have to be characterised to provide sufficient guidance for translators.

- (1) On the basis of linguistic organisation
 - 1.1 Texts with a rigorous structure and with strict linguistic formulation,
 - 1.2 Texts with a soft structure, allowing the translator greater variety regarding linguistic formulation;

- (2) On the basis of the functional style
 - 2.1 Scientific texts,
 - 2.2 Technical texts,
 - 2.3 Official texts,
 - 2.4 Legal texts,
 - 2.5 Journalistic texts;

- (3) On the basis of functional register
 - 3.1 Scientific texts (3.1.1 Academic texts, 3.1.2 Texts with an educational purpose, 3.1.3 Encyclopaedic texts);
 - 3.2 Technical texts (3.2.1 Technical descriptions, 3.2.2 Instructions, 3.2.3 Technical information);
 - 3.3 Official texts (3.3.1 Official directions, 3.3.2 Management texts, 3.3.3 Official correspondence);
 - 3.4 Legal texts (3.4.1 Technical documentation, 3.4.2 Descriptions of inventions, 3.4.3 Patent management texts);
 - 3.5 Journalistic texts (3.5.1 Scientific journalistic texts 3.5.2 Popular science texts);

- (4) On the basis of manner of expression
 - 4.1 Narrative texts,
 - 4.2 Descriptive texts,
 - 4.3 Explanatory texts,
 - 4.4 Argumentative texts;

- (5) On the basis of logical content
 - 5.1 Exposition/Discussion,
 - 5.2 Justification,
 - 5.3 Conclusion,
 - 5.4 Definition;

- (6) On the basis of subject-related contents
 - 6.1 Texts in exact sciences,
 - 6.2 Texts in natural sciences,
 - 6.3 Texts in social sciences;

- (7) On the basis of manner of communication
 - 7.1 Texts for oral communication,
 - 7.2 Texts for written communication;

- (8) On the basis of genre (e.g., within the scientific style)
 - 8.1.1 Book, 8.1.2 Monograph, 8.1.3 Article/Paper, 8.1.4 Dissertation,
 - 8.1.5 Presentation/Lecture, 8.1.6 Communiqué, 8.1.7 Report,
 - 8.1.8 Comments;

- (9) On the basis of the primary or secondary nature of the information
 - 9.1 Primary information,
 - 9.2 Secondary information (9.2.1 Report, 9.2.2 Annotation,
 - 9.2.3 Review, 9.2.4 Bibliographical description, 9.2.5 Bibliography);

- (10) On the basis of expressive-stylistic features
 - 10.1 Stylistically rich/colourful text, 10.1 Stylistically poor/not colourful text;

- (11) On the basis of general pragmatic features
 - 11.1 Texts addressed to the source language reader,
 - 11.2 Texts addressed to the target language reader,
 - 11.3 Texts addressed to any audience;

- (12) On the basis of specific pragmatic features
 - 12.1 Informative texts,
 - 12.2 Normative texts,
 - 12.3 Instructive texts,
 - 12.4 Systematising texts;

Although in Vannikov's view the aim of text typology is to rationalise the translators' activity (*"ratsionalizatsiya perevodcheskoy deyatel'nosti"*) and so he sets himself a rather practical aim, his work suggests a theoretical position, namely that description of the characteristic features of the text to be translated will lead to the solution of translation problems as well.

In our view, no matter how thoroughly one selects criteria to classify a particular text, and how detailed a description of the characteristic features of texts is offered, these account for only a fraction of the translational operations performed by translators. The internal organisation of texts is determined by a variety of rules that are independent of text type and are characteristic of the given language. Thus, if we want to choose between the two text linguistic approaches to translation, we consider the one approaching text from the point of view of its **internal** organisation more beneficial, studying texts from the point of view of differences and similarities between the internal organisation of source and target language texts.

4.7. Integration of the two approaches

In the second half of the 1980s, a number of attempts were made to integrate the two text linguistic approaches to translation, that is, the internal organizational approach and the text typological approach. A book published by Katharina Reiss and Hans Vermeer in 1984 devotes more attention to text-type-independent forms of internal textual organization. Albrecht Neubert's *Text and Translation*, published in 1985, discusses the problem of text types, but then goes on to describe the difficulties of clearly defining such text types, and then devotes the greater part of his book to issues of text organisation.

Reiss and Vermeer's book requires a more detailed discussion, since it is based on Vermeer's (1978) skopos theory, developed somewhat earlier. *Skopos* means *aim* in Greek, and skopos theory is a functional theory of translation. Its two main characteristics are, on the one hand, attributing priority to the **aim** of translation, and on the other hand, emphasising the **cultural transfer** nature of translation. Vermeer's goal is to define the rules of cultural transfer. The most important rule is the priority of the translation's aim, while the **coherence rule** (Kohärenzregel) and the **fidelity rule** (Fidelitätsregel) are of less importance. In his work *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* co-authored with Katharina Reiss, he develops the theory further. The most important rule of translation remains the priority of the aim of the translation. This is followed by the coherence rule, in which the authors make a distinction between **intratextual coherence** (the internal coherence of the text) and **intertextual coherence** (equivalence with the source language text). Between the two types of coherence there is a relation of sub- and superordination. In their view, intertextual coherence has to be subordinated to intratextual coherence.

As translation theory and text linguistics slowly move closer together, a collection of papers published in 1986 marks an important milestone in this process. The subtitle of this book, *Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, is more informative than its title, *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. The volume contains the papers presented at an international conference held in 1984 in Hamburg, and is divided into three main chapters, the first of which is entitled *Text and Discourse*. This chapter contains seven studies on the text-level analysis of translations, and four out of the seven authors, Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Gideon Toury, Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit and Elda Weizman have remained in the front line of text-level translation studies .

Shoshana Blum-Kulka's study (*Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation*) investigates the **shifts** that occur in the process of translation in the text's "external", i.e. open and visible organisation ("cohesion") and "internal" logical/content-related organisation. She calls for a comparison of cohesive devices across languages, which, she argues, has to be first done independently of translation, on source language and target language texts belonging to the same register. Such investigations may reveal, for instance, that English uses pronominalisation for anaphoric reference, while Hebrew tends to opt for lexical repetition. While shifts in cohesion are often necessary and cannot be treated as mistakes, shifts in coherence are always regarded as mistakes. In the restaurant scene in Hemingway's short story cited by the author the everyday nature of the dishes ordered is of pivotal importance, which is evident only for the American reader, so a simple, literal

translation of these meals carries loss of information for other readers and thus reduces the coherence of the target language text (Blum-Kulka 1986: 17–37).

Gideon Toury's study (*Monitoring Discourse Transfer: A Test-Case for a Developmental Model of Translation*) makes a distinction between the concept of **transfer** in second language acquisition, which refers to the incorrect transfer of the mother tongue's features to the foreign language, and the concept of transfer as used in translation, which involves the incorrect transfer of textual features from the source language text into the target language text. Toury calls the latter "discourse transfer". "Discourse transfer" is greatly influenced by the way the translator segments the text, that is, what stretches of text he/she considers as the basic unit of translation. According to his view, the more experienced a translator is, the longer segments he/she treats as the basic unit of translation, which contributes to the avoidance of "discourse transfer" (Toury 1986: 79–95).

Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit's study (*Text Type Markers and Translation Equivalence*), explores the problem that **argumentative** texts, which can be considered a kind of dialogue with an imagined reader, can only be translated knowing the whole text, and therefore it is wrong to set abbreviated texts as translation examination tasks without giving examinees access to the full text (Tirkkonen-Condit 1986: 95–115).

Elda Weizman's study (*An Interlingual Study of Discourse Structures: Implication for the Theory of Translation*) discusses the general principles of text-level comparison. In analysing translated texts, four aspects need to be considered: (1) the text-building norms of the source text, (2) the text-building norms of the target text, (3) the general tendencies of texts translated from different languages into the target language, and (4) tendencies generally characterising translated texts. In comparing the text-building norms all linguistic elements must be examined on two levels: (1) the role that the particular linguistic element fulfils in the information structure of the text ("textual function"), (2) the role that it fulfils in text organisation ("metatextual function"). These functions, of course, do not exclude each other: in most cases they go together. However, it does sometimes happen that a particular linguistic element, which only fulfilled a text-organising function in the original text, in spite of the translator's intentions, becomes informative in political texts: for example, the title *Mr.* before proper names is a neutral element in English, but denotes a particular attitude in Hebrew (Weizman 1986: 115–129).

4.8. Research on quasi-correctness

The text-level properties of translated texts as distinct from those of authentic, non-translated target language texts were examined by Klaudy (1981abc, 1987). The research on "quasi-correctness" explores the differences between two corpora of texts: between authentic or primary texts and translated or secondary texts. These differences are subtle, and hardly perceptible on the sentence level: it is the **whole** of the translated text that differs from original target language texts. What the reader notices is that the text is slightly odd, without being able to identify the source of this oddity. One of the reasons for this oddity is that the devices ensuring coherence in the source language do not always work in the same way in the target language. Another reason for this strange, foreign flavour is that there are

slight shifts in emphases, leading to **slight distortions in functional sentence perspective**, which is almost unnoticeable if it occurs only in one or two sentences, but if it occurs several times, then it also contributes to the oddity of the text. The oddity results from shifts in sentence connections and of the way theme-rheme relations are marked.

The phenomenon of quasi-correctness, or, to use another term, “**translationese**”, is a promising field in which research had been undertaken by several researchers simultaneously and independently of each other in the 1980s (Klaudy 1981 abc, 1987, Gellerstam 1986, Weizman and Blum-Kulka 1987, Vehmas-Lehto 1989).

Research on quasi-correctness can be distinguished from traditional interference research on the basis of two factors. The first is that it does not set out to explore the influence of the foreign language on the level of words, phrases or grammatical structures, but on the level of the whole text. The second is that the object of such research is not utterances produced by foreign language learners in various stages of foreign language acquisition, but texts produced by professional translators in their native language. Increased interest in discourse-level interference is indicated by the fact that most of the studies included in the volume *Interferenz in der Translation*, published in Leipzig (Schmidt 1989), are devoted to this topic.

4.9. Skepticism regarding the discourse-level approach

With all the enthusiasm for the discourse approach, skepticism is voiced time and again regarding the results achieved, and the researchability of translation on the level of the text. In the introductory part of his 1988 book, Shveitser gives an excellent overview of the relationship between translation theory and text linguistics (28–36), but later on he argues that the combination of the two disciplines requires the implementation of an extensive research agenda, which can only be achieved in the future (178). This sceptical attitude is also reflected in the structure of the book, which is primarily devoted to the semantic and pragmatic questions of translation, with only a couple of examples included in the last chapter on textual coherence illustrating transformations performed to preserve the anaphoric references which ensure the coherence of the original text (Shveitser 1988: 178–183).

Peter Newmark, in his book *A Textbook of Translation* openly attacks the current over-enthusiasm for discourse approaches:

Many translators say you should never translate words, you translate sentences or ideas or messages. I think they are fooling themselves. The source language texts consist of words, that is all that is there, on the page. Finally all you have is words to translate, and you have to account for each of them somewhere in your TL text ... (Newmark 1988: 36–37).

According to Newmark, it is the advance of text linguistics that forces translation scholars to treat the text as the basic unit of translation. The everyday practice of translators, however, shows that translators always try to choose the smallest unit of translation, and only resort to the whole text when they experience difficulty or when finally checking their translation.

4.10. The central role of text linguistics in translation studies

The use of text linguistics terminology has indeed become fashionable in today's translation theory. It has also become fashionable to include the term "text" or "discourse" in the titles of studies dealing with the general questions of translation. The 1990 book *Discourse and the Translator* by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason offers a thorough overview of the text linguistic problems of translation. Their book, building primarily on research by Halliday, represents a nice example of how slowly new findings in linguistics trickle down into the science of translation. Halliday and Hasan's fundamental work on text linguistics, *Cohesion in English*, was first published in 1976, followed by several new editions, the twelfth edition appeared in 1993. Consequently, in writing the book *Discourse and the Translator*, Hatim and Mason might very well have consulted the ninth or even the tenth edition, while the use of Halliday's terminology (**field, tenor, mood**, etc.) in translation theory was still regarded as a novelty. At the end of their book they explain some key terms of text linguistics (anaphoric, cataphoric, coherence, cohesion, communicative dynamism, context, co-reference, discourse, functional sentence perspective etc.), which is living proof of the fact that these terms still have not become an organic part of translation theory.

Mary Snell Hornby, in her 1988 book *Translation Studies – an Integrated Approach* (1988: 32) offers a one-page diagram of the way she imagines an integrated approach to translation, that is, how the various disciplines could co-operate in translation research. She lists three types of translation: literary translation, general language translation, and special language translation. Within the above three groups she distinguishes further subgroups, from the Bible to scientific-technical texts, and enumerates the disciplines that are important in the study of the given text types and subtypes. This diagram neatly shows the central role of text linguistics in translation studies: text linguistics is the discipline from which arrows point to all the text types to be translated. She formulates this in the following manner:

Level E (*referring to the diagram, K.K.*) names those areas of linguistics which are relevant for translation. Of basic importance is textlinguistics in all its aspects, from the analysis of the macrostructure (...), thematic progression and sentence perspective (...) to coherence and cohesion (Snell-Hornby 1988: 34–35).

In our view, the discourse approach is a most fruitful branch of translation research. If the aim of translation research is to find objective explanations for as many translation decisions, which used to be classed as subjective, as possible and to reveal as many regularities in the process of translation as possible, then the research methods, conceptual apparatus and terminology of text linguistics hold enormous potential for the future. In return, translation research can offer important data to text linguistics about the differences between the internal organisation of texts in different languages.

5. Linguistic models of the process of translation

One of the most important questions of the theory of translation is what it is exactly that takes place in the mind of the translator, in this “black box”, about which the only thing we know is its input (the source language text) and its output (the target language text). The process in between can only be described by comparing the source text and the end product.

5.1. Analysis and synthesis

During the process of translation the translator moves along a path which is of paramount interest not only for the study of translation but also for the study of language in general, since the modelling of the translating activity would also be the model of **text comprehension** (the way leading from the linguistic form to the mind) and **text production** (the way leading from the mind to the linguistic form).

How does the transfer from one sign system to the other take place? There is general consensus among the different branches of translation theory in the idea that there is no direct transfer; the process of translation consists of at least two phases: as the first step the translator analyses the source language text (the **analysis** phase), and as the second step he/she constructs the target language text (the **synthesis** phase).

5.2. The transfer phase

Let us recall Nida’s analogy of the process of translation: “A useful analogy is that of crossing a broad, deep, swift river. If one does not know how to swim, and does not have a boat, it is necessary to go up and down the bank of the river until a place is found which is shallow enough to serve as a ford. The time and effort spent walking along one side of the river is not only not wasted; it is absolutely essential to the crossing (Nida 1969: 34).

This vivid description also highlights the most important problems related to the process of translation. The first problem is – still using Nida’s metaphor – where the ford is? The rest of the questions are all related to this one. And the questions are endless. How is the analysis conducted? In what language? In what phases? How is the synthesis conducted? In what language? In what phases? How do the analysis and synthesis relate to each other time-wise? How does the shift from one to the other take place? What is there between the two?

With regard to these questions there is no general agreement among translation scholars. Some of them identify a **transfer phase** between the analysis and synthesis phase, moreover, they even argue for the existence of a special transi-

tional, mediator language so called “interlanguage” operating in this phase. Others, however, state the contrary. They argue against a rigid separation, claiming that in the comprehension of the source language text the target language plays an important role, and vice versa, in the production of the target language text the source language has no small role, either. The first part of this statement is generally supported by the claim that while reading a foreign language text we translate it to our mother tongue even if we are not supposed to prepare a written translation of the given text. The second part of the statement is justified every day by the numerous translations exhibiting the traces of the foreign language.

It is also an important question to decide in what segments the analysis takes place. In morphemes, words, sentences, or paragraphs? And in what segments does the synthesis occur? Does it take up longer stretches of text than the analysis? Do we happen to analyse according to words and synthesise according to sentences? Or does this activity always happen simultaneously? These are the questions the attempts aiming to model the process of translation intend to answer in different ways.

5.3. The modelling of the process of translation

The two basic types of translation models were first established by Revzin and Rozentsveig in 1964. One of them is called the **denotative** model and the other one the **transformational** model. The most significant difference between the two is, as we shall later discuss in detail, that in the denotative model the way from the source language to the target language leads **through reality**, that is, the translator uses his/her knowledge and previous experience of the world at the point of transfer. In the transformational model there is a **direct** path from the source language to the target language. Revzin and Rozentsveig also make a terminological distinction between the two models and use the term **translation** (perevod) only in the case of the second model and call the first one as **interpretation** (interpretatsiya).

In the 1970s a number of studies were published not only on translation models, but also on the systematisation of translation models. Before discussing the various models, let us first take a look at some of the systematisation attempts.

One of the best known taxonomies is maybe Komissarov’s system, which contains the following models (1972, 1973):

- (1) Denotative model
- (2) Transformational model
- (3) Semantic model
- (4) The model of equivalence-levels

Erdei (1979) offers the following classification:

- (1) **Syntactic models**
 - a) transformational syntactic model
 - b) transformational generative syntactic model
 - sentence linguistic model
 - text linguistic model

- (2) **Semantic models**
 - a) structural semantic model
 - b) transformational generative semantic model
- (3) **Situational or denotative model**
- (4) **The model of equivalence-levels**

Lvovskaya (1985) proposes a different classification:

- (1) **Linguistic models**
 - a) Transformational model
 - b) Semantic model
 - c) The theory of regular correspondences
 - d) Situational model
- (2) **Communicative models**
 - a) The theory of dynamic equivalence
 - b) The theory of equivalence levels

All three systems share many elements. All of them contain the denotative or situational model, the transformational model, and the equivalence-level modelling of the process of translation. The fact that the creators of these systems alternate in the use of the words **theory** and **model** only means that the various trends within general translation theory also differ with regard to the way they model the process of translation, i.e. for example the theory of equivalence-levels may be considered as a given model of the process of translation.

5.4. The denotative (situational) model

Followers of the denotative translation model start out from the idea that apart from some insignificant differences, there is a common reality surrounding us, and thus in linguistic interaction it is only the linguistic signs that differ, the signified objects, i.e. the denotata are the same.

According to this theory, during the process of translation, in the **analysis** phase, the translator traces the source language signs back to the world of denotata common to all of us (this is where the name “denotative model” comes from), or, in other words, he/she clarifies which situation of the objective world is described by the source language text (this where the name “situational model” originates from). In the **synthesis** phase, he/she describes the same denotata, the same situations using the devices of the target language. Ideally, the translator never establishes a direct reference between the source and the target language.

5.4.1. The advantages and disadvantages of the denotative model

This model reflects the process of translation more or less adequately, since the target language equivalents can often be identified by taking into account the situational reality behind the source language text. Such cases are, for instance, when a particular object or phenomenon does not have a generally accepted name in

the target language, and therefore a name has to be created by the translator on the basis of his/her knowledge of the given object or phenomenon.

A typical case of translation based on the denotative model is the translation of realia, i.e. of objects typically characterising the particular foreign culture. In such cases, the translator can make several choices: he/she can borrow the foreign word, equate it with a similar target language realia, invent a new target language word, etc. But to be able to select the best alternative, he/she definitely has to be familiar with the realia in question. Let us recall Bertrand Russell's statement: "no-one can understand the word 'cheese' unless he has a nonlinguistic acquaintance with cheese" (in Jakobson 1959).

We translate according to the denotative model when there is only one possible solution in the target language for the naming or description of an object or situation in English: *Keep off the grass*; Russian: *Po gazonam ne hodit'* ('Do not walk on the grass'); Hungarian: *Fűre lépni tilos*. ('It is forbidden to step on the grass').

The denotative model, however, cannot be used to explain cases when there are several alternatives for the description of a particular object or phenomenon in the target language and the translator has to choose the best one. In such cases the translator does not merely consider **what** the original text says, but also **how** it says it.

Moreover, we cannot assume that translators, after identifying the situation, forget about the source language signs and formulate the perceived piece of reality, object, phenomenon or situation using exclusively the devices of the target language. This might suggest that there is thinking without language, because in this intermediary stage, when we have already distanced ourselves from the source language signs but have not yet formulated the target language solution, we would be able to think about objective reality without the help of the language. This is obviously nonsense. And it is equally absurd to believe that translators, who have at their disposal at least two language systems, never establish direct references between the two. This is what the various types of transformational models take into consideration.

5.5. The transformational model

According to the simplest version of the transformational model, it is not reality translators identify the source language signs with but the target language signs, since the target language equivalents to the source language words are already given in their minds. In this theory, translation is viewed as simple substitution; the substitution of source language signs with target language signs.

This model, however, would only work if the system of the source language and the target language were identical regarding the number, the distribution and operation of elements. That is, each source language sign would have only one equivalent in the target language, and this would link to the rest of the target language signs according to the same rules as the source language sign to the rest of the source language signs.

In the case of natural languages this is obviously impossible. But the fact that there exist no two languages whose elements and their distribution would be the same does by no means imply that there are no elements in any two languages

which would have the same distribution and would function following the same rules. According to the transformational model, this common field serves as the basis for interlingual translation, which the translator reaches via a series of intralingual, i.e. language internal transformations.

5.5.1. The antecedents of the transformational model

The enormous influence that Noam Chomsky's works exerted on the developers of transformational translation models can also be detected in their terminology. Rozentsveig, in his 1964 study on the transformational model of translation, used the term **jadro** ('core'), although he did not use the concept of deep structure, which is not surprising, since Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, introducing the notion of "deep structure" is only published in 1965.

The influence of Chomsky's generative grammar is clearly detectable in the works of another outstanding representative of the transformational translation model, Eugene Nida. In his first book, *Science of Translating* (1964) he describes his attitude to Chomsky's ideas in the following way:

For the translator especially, the view of language as a generative device is important, since it provides him first with a technique for analysing the process of decoding the source text, and secondly with a procedure for describing the generation of the appropriate corresponding expressions in the receptor language. Certain comparativists and descriptivists who are working with a limited corpus of written texts may find more traditional techniques somewhat easier to apply, but for the translator, who perhaps more than anyone else must take language in its dynamic aspect, a view of grammar as a generative device has many distinct advantages (Nida 1964: 60).

In his 1964 book Nida uses the following terms: **kernels** ("the kernel constructions in any language are the minimal number of structures from which the rest can be most effectively and relevantly derived") and **basic structure** ("remarkable similarities between the basic structures of different languages are increasingly becoming an object of study by linguists"), but does not use the term "surface structure" and "deep structure". In 1964, he describes the process of translation as consisting of the following stages:

- (1) Analyse the source language expression in terms of the basic kernel sentences (...),
- (2) Transfer the kernel forms of the source language to the equivalent kernel forms of the receptor language (...),
- (3) Transform the kernel utterances of the receptor language into the stylistically appropriate expressions (Nida 1964: 69).

In 1969, by the time of Nida's second seminal book written together with Charles Taber *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, the Chomskyan notions of "surface structure" and "deep structure" were widely used in the literature and Nida's description of the process of translation changed accordingly (see below in 5.5.2.). He

made use of the term “surface structure”, but he did not use the term “deep structure” (see the following footnote, where Nida referred to the term “near-kernel level”):

For this book on the theory and practice of translation we are not advocating that the translator go below the level of the kernels to the underlying bases, the “deep structure”. There are certain theoretical interests in such an approach, but practically, the bases are neither useful nor advisable, since these bases cannot be readily manipulated. When the message is transferred, it is not however on precisely on the kernel level for if this were the case, the connections between the kernel elements would be lost or obscured. Therefore, the transfer is made at a **near-kernel level**, in which the relevant connections between the kernels are explicitly marked (Nida 1969: 39–40, emphasis by K.K.).

It should be noted, however, that the terms taken over from generative grammar do not have the same meaning in the work of Rozentsveig’s or Nida’s as in Chomsky’s. As distinct from the latter, the former theorists use these terms metaphorically and their method of analysis also fails to meet the strict formal requirements dictated by generative grammar.

5.5.2. The process of translation in the light of the transformational model

According to the transformational model (Revzin and Rozentsveig 1964, Komisarov 1980), in the first phase of the process, the analysis phase, the translator goes back from the source language surface structure to the source language core sentences or deep structure via a series of transformations (**intralingual transformation**); in the second phase these are replaced by the equivalent core sentences or deep structure of the target language (**interlingual transformation**); and in the third phase, the synthesis phase, the translator reaches the target language surface structure from the target language core sentences or deep structure via a series of transformations (**intralingual transformation**).

A similar description of the process of translation can be found in Nida and Taber (1969). They call the analysis phase “back-transformation”, the synthesis phase “restructuring” and they assume a “transfer” phase in between.

- (1) analysis, in which the surface structure is analysed (...),
- (2) transfer, in which the analysed material is transferred in the mind of translator from language A to language B, and
- (3) restructuring, in which the transferred material is restructured in order to make the final message fully acceptable in the receptor language. (Nida and Taber 1969: 33).

As a result of such analysis “kernel or core structures” are created in this system as well, which are a composite of four structural categories: **objects** (e.g., *house, dog, man, sun, stick, water, spirit*, etc.), **events** (e.g., *run, jump, kill, speak, shine, appear*,

grow, die, etc.), **abstracts** (e.g., *red, blue, small, many, quickly, etc.*), and finally **relations** (e.g., *because, and, not*).

These structural categories cannot be identified with word classes. The word *promise*, for instance, which is a noun on the source language surface, is an event name in the kernel structure, and can also be realised as a verb on the receptor language surface. Kernel structures are such that the relationship between the elements within them is expressed in the clearest and simplest possible way, ready for transfer.

5.5.3. The advantages and disadvantages of the transformational model

The advantage of transformational models is that by introducing the concept of intralingual transformation and describing their operation they provide a realistic picture of the various stages of the process of transformation. The everyday routine of translators, the constant decisions between the various target language options can be considered transformations. However, in comprehending the target language text and analysing its content, one is also conducting language **internal** transformations. It often happens, for instance, that complex nominal structures with multiple modifications are broken down into several simple sentences in the mind.

The idea that translation basically comprises a series of language internal transformations may be useful in translator training. Back-and-forth transformation of the surface sentences of the source text contributes to a better understanding of the text, and transformations carried out in producing the target language surface contribute to translators' awareness of the target language devices.

Taking into consideration language internal transformations may also be helpful in the assessment of translations, in determining the degree of equivalence. Sometimes a source language and target language element sign cannot be directly equated with each other because in addition to occupying different places in the systems of the two languages, they also have a different "transformational history". The Hungarian noun *fejlődés* ('development') is not always equivalent with the Russian noun *razvitie* ('development') because *razvitie* is a nominal transform of four Russian verb forms (1) *razvivat'sya* (imperfect indefinite), (2) *razvit'sya* (perfect indefinite), (3) *razvivat'* (imperfect definite), (4) *razvit'* (perfect definite), while behind the Hungarian noun *fejlődés* ('development') there is only the intransitive verb, namely *fejlődik* ('to develop'), while the nominal transform of the transitive verb *fejleszt* ('to develop') is another noun: *fejlesztés* ('development'). A similar comparison can be also made between English and Hungarian: the English noun *development* has two Hungarian equivalents: *fejlődés* and *fejlesztés*, because of differences in their derivational history.

The transformational model plays an important role in machine translation as well. If there exists a common area between the two languages, i.e. if there are lexical units and grammatical structures in the two languages whose equivalence can be predicted, then within this area there is no need for the skills or previous experience of a translator. This kind of transfer can be done even by a machine, and so machine translation can be accomplished with some pre- and post-editing.

A defect of the transformational model is that, similarly to the denotative mod-

el, it creates a drastic separation between the source language text and the target language text. It does not take into account the important role of the source language form in creating the target language surface.

In addition, it often happens in translation that certain source language and target language structures can be treated as equivalent despite the fact that they cannot be traced back to the common area between the two languages. These may be classified as equivalences on the basis of the denotative-situational model; when the linguistic form plays almost no role in the translation: English: *Beware of the dog!* French: *Chien méchant!*, German: *Bissiger Hund!*, Hungarian: *Vigyázz, a kutya harap!* ('Be careful, the dog bites').

5.6. The semantic model

As it has been shown, the transformational model views the process of translation as a series of transformations through which the translator reaches the core/kernel structure, which is common or very close to each other in the various languages, and then through another series of transformations he/she arrives at the target language surface.

It has not been explicitly stated, but it has been assumed all along that meaning ("Bedeutung", "znachenie", "signification") or – as scholars who consider meaning language-specific refer to it – sense ("Sinn", "smisl", "sans") remains unchanged in the meantime.

5.6.1. The antecedents of the semantic model

The followers of the semantic model, treated as a branch of the transformational model, approach translation from the point of view of meaning or sense. Research on semantic theory at the end of the 1960s exerted significant influence on the linguistic ideas related to translation. The ability of the speaker to decide about a sentence whether it has one or several meanings, or to decide about two sentences whether they have common meanings or not, that is whether they are synonymous plays a significant role in translation as well.

Translation scholars were also inspired by the theory of semantics developed by Katz and Fodor (1964), based on Chomsky's theory of generative grammar. In Nida's 1964 book the classic diagram of the meaning of *bachelor* is reproduced, with the semantic markers +human, +animal, +male and distinguishers [one who has never married], [young knight serving under the standard of another], [one who has the first or lowest academic degree], [young fur seal when without a mate during breeding time] (Nida 1964: 39).

It became more and more fashionable to assume that the translator might be breaking down the words of the source language sentences into such semantic constituents. In other words, in source language analysis the original text is not traced back to basic lexical units and grammatical structures but to basic semantic constituents, to basic meanings. These basic meanings form a particular system irrespective of the situation and the context: some of them will be relevant (central) in the given context and others will be secondary (peripheral).

5.6.2. The process of translation according to the semantic model

The transfer from one language to another, according to this theory, does not happen through kernel structures consisting of basic lexical units and grammatical structures but through a **semantic deep structure** consisting of some system of basic meanings.

The literature on translation theory contains abundant examples for semantic analyses presumably conducted by translators (first of all in Nida 1964, Nida and Taber 1969), but unfortunately these examples always illustrate the semantic analysis of words or word classes (cf. Komissarov's English-Russian comparison of the semantic structure of verbs of spatial position: 1973: 51-9), and only rarely discuss how translators break a complete sentence down into basic meanings (Catford 1965: 39).

They also fail to explain the organisation and hierarchy of basic meanings, the nature of this assumed semantic deep structure, and the way these basic meanings are organised within this semantic deep structure.

5.6.3. Melchuk and Zholkovskiy's semantic model

Melchuk and Zholkovskiy's "*smisl*→*tekst*→*smisl*" (sense→text→sense) model (1965) reveals more about this assumed semantic deep structure. They start out from the idea that during the process of translation the translator first understands the text to be translated and then he/she expresses what he/she has understood in the given language, i.e. he/she expresses the **sense** of the text. But can sense be defined? In their view, it is in fact the **possession of the sense** that has to be defined which implies that the speaker can express the same idea in different ways and the listener can perceive the identity between the senses despite the formally different statements.

Thus, according to the authors, the sense of the text refers to the common ground that can be found in all texts intuitively regarded identical with the given text. They intend to describe this common content-related invariant with the help of a special semantic language, the so called **basic language**.

Accordingly the process of translation (e.g., from English into Russian) is as follows: in the first phase the translator switches from idiomatic English to the English basic language (independent sense analysis), in the second phase he/she switches from the English basic language to the Russian basic language (this is what can actually be considered translation), and in the third phase from the Russian basic language he/she switches onto the idiomatic Russian language (independent sense synthesis).

What does the basic language contain into which the translator paraphrases surface sentences of the source language? The lexis of the basic language is a composite of three types of elements: (1) predicates, (2) nominals, (3) adjuncts. The lexical elements of the basic language can be subdivided into constant elements and changing elements, that is, into lexical functions, which are the lexical correlates of the given word.

Lexical correlates (abbreviated in Latin) are the following:

a) substituting correlates, e.g.,

synonyms: storm → **Syn** → tempest
 antonyms: good → **Anti** → bad

b) connecting correlates, e.g.,

rain → **Incep** → begin
 mourning → **Magn** → deep
 sleep → **Fin** → wake up
 engine → **Fin** → shut off

5.6.4. Lexical functions

Lexical functions make the paraphrasing of the source language possible, i.e. allow for the explication, expression, and clarification of the semantic relations below the surface of the sentence. Lexical functions contribute to both the deconstruction of the source language meaning to its elements and also to the reconstruction of the target language meaning.

Every language has to be capable of expressing that something starts (**Incep**), finishes (**Fin**), operates (**Oper**), causes something (**Caus**), liquidates/eliminates something (**Liqu**), goes wrong (**Degrad**), etc., and all of these relations are expressed differently in the different languages.

Magn (rain)

English: heavy rain

Russian: silnij dozhd' ('strong')

Magn (losses)

English: heavy losses

Russian: tyazholie poteri ('weighty')

Magn (prison terms)

English: heavy prison terms

Russian: dlitel'nie sroki zaklucheniya ('long-term')

Oper (talk)

English: give a talk

Russian: chitat' doklad ('to read')

Oper (look)

English: give a look

Russian: brosit' vzglyad ('to throw')

If, for instance, one has to translate to any language expressions such as: *meat becomes stinky, bread becomes dry, wine turns acid, apple becomes rotten, milk turns sour, engine*

fails, clock is out of order, fish taints quickly etc. then the translator does not need to think about how to translate the verbs *to become stinky, to become dry, to turn acid, to turn sour, to fail, to taint* etc., but how the given foreign language expresses the **Degrad** function besides *meat, bread, wine, milk, engine, clock, and fish*.

The finite number of universal lexical functions (cca 60 according to Melchuk 1997) allows for the systematisation of basic meanings and provides a basis for the deconstruction and reconstruction of meanings in any language. Besides lexical functions, Melchuk and Zholkovskiy's paraphrasing system of rules also contains syntactic rules, some kind of filters, which can filter out the inappropriate solutions, on the way towards the target language surface.

Of course, it is not only Melchuk and Zholkovskiy who approach the process of translation from the point of view of meaning or sense, but it is these authors who have achieved the most in the formalisation of sense relations and the precise modelling of the sense → text → sense process.

5.6.5. The advantages and disadvantages of the semantic model

The semantic model reflects many aspects of the process of translation correctly. In the process of translating the translator does in fact go back to sense relations rather than to basic lexical units and grammatical structures. It is also self-evident that equivalences of basic lexical units and grammatical structures – be it intralingual or interlingual equivalence – can only be determined on the basis of identity of sense. But the question may be raised whether it is possible or necessary to perfectly formalise sense relations or not. Is linguistics able to do so, and does the theory of translation need this in order to model the process of translation?

The semantic model, even in its present form, can explain several translational operations. Just to take one example, why is it that the English verb *make* enters the translator's head "at one side" and the Russian verb *navodit'* leaves his/her head "at the other side", despite the fact that these verbs never appear together in the dictionary. This may be explained as follows: both are connected to the nouns *order/poryadok* by the semantic function **Caus**.

However in cases where the source language form does not play a role in finding the target language form, where the target language equivalent has to be found on the basis of the situation or the communicative goal, the semantic model could not provide satisfactory explanations even if it were worked out in more detail.

5.7. Komissarov's model: levels of equivalence

If the models discussed so far are evaluated using Nida's previously cited "ford" metaphor, it can be stated that all the models placed the ford, the crossing-place too far or too close. They viewed translation as a process in which the translator either has to completely distance him/herself from the level of linguistic signs (denotative model) or can move from one language to the other on the level of linguistic signs as well (transformational model).

Neither view reflects successfully the activity of the translator. In reality the translator always prefers the shortest possible way from the source language to the target language, which is on the level of linguistic signs, and only chooses the longer

way if the direct one is impossible. In other words, translators work according to **several models** and the level of transfer is determined by the specific task.

This is reflected in Komissarov's theory of the process of translation (1973) in which he distinguishes five levels of transfer:

- (1) the level of linguistic signs,
- (2) the level of utterance,
- (3) the level of message,
- (4) the level of situation,
- (5) the level of communicative goal.

These levels are called content levels by Komissarov, into which both the source language and the target language text can be broken down.

His starting point is that the speaker **producing** a text always follows a particular goal, for instance, he/she intends to inform the receiver about something or would like to affect him/her emotionally, or wishes to make him/her carry out a particular action. Using our own example, let us suppose a tenant would like to persuade the landlord to renovate the house. This is the **level of the communicative goal**.

To achieve this goal he/she informs the receiver about real objects, persons, or abstract phenomena and the relationship among them. In our case, he/she informs the landlord about the miserable living conditions in the house: the roof is leaking, the ceiling is shedding its plaster etc. This is the **level of the situation**.

The situation, however, cannot be grasped completely, we describe its different characteristics and approach it from various angles. So, the situation for instance, that the roof is leaking can be approached in different ways: *The roof is to be repaired* (neutral statement), *It is a house where you need a mackintosh in the rainy season* (colloquial, comic), *The sky shines through* (elevated). That is, every situation can be described by several different messages. This is the **level of message**.

When the sender words the message, he/she has to linearly order the linguistic signs at his/her disposal, that is, he/she has to create an utterance in which the elements can be structured and ordered in several ways. Even a neutral statement of the fact that the roof is leaking can be expressed by several types of utterances: *The roof is in need of repair*, *The roof is in bad repair*, *The roof has to be repaired*, *The roof is to be repaired*. This is the **level of utterance**.

Finally, in the similarly structured utterances one may use several different words, for example: *The roof has to be repaired*. *The roof has to be fixed*. This is the **level of linguistic signs**.

All in all, in Komissarov's view, the production of every text is the result of numerous multi-level decisions. The sender chooses from among several situations to achieve the desired communicative goal. He/she chooses from several possible statements or messages to describe the selected situation. In formulating the message, he/she has several possible utterances to choose from, and in the formulation of utterances he/she chooses from several possible linguistic signs.

In **comprehending** the text, the receiver moves in the opposite direction. He/she starts from the level of linguistic signs and ends with the assumed communicative goal of the sender.

How does all this take place in translation? The translator, who embodies both

the receiver and the sender, moves along both paths. During **analysis**, he/she moves from the level of linguistic signs to the level of the communicative goal, and during **synthesis** he/she moves from the level of the communicative goal to the level of linguistic signs.

The translator, on the other hand, does not always have to make each step in both directions. More precisely, according to Komissarov, the five steps of the analysis phase always have to be taken, but in the synthesis phase the “higher” levels, e.g., that of the communicative goal, **excludes choices on the “lower” levels**.

The **communicative goal** determines the choice of the target language equivalent, independently of the situation, message, utterance, or linguistic sign it is expressed by in the source language for example, when one asks for help or cheers on his/her favourite team on the football field. It is the communicative goal that fully determines the choice of the target language forms in such cases where source language text is about someone’s linguistic behaviour, for instance about someone’s strange accent or bad language. The fact that someone pronounces the sound *r* like the French do, can only be illustrated through English words containing the sound *r*. An often cited translating mistake is the following one: *Oh, I’m so glad you’ve come, said the countess, crunching the r-s like the French do.*

The **level of the situation** can also exclude equivalence on all lower levels. If the situation requires us to call attention to a freshly painted door, we have to use *wet paint* in English, and *ostorozhno okrasheno* in Russian, independently of the source language message.

The **level of the message** excludes the possibility of equivalence on lower levels, for instance, in the translation of idiomatic expressions like English *It is raining cats and dogs* and Hungarian: *Úgy esik, mintha dézsából öntenék* (‘It is pouring like from tubs’).

The **level of the utterance** excludes the possibility of equivalence on lower levels, for instance, in the case of translating official documents: English *Regulation shall be repealed with effect from...*, French *Le règlement est abrogé avec effet au...* and German *Die Verordnung wird mit Wirkung vom ... aufgehoben.*

Finally, the translator has no choice at all in the translation of international organisations which have their own constant equivalents e.g., English: *European Parliament*, French: *Parlement européen*, German: *Europäisches Parlament*. Equivalence is achieved on the **level of linguistic signs**.

5.7.1. The advantages and disadvantages of the equivalence level model

Komissarov’s model dexterously avoids the one-sidedness of the denotative and the transformational models, and successfully reflects the complexity of the work of the translator, who does not follow only one strategy. He slightly idealises the activity of the translator by assuming that the translator always takes all the steps leading from the level of linguistic sign to the level of communicative goal, and he/she can only shorten the way when selecting the target language equivalent, if the “higher” levels, i.e. the level of the communicative goal or the situation determines the target language equivalent independently of the source language.

In reality, elements with an equivalent on the level of linguistic signs are trans-

lated on the level of linguistic signs, and the step onto the “higher” levels as defined by Komissarov occurs only when no direct equivalences are found. This, of course, will happen very soon, because even the simplest possessive or passive structure in an English or Russian sentence requires the translator to step to the next level in translating it into Hungarian.

5.8. Translation as the joint functioning of two languages

In our view, the switch from one language to the other on the level of linguistic signs happens almost simultaneously with switches on the “higher” levels: the direct transfer occurs simultaneously with transfer through analysis and synthesis. The translator constantly moves between the two languages, constantly exploring the relationship of the source language and the target language signs to each other and to reality. The target language equivalent, once found may facilitate the comprehension of the target language text, but it can also lead it astray.

The deeper the translator delves into the comprehension of the source language text, the more likely he/she is to reject target language options previously regarded appropriate. Therefore, the best way to characterise the process of translation is by looking at it as the **joint functioning** of two languages. The linguistic models of the process of translation contribute to a better understanding of this complex process.

6. The concept of equivalence in the theory of translation

Research on **equivalence**, that is, on the “equal value” of the source language and target language text, is an important field of linguistic translation theory. Equivalence is a central category not only within the theory of translation but also within linguistics in general. No language system can be described without an attempt to identify the sense- and content-related equivalences of its linguistic units. When comparing different languages, the relations between the different forms are also described on the basis of sense- and content-related identity or equivalence.

6.1. The equivalence perception of readers, translators, and researchers

The situation is much more complex in the theory of translation, where languages are compared from the point of view of translation, since in this case, determining the presence or absence of equivalence, further “participants” must be taken into consideration. Besides the researcher and the translator, the receiver (the reader or the listener of the translated text) also has own points of view. The concept of equivalence is viewed differently by the reader or listener, who **assume** equivalence, by the translator, who **creates** equivalence, and by the researcher, who **investigates** equivalence (Albert 1988).

The **reader's** attitude is the simplest one. He/she places confidence in the translator. When he/she is given a translation, he/she will consider it equivalent. Readers do not have a conscious view about equivalence; if they do not like a piece of writing, be it scientific or literary, they will blame it on the author. When readers blame the translator, they usually say that the translator mistranslated certain words. **Translators** have a more or less conscious idea about equivalence. Paradoxically, the quality of translation, the success or failure of the translator in creating equivalence is not closely related to the extent to which his/her ideas about equivalence are conscious or instinctive.

The problem of equivalence is treated as an issue of the greatest complexity in the work of **researchers of translation**. In contrast to the more or less instinctive, but still “evident” equivalence perception of readers and translators, researchers of translation have formed various less self-evident views about the essence of equivalence.

6.2. Approaches to equivalence

Some researchers consider equivalence as a **precondition** of translation, which distinguishes it from other forms of transformations into a foreign language, such as adaptation, abridgment, summary, etc. They include equivalence in the defini-

tion of translation as a requirement or precondition (translation = replacement of the source language text by the target language equivalent). In this approach equivalence does not have subtypes or degrees in translation. If only those target language texts can be considered translations, which are equivalent with the source language text, then all translations are equivalent, and thus further research on equivalence is unnecessary.

The other approach starts out from the idea that equivalence is never complete. The target language text intended as equivalent by the translator and accepted as equivalent by the reader is identical with the original text only from certain (formal, situational, contextual, communicative, etc.) aspects, and these are the aspects that have to be revealed and systematised. This approach is apparently more fruitful. Translating practice provides researchers with vast amount of data to explore the various types and degrees of equivalence.

Within this approach, two trends may be distinguished. One of these is the **normative** view, which prescribes what the translator has to do to produce an equivalent translation; what it is that he/she has to definitely preserve from the original text and what it is that he/she can sacrifice (Fedorov 1953, Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Jäger 1975). The other trend is the **descriptive** view, which describes, on the basis of the analysis of numerous translating facts, how translators create equivalence; what it is that they have preserved from the original text and what it is that has been sacrificed (Revsin and Rozentsveig 1964, Catford 1965, Komissarov 1980).

A third approach to research on equivalence starts out from the idea that no identical equivalence requirements can be established for the translator of a users' manual and that of a movie script or lyrical poem. In other words, the number of text types determines the number of equivalence types possible (Reiss 1971).

The present chapter excludes the investigation of the concept of equivalence from the point of view of the reader and translator (for the first see Popovich 1975, for the latter see Albert 1988). It will focus on the views of translation scholars who do not regard equivalence as a general precondition of translations, but attempt to describe various types of equivalences.

6.3. Catford's view on equivalence

We find one of the first definitions of equivalence in Catford's classic work *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965). He distinguishes between "formal correspondence" and "textual equivalent". Formal correspondent is any "TL category, which may be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the 'same' place in the economy of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL" (1965: 32). His definition of textual equivalence is rather vague: "any TL form (text or portion of text) which is observed to be equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of text)" (1965: 27).

Catford continues by discussing the nature of formal correspondence, which can be only approximate. Because of the differences between the systems of languages, lexical units and grammatical structures almost never occupy the same place within the hierarchy of the two languages. He cites English and French prepositions as examples. In both languages they appear together with nominal groups in the structure of adverbial phrases, and function as either qualifiers in nominal

group structure (*door of the house – la porte de la maison*) or as adjuncts in clause structure. If, however, we want to move one step forward to show the equivalence of adverbial phrases containing prepositions, it can only be done on the basis of textual equivalence (1965: 33).

As Catford's further examples refer to the establishment of formal correspondences between English and Kabardian, let us continue with examples of Hungarian and Indo-European languages. System identity would be the condition of formal correspondence in the case of lexical units as well. The English word *brother* cannot be a formal correspondent of the Hungarian word *fivér*, because Hungarian, in contrast to English makes a distinction between an elder brother (Hung: *báty*) and a younger brother (Hung: *öcs*). The Hungarian or English *nagymama/grandmother* cannot be the formal correspondent of the Russian *babuska* ('grandmother'), because in Hungarian and English beside *nagymama/grandmother* and *nagy-papa/grandfather* there is also the collective lexeme *nagyszülők /grandparents*, which does not exist in Russian. The German *blau* cannot be the formal correspondent of the Russian *siniy*, because besides *siniy* ('dark blue') there is also the word *goluboy* ('light blue').

Catford's example for the lack of formal equivalence is the English word *yes*, and the Japanese word *hai*, because Japanese *hai*, besides meaning *yes*, also expresses a reinforcement to a negative question. The English *yes* fails to qualify as the formal correspondent of the French *oui* as well, because *yes* belongs to a binary system (*yes-no*), while *oui* is part of a three-component system (*oui-si-non*).

Looking at these examples, the possibility of formal correspondence may be almost completely excluded from translation, because the identity of place in the system hierarchy only applies to international terms.

However, what Catford says about textual equivalence is, as mentioned before, rather vague: "any TL form (text or portion of text) which is observed to be equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of text)" (1965: 27). He further specifies this as follows: "SL and TL texts or items are translational equivalents when they are *interchangable in a given situation*" (1965: 49) (author's italics).

Catford cites the following example to illustrate this statement: In an imaginary situation a girl walks in and says: *I have arrived*. The situation has numerous elements: the place, the time, the girl's name, age, height, weight, colour of her eyes and hair, her clothes, profession, religion, relationships to other people; the number and nature of her audience, and so on. Only very few of these are linguistically relevant, very few are built into the sentence *I have arrived*. These are the following: (1) the speaker (*I* and not *you* or *he*), (2) she has arrived and not left (*arrive* and not *leave*), (3) it is about an event that has already happened and not something that will happen (*have arrived* and not *will arrive*), (4) the prior event is linked to the current situation (*have arrived* and not *arrive*, or *arrived*), (5) the current situation is present (*have arrived* and not *had arrived*).

If this expression is translated into Russian (*Ya prishla*), then in the Russian sentence different elements of the situation will be realised linguistically: (1) the speaker (*ya* and not *ti* or *mi*), (2) the speaker is feminine by gender [*prishla* and not *prishol*], (3) she has arrived and not left (*prishla* and not *vishla*), (4) she walked and did not drive (*prishla* and not *priehala*), (5) the event has already happened and will not happen in the future (*prishla* and not *pridot*), (6) the activity has been completed and is not in the process of being completed (*prishla* and not *prihodila*).

The English and the Russian sentences have only three of these elements in common: the speaker, the arrival, and the prior event, but the fact that these three elements are shared is enough to make the English and the Russian sentence mutually interchangeable in the given context. Thus, while there is no formal correspondence between the English verb *arrive* and the Russian verb *prishla*, the English sentence *I have arrived* and the Russian sentence *Ya prishla* are interchangeable in the given situation and therefore they may be considered text equivalents. So, in Catford's system the main criterion for text equivalence is the **identity of contextually relevant features**.

6.4. Nida's view on equivalence

Another classic of translation studies, Eugene Nida, in his book *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964), claims that it is not the identity of situationally relevant features that is the main criterion for equivalence, but rather the identity of the receiver's reaction. He distinguishes between two types of equivalence: **formal** equivalence and **dynamic** equivalence.

He interprets formal equivalence completely differently from Catford. He only speaks about formal equivalence if the translator attributes priority to the source language text, and tries to render the source language text as faithfully as possible, not only in its content but also in its form including (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, (3) meanings in terms of the source context. To faithfully give back the grammatical units, (1) verbs are translated into verbs, and nouns into nouns, (2) the boundaries of the sentences remain unchanged, (3) punctuation, paraphrasing, etc. also stay the same.

When is such translation necessary? According to Nida, this is how Plato's dialogues have to be translated to understand the essence of Plato's philosophical system and to be able to follow the development of his terminology. Formal equivalence is also important if the translation is done for linguists, who intend to contrast the comparable units of two languages. Formal equivalence is thus not to be rejected, but is to be treated as an important form of translation in the case of certain texts and certain audiences.

Dynamic equivalence is the exact opposite of formal equivalence; here the translator concentrates on the target language receiver. When reading a dynamically equivalent translation a bilingual and bicultural person can justifiably say "That is just the way we would say it" (166). The dynamically equivalent translation is "the closest natural equivalent" of the source language text. To produce a "natural" translation, the translator has to bear in mind three important factors: (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole, (2) the context of the particular message, and (3) the receptor-language audience (1964: 167).

Taking into account the receptor language and the receptor-language culture is the first criterion of a "natural" translation for Nida. He cites J. H. Frere's thoughts: "the language of translation ought, we think, to be a pure, impalpable and invisible element, the medium of thought and feeling and nothing more; it ought never to attract attention to itself..." (Frere 1820: 481, in Nida 1964: 167).

According to Nida, a natural translation involves two principal areas of adaptation, namely, grammar and lexicon. Nida considers grammatical modifications

easier, especially because these are “dictated by the obligatory structures of the receptor language”. During translation, the translator is sometimes required to change the word order, replace a verb with a noun, or a noun with a pronoun, etc.

Adjusting the lexical structure of the source language to the semantic requirements of the receptor language is a much more demanding task. From this aspect Nida considers three lexical levels: “(1) terms for which there are readily available parallels, e.g., *river, tree, stone, knife*, etc.; (2) terms which identify culturally different objects but with somewhat similar functions: e.g., *book*, (...) and (3) terms which identify cultural specialities: e.g., *synagogue, homer, ephah, cherubim ...*” (1964: 167). In the case of this latter group, their “foreign associations” can rarely be avoided, and if the cultures in question are distant from each other, then it is almost impossible.

The second criterion of “natural” translation in Nida’s system is the consideration of the context of the given text. Nida’s concept of context is interesting. First he mentions the intonation and rhythm of sentences, and then discusses the issue of rendering the stylistic characteristics of the original text. How is it possible to avoid vulgarisms in a sophisticated text, or, on the contrary, how is it possible to avoid producing a complicated legal document out of an ordinary text when the translator tries to avoid ambiguities in the translation? Translators also have to think about “the standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse” which differ radically from language to language: “What is entirely appropriate in Spanish, for example, may turn out to be quite unacceptable “purple prose” in English, and the English prose we admire as dignified and effective often seems in Spanish to be colourless, insipid and flat” (1964: 169).

The third criterion of “natural” translation in Nida’s work is taking into consideration the receptor-language audience. “This appropriateness must be judged on the basis of the level of experience and the capacity for decoding, if one is to aim a real dynamic equivalence” (1964: 170). Translators have to make sure that the translation produces the same effect in the receptor-language readers as the original piece did in the source-language audience.

As we have seen, Nida bases the notion of dynamic equivalence on three criteria, but it is his third criterion that has gained wide currency in the literature on translation theory. Dynamically equivalent translation, according to Nida, is generally identified with translation producing the same effect and the same reaction. An oft-cited Biblical example is the *Lamb of God*, which has to be translated as *Seal of God* to an audience, such as the Eskimos, who do not know the animal *lamb*.

The requirement of identical reaction is, of course, easily questionable, and Nida was also aware of this. He himself calls our attention to the fact that we cannot always tell how the original audience reacted to a particular piece. “On the other hand, one is not always sure how original audience responded or were supposed to respond” (1964:170). Still, identical receiver reaction, as the criterion of equivalence, was a good starting point for further research. The more absurd it seems to require similar reader reaction in the translation of books written several hundred years ago or in the translation of literary works from completely different cultures, the less absurd it seems to require similar reader reaction in the case of translations of scientific or technical works written for a contemporary audience.

6.5. Other views on equivalence

The concept of equivalence (Äquivalenz) is a central category of German translation research. Otto Kade (1968) enumerates four types of equivalences: **total equivalence** (totale Äquivalenz), where a source language unit has a permanent equivalent in the target language (e.g., in the case of terms, or institutional names), **optional equivalence** (fakultative Äquivalenz), where a given source language unit has several equivalents in the target language (e.g., in German: *Spannung*, in English: *voltage, tension, suspense, stress, pressure*), **approximate equivalence** (approximative Äquivalenz), where the meaning of a source language unit is divided between two target language equivalents (e.g., German: *Himmel*, English: *heaven/sky*), and finally, **zero equivalence** (Null-Äquivalenz), where the source language unit does not have a target-language equivalent (e.g., in the case of cultural words and realia).

Another well-known view in the theory of translation is Gert Jäger's view on equivalence, which he put forward in his book *Translation und Translationslinguistik*, published in 1975. Jäger distinguishes between **communicative** and **functional** equivalence. He speaks about communicative equivalence when the "**communicative value**" (kommunikativer Wert) of the original text does not change in translation, that is, the translation produces the same communicative effect as the original text. So far this is similar to Nida's concept, but according to Jäger, communicative effect is primarily a psychological concept, and therefore cannot be studied with the tools of linguistics. What can, however, be studied linguistically is the "**functional value**" (funktioneller Wert) of the text, the preservation of which is a precondition of functional equivalence.

How can the functional value of texts be grasped? By functional values Jäger refers to the sum of the functions of linguistic signs, the sum of their meanings. More precisely, it is not exactly their sum, because he differentiates three types of meanings (semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic) borrowed from semiotics, and considers them only partly preservable in translation. Within syntactic meaning, he only considers preservable grammatical functions, which participate in the actualisation of meaning, such as topic-comment structure. From pragmatic meaning, he only takes into consideration meanings that are realised linguistically, for example those that occur in the style of the text. Therefore, in his view, the functional value of the original text is a composite of semantic meaning, topic-comment structure, and pragmatic meanings realised linguistically; and this is what has to be preserved in translation to achieve functional equivalence. According to Jäger, such precise delimitation of meanings to be preserved will save us from making empty statements as the one that claims that a precondition of equivalent translation is the preservation of "content", "sense", or "meaning".

At the end of his discussion, Jäger returns to the separation of communicative and functional equivalence. While communicative equivalence cannot be described with the tools of linguistics, functional equivalence can. While a functionally equivalent translation is equivalent communicatively as well, the reverse is not true, because the same original text can have several communicative equivalents, whose functional values are different (Jäger 1975: 87–95, 100–109).

Similarly to Jäger, in *Yazik i perevod* (1975) Barkhudarov also works with the three dimensional meaning concept of semiotics. He uses the terms (1) “*referentsial’noe znachenie*”, that is, **referential meaning** to indicate the relationship between signifier and signified, (2) “*vnutriyazikovoe znachenie*”, that is, **intralinguistic meaning** to indicate the relationship between linguistic signs, and (3) “*pragmaticheskoe znachenie*”, that is, **pragmatic meaning** to indicate the relationship between signs and their users, and ranks them according to importance. He starts out from the idea that in translation semantic losses are unavoidable. These losses can only be minimised if the translator establishes priorities among the meanings to be translated and decides which meanings must be translated and which can be sacrificed. In most cases, the order of priority is the following: the most important meaning is referential meaning, this is followed by pragmatic meaning and last comes intralinguistic meaning. There are, of course, exceptions, for example literary texts.

Werner Koller’s 1979 book, *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* contains similar equivalence types. He distinguishes denotative, connotative, text-normative, pragmatic and formal equivalence.

Newmark, in his book *Approaches to Translation* (1982) blames Nida for contrasting dynamic equivalence only with formal equivalence and disregarding **cognitive** equivalence, i.e. equivalence of **sense** and **content**. According to Newmark, the more informative a text is the easier it is to create a similar effect in translation, and the more emotive a text is the more difficult it is to achieve the same effect. He distinguishes between two types of translation: **semantic translation**, where the preservation of the information content of the source-language text is important, and **communicative translation**, where the effect produced on the target-language reader is important (Newmark 1982).

6.6. What “should” be preserved in translation?

In reviewing the above sources one may notice that the views of different authors differ most on what has often been called the **invariant** of translation, in other words, what it is that definitely has to be transferred from one language to the other, what it is that must be preserved, that has to remain unchanged in translation. All of them agree, though, that no matter what we call it – the **contents** of the original text (Fedorov 1958), its **sense** (Revzin and Rozentsveig 1964, Melchuk and Zholkovskiy 1968), its **functional value** (Jäger 1975), its **meaning** (Barkhudarov 1975), or its **information structure** (Chernyakhovskaya 1976) – in order to create equivalence this something must be transferred by the translator from the source language to the target language.

From the above it follows that this approach is characterised by a certain degree of normativity. Most of the representatives of this approach talk about what the target-language text “**should**” look like, what it is that the translator “**should**” preserve. As early as in 1964, Revzin and Rozentsveig declared that translation studies, if it intends to describe translation as a process and not as a product, must be theoretic and not normative by nature: “*Nauka, stermyashchayasya opisat’ perevod kak protsess, dolzhna bit’ ne normativnoy, a teoreticheskoy*” (1964: 21).

6.7. Komissarov's view on equivalence

Komissarov also argues against the normative view. In his two basic works *Slovo a perevode* (A Word about Translation, 1973) and *Lingvistika perevoda* (The Linguistics of Translation, 1980) he does not intend to describe the criteria for creating equivalence: instead, based on a large number of facts he sets out to explore and systematise the equivalence relations observed in translations. He emphasises that in order to be able to do so, the researcher has to refrain from any evaluative or critical comments. What the researcher should study is not the “goodness” of a particular translation or whether a “better” or “different” translation could have been provided. If the texts submitted to analysis are translations, then it must be assumed that they are equivalent, and the researcher's question that must be asked is how equivalence is created in the specific cases.

Comparative analysis of translations will show that equivalence between the original text and its translation or, “semantic similarity” (*smislovaya blizost'*), in Komissarov's terms is rather variable. The researcher's task therefore is to explore the various types of equivalence relations on the basis of analysing large amounts of text. Komissarov distinguishes five such equivalence types based on the Russian translation of English texts.

Komissarov's equivalence types described in detail in his two main theoretical works (1973: 78–152, 1980: 59–100), will be presented here in brief, using English-Russian examples from one of his later books, which is a practical supplement to his theoretical works: *A Manual of Translation from English into Russian* (Komissarov and Koralova 1990: 11–14).

In the previous section, in discussing the different theoretical models of the process of translation we presented Komissarov's five levels of transfer. These same levels correspond to five different levels of equivalence:

- (1) equivalence on the level of the communicative goal,
- (2) equivalence on the level of the situation,
- (3) equivalence on the level of message,
- (4) equivalence on the level of utterance, and
- (5) equivalence on the level of linguistic signs.

- (1) The **first** type includes translations with the lowest degree of semantic similarity with the original text.

English: Maybe there is some chemistry between us that doesn't mix.

Russian: Bivaet chto lyudi ne shodyatsya kharakterami.

The relationship between the English original and its Russian translation can be characterised in the following way: (i) the lexical units and the syntactic structures of the source text and the target text are totally different, (ii) the lexical units and grammatical structures of the target text are not in a derivational relationship with the source text. What is it that is common in the two texts? On what grounds can the equivalence relationship be postulated? It is “the general intention of the message, its orientation towards a certain communicative effect, which can be called ‘the purport of communication’” (1990: 12).

The **second** type of equivalence relation shows a higher degree of similarity, even though it is not so evident at first sight.

English: He answered the phone.

Russian: On snyal trubku.

English: It was late in the day.

Russian: Blizilsya vecher.

The relationship between the English original and its Russian translation can be characterised in the following way: (i) the lexical units and the syntactic structures of the source text and the target text are totally different again; (ii) however these different language units describe the same situation; they describe it in a different way, but it is still the same situation. "The information which characterised the second type of equivalence can, therefore be designated as 'identification of the situation'" (1990:13).

The **third** type of equivalence relation involves even higher degree of similarity: it is not only the communicative goal and the situation that are identical, but also the way in which the situation is described:

English: Scrubbing makes me bad tempered.

Russian: Ot mitiya polov u menya nastroenie portitsya.

English: London saw a cold winter last year.

Russian: V proslom godu zima v Londone bila holodnoy.

The relationship between the English original and its Russian translation can be characterised in the following way: (i) the syntactic structures of the source text and the target text are totally different again, but the lexical units contain common semes; (ii) the target text is a semantic paraphrase of the source text. In the first example, for instance, both the source text and the translation can be characterised by a cause and effect relation. In this type of equivalence the way the situation is described is also equivalent.

In the **fourth** type of equivalence relation, the degree of similarity increases even further: besides the communicative goal, the situation described, and the manner of describing the situation, the grammatical structures are also partly identical, i.e. their differences are only due to the differences between the systems of the two languages.

English: He was never tired of old songs.

Russian: Starie pesni emu nikogda ne nadoedali.

The relationship between the English original and its Russian translation can be characterised in the following way: (i) the lexical units and the syntactic structures of the source text and the target text are similar; (ii) the syntactic structures of the target text are in a derivational relationship with the source-language syntactic structures. As Komissarov puts it: "We can say that here the translation conveys

not only the “what for”, the “what about” and the “what” of the original, but also something of the “how it is said in the original” (1990:14).

And finally, the **fifth** type of equivalence relation is characterised by the maximum possible similarity.

English: I saw him at the theatre.

Russian: Ya videl yevo v teatre.

The relationship between the English original and its Russian translation can be characterised in the following way: (i) the translation retains the meaning of all the words used in the source text; (ii) the parallel syntactic structures imply the maximum invariance of their meanings.

It should be noted that in his 1990 book, from which the examples are taken, Komissarov changed the names of his levels of equivalence as follows: (1): the level of the purport of communication; (2) the level of (the identification) of the situation; (3) the level of the method of description (of the situation); (4) the level of syntactic meanings; (5) the level of word semantics (1990: 15).

Komissarov’s works (1973, 1980, 1990) indisputably offer a broader view of equivalence than the studies discussed earlier, which tried to define criteria for equivalence on the basis of invariant sense, content, or meaning. The role of the **text**, however, is absent from his analysis, too. The fact that the original and the translated sentence contain the same lexical units and syntactic structures does not at all make them equivalent; what is more, it is most often the identity of lexi-co-grammatical elements that cause errors in translation. It is true that, according to Komissarov, the particular equivalence types are preconditions of one another, that is, if two sentences are claimed to be equivalent then they are also claimed to be equivalent in terms of their communicative goals, the situation described, and the manner of describing that particular situation, etc. The system, though, fails to take into consideration the idea that a target language sentence can only be equivalent with a source language sentence if it plays the same role or occupies the same position in the target-language text as the source-language sentence in the source-language text.

6.8. The conditions of communicative equivalence

In this section, we shall present an outline of our own view of equivalence. In our view, three types of equivalence relations characterise a communicatively equivalent translation: referential, contextual, and functional equivalence. The essence of **referential** equivalence is that the target-language text should refer to the same segment of reality, to the same facts, events and phenomena as the source-language text. The essence of **contextual** equivalence lies in the idea that individual sentences should occupy the same position in the whole of the target-language text as their correspondents in the whole of the source-language text. **Functional** equivalence means that the target-language text should play the same role in the community of target-language readers as the source-language text in the community of source-language readers (this role may involve transfer of information, provoking certain emotions, appeal, etc.).

Only target-language texts, which equally satisfy the requirements of referential, contextual, and functional equivalence, can be considered communicative equivalents of given source-language texts.

What research agenda does this three dimensional division set for translation theory? In our view, referential identity is a precondition of translation. If a target-language text does not refer to the same segment of reality, the same objects, events and phenomena, then it cannot be considered translation. Therefore, in our view, research on the causes of “bad” or “incorrect” translation and “mistranslation” does not belong to the tasks of translation theory.

Research on **contextual** equivalence, on the other hand, has great future potential. Contextual equivalence can be approached from two angles: from the point of view of the **sentence** and from the point of view of the **text**.

Approaching it from the point of view of the sentence means that target language sentences should be connected to each other and should participate in the organisation of the target-language text the same way as their correspondents do in the organisation of the source-language text. And here there is a wide scope for future research, since the linking of sentences and their organisation into texts is carried out by different means in different languages, and indeed, even within particular languages, there are noteworthy differences among the various text types. These means are applied intuitively by language users (writers, translators, etc.), while linguistics has not yet fully explored the typical sentence connections and discourse organisation characteristic of particular languages and text types.

As mentioned before, contextual equivalence can also be approached from the point of view of the **whole** of the source-language and target-language **texts** considered to be translations of each other. In such cases contextual equivalence means that in the target-language text, produced as a result of translation, sentences should be connected to one another in the same way as in other non-translated target-language texts representing a similar genre.

This is seemingly contradictory. What could non-translated target-language texts have to do with translated texts? How can equivalence depend on the degree to which translated target-language texts are similar to original non-translated target-language?

The answer is simple. This is possible because the third previously mentioned criterion of communicative equivalence, **functional** equivalence, which means that the target language text should play the same role for the target-language audience as the source-language text plays for the source-language audience, can only be realised if the target-language text produced as a result of translation conforms to the patterns of target-language texts used by target-language speakers. Thus works of literature should not resemble legal documents, and scientific texts should not sound like small talk.

This requirement begs the question whether the practice of literary translation does not contradict all of it, since in this case stylistic inventions could never be transported from one national literature into that of another. In our view, this contradiction can be eliminated in the following way. In literary texts form is also part of content, and literary texts contain information about form as well as information about phenomenon in the real world. Thus, we can assume that here form becomes part of the referential component, and contextual aspects remain important because, no matter how new and unusual a literary form may be, it has to conform to texts regarded as literature by target-language readers.

6.9. Rejection of the concept of equivalence

In using the concept of equivalence or identity, admittedly or not, translation scholars generally relate it to the source-language text, trying to assess whether the translation and the source-language text are of equal value.

It was Gideon Toury, who first directed the attention of translation scholars to the target language in the early 1980s.¹ In his view, the text of the translation must function in a target-language context, and so it should meet the genre and stylistic requirements of the target-language. Therefore, he claims that it is not only its equivalence to the source-language text that is important, which he calls “adequacy”, but also ability to meet the requirements presented by the target language called “appropriacy”. And if we take into account the target language reader, we also have to introduce the requirement of “acceptability” as well (Toury 1980).

Another scholar who questions the notion of equivalence is Mary Snell-Hornby. In her 1988 book, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, she aims at integrating the linguistic and the literary approach. After reviewing the various theories of equivalence and the equivalence typologies proposed by different authors she claims that the concept of equivalence cannot be a central category in translation studies. In fact, it can do harm, because it suggests an atomistic view, producing the false illusion of symmetry between languages. She proves her case in an ingenious way by discussing the etymology of the English term *equivalence* and the German term *Äquivalenz*, pointing out that even these two terms cannot be regarded as truly “equivalent” (Snell-Hornby 1988: 18–19).

6.10. The importance of the concept of equivalence

Despite the views rejecting the concept of equivalence, research on equivalence in translation still has great theoretical and practical significance. Its theoretical significance lies in the fact that as a result of translation totally different linguistic structures may enter into equivalence relations, and without translation their identical functions would never be detected. In this way, they provide data for research into one of the most fascinating problems in the study of language, the relationship between form and function.

The practical significance of the concept is also remarkable, because it may provide scientifically sound criteria for translation criticism, which has so far been practised on an intuitive basis. If we do not adopt the view that all translations that get published and are read as translations are equivalent, then we have to accept the idea that equivalence appears in various degrees, and that translations

¹ This approach, distinctly ‘literary’ in its inspiration, is augmented by the present author’s rather more ‘linguistically’ inspired work, done as early as 1979, which nevertheless comes to similar results as to the relevance of the target-language, through investigating translated scientific Hungarian texts in comparison with non-translated Hungarian texts (Klaudy 1981abc, 1984, 1987, 1988, 1989). Clearly, an example of a scientific idea maturing independently, but simultaneously in different schools of thought.

on the market cannot always be regarded as communicatively equivalent to the original texts, be it a literary, journalistic, scientific or technical text.

Research on translations that are not equivalent in content, as mentioned above, does not belong to the tasks of translation studies, because no scientifically sound general conclusions can be drawn on the basis of bad translations, reflecting the translator's deficient knowledge of language and/or subject matter. It is, however, the task of translation studies to conduct research on **the criteria of contextual equivalence**, based on a comparison of source-language texts belonging to different genres and, on the one hand, their target-language translations and, on the other hand, target-language texts not produced via translation but belonging to the same genre. It is by providing a discourse-based analysis and explanation of equivalence relations that can help translation studies in developing scientifically sound criteria for translation criticism.

7. New trends in translation theory at the turn of the century

The previous chapters described the birth, evolution, and development of a new discipline. In this last chapter on the theoretical background I wish to offer a snapshot of the current state of the art. This chapter might be the first to become outdated. Names, journals, approaches, and research methods will be mentioned, and only time will show whether they belong to the main line of development in the science of translation or not.

7.1. A new name

Theory or science of translation? The problem of naming has haunted the evolution of scientific thinking about translation for a long time. English speaking scholars usually avoid the word “science” because in English it is generally applied to natural sciences. Scholars with a German speaking background do accept the word “science”, because the use of German “Wissenschaft” is not limited to natural sciences; they, on the other hand, tend to have reservations concerning the word “theory”.

In the case of translation, we cannot develop a formalised, logically consistent, exhaustive and contradiction-free system of concepts, starting with axioms, and accepting new claims only if they can logically be derived from the basic theoretical principles. However, the word “theory” can be interpreted in less tight terms. There exist not only deductive but also descriptive theories, which describe and systematize empirical data and formulate general truths. Gideon Toury, in his book *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond* (1995), speaks about translation theory in this light.

In the past few years, the term “Translation Studies” has been increasingly used in the literature, while the use of “Science of Translation” or the “Theory of Translation” has been declining. As mentioned before, the term “Translation Studies” was first introduced by James S. Holmes in 1972, and it was popularised by Susan Bassnett’s 1980 book bearing the same title. It became commonly used in the early 1990s. It avoids both the word “theory” and the word “science”, and is so general that it is capable of integrating approaches related to linguistics, the history of literature, pedagogy, history, philosophy, etc.

The general acceptance of the term is also indicated by the fact that in 1992, when a European society was established in Vienna to coordinate research into the problems of translation, it was this term that was chosen: EST – European Society for Translation Studies. Also theoretical papers on translation at international conferences on translation are usually grouped together in the section “Translation Studies”, and most newly founded translation departments are also called departments of “Translation Studies”.

Unfortunately, a literal translation of the term “Translation Studies” cannot be used in Hungarian, since the word “tanulmányok” used in translating names like *European Studies*, *British Studies*, *Women Studies* cannot be collocated with translation. Therefore, in the Hungarian original of the current book we use the terms “fordítástudomány” (science of translation) and “fordításelmélet” (theory of translation), even though both of the terms (“theory” and “science”) are debated in the Hungarian literature (Albert 1988). Of course, best solution would be the finding a name that does not involve either “theory” or “science”. Some Hungarian scholars following German or French traditions use the term “transzlatológia” (cf. German “Translatologie”, English “translatology”), and “traduktológia” (cf. French “traductologie”, English “traductology”). For more details see Shuttleworth 1997.

7.2. New social tasks

Taking *TRANSST*¹, the International Newsletter in Translation Studies into our hands, small in size but rich in content, published four times a year and giving information about conferences, scholarships, new books, journals, etc. in the field of translation/interpretation, we must notice that research on translation, which could only slowly separate from literature, is now gathering momentum. Of course, this newsletter (edited by Gideon Toury from 1990) provides information on events related to literary translation, too, but the information on linguistic translation research seems to be increasing in volume and importance. We several times referred to the fact that linguistic translation theory was born in the second half of the 20th century, but what is going on at the moment reaches beyond the boundaries of linguistics, we might even say that the science of translation has now become **the science of European integration**.

While in previous years international organizations had only one or two official languages (the languages of the Europe Council, uniting 32 countries is still French and English), in the European Community (called the European Union since 1993), consisting of 15 member countries, the language of every participant is an official language, and every document is published in the language of every member state. As a matter of fact there are only 11 languages and not 15, because Belgium, Luxembourg, Ireland, and Austria do not add to the number of languages, but even so enormous amount of texts have to be translated. While the first four languages (French, German, Italian, Dutch) required 12 translation-interpretation relations, the six languages (French, German, Italian, Dutch, Russian, Danish) of the second phase required 32, the nine languages (French, German, Italian, Dutch, Russian, Danish, Greek, Spanish, Portuguese) of the next phase required 72 translation-interpretation relations, with the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden the number of EU languages of the European Union reached 11, which amounts to 110 translation-interpretation relations. A new linguistic bureaucracy is emerg-

¹ *TRANSST* serves as an information clearinghouse for the Committee for Translation Studies of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA/ AILC) and for the Scientific Commission on Translation and Interpreting of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (IAAL/AILA).

ing, and many more “linguistic bureaucrats” will be needed in the future. And it is easy to foresee the vast number of translators and interpreters needed when Central European states accede to the Union and join to European institutions and business.

Since reducing the number of official languages would contradict a fundamental principle of the Union (Patterson 1981), the only solution that remains may only be sought for in the development of new linguistic technologies. In the 1991-1994 linguistic development plan of the European Union there were altogether 24 projects, several of which concerned the development of machine translation or Computer Assisted Translation (CAT). The 32 million ECUs that the European Union intended to invest in the development of linguistic technologies in this period could not leave translation research unaffected (*Telematics Programme 1991-1994*).

All this is important for translation studies because, once again, as in the case of emergence of linguistic theories of translation, we see social needs prompting new developments in the field, with new schools and new research centres being established and new translation studies journals launched.

7.3. New centres of research

In the development of every discipline, centres of research play an important role. Such centres of research may come into being in academic institutions, university departments, where a leading figure in the field can give direction to research, gathering students, organising international conferences, etc., and, most importantly, can obtain funding, too. These centres of research have their own history, in which there are successful, stagnating or even declining periods. Several of the old centres of translation studies have recently been silent (e.g., the ones in Moscow, Leipzig, Berlin, etc.) and many new ones are just becoming established or have reached maturity.

The first one to mention is the Translator and Interpreter Training Institute in Vienna (*Institut für Übersetzer- und Dolmetscherausbildung der Universität Wien*), whose director, Mary Snell-Hornby, has made enormous efforts to bring together scholars working in the field of translation studies in Europe. In 1992, she held an international conference in Vienna called “Translation Studies – An Interdiscipline”, whose closing event was the foundation of the European Society for Translation Studies.

An important centre of translation research is the *Leuven Research Centre for Translation, Communication and Cultures* created within the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, under Jose Lambert’s leadership. First it had literary leanings, but later on it became an interdisciplinary research centre. Since 1989 a special research programme has been going on at the Centre, primarily focusing on the study of the intercultural function of translation. The most important part of the programme is the summer school, which hosts young researchers from all over the world for a month every summer. Every year the course is led by an outstanding personality of translation studies (Gideon Toury 1989, Hans Vermeer 1990, Susan Bassnett 1991, Albrecht Neubert 1992, Daniel Gile 1993, Mary Snell-Hornby 1994, André Lefevre 1995, Anthony Pym 1996, Yves Gambier 1997, Lawrence Venuti 1998,

Andrew Chesterman 1999). The programme includes lectures on translation theory, seminars and tutorials, as well as the publication of the students' final papers in the form of an edited volume. Many of the young researchers published their first studies in the volumes of the Leuven seminar, *Translation and the Manipulation of Discourse. Selected Papers of the CERA Research Seminars in Translation Studies 1989–1991 and 1992–1993* (Robyns 1994, Jansen 1995).

The third centre to be mentioned is the one in Savonlinna, Finland. The College of Foreign Languages in Savonlinna has been running two-year translation courses since 1968. In 1981, this college merged with Joensuu University and its name was changed to Savonlinna School of Translation Studies. The duration of the translator training course was increased. In addition to translation training, the School offers a PhD course in translation studies. The School headed by Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit conducts intensive empirical research into the process of translation.

The fourth centre of research is the Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori in Triest, where a few years ago Laura Gran and John Dodds started to investigate the theoretical and practical problems of interpreting. Very wisely they immediately began to publish their results in *The Interpreters Newsletter* with a very modest format at first, but with quite a lot of interesting information. This publication unites all of those who claim that the problems of interpreting so far regarded as a matter of a practical nature, deserve to be studied experimentally, leading to scientific conclusions that are applicable in practice.

One of the central figures in English translation research is professor Peter Newmark at the University of Surrey, who, despite the fact that he considers himself anti-theoretical, writes excellent studies on translation (*Approaches to Translation* 1982, *A Textbook of Translation* 1988, *About Translation* 1991, *Paragraphs on Translation* 1993, *Further Paragraphs on Translation* 1998). A predominantly literature-oriented research centre under the leadership of Susan Bassnett operates in the University of Warwick frequently hosting international research teams as well.

In Central Europe it is the *Translation Studies Institute, Charles University, Prague* that has the richest traditions in translator and interpreter training. The institute, under various names, has existed since 1963 as the country's only university-level translator and interpreter training institute. It offers a five-year MA course in English, French, German, Russian, and Spanish. The head of the institution, Zuzana Jettmarová, organised the 9th international conference, entitled *Translation Strategies and Creativity* (Prague, September 25–27, 1995) which was devoted to the memory of two classics of Czech and Slovak translation studies, Jiří Levy and Anton Popovič. Its proceedings were published by Benjamins (Beylard-Ozeroff, A. et al. (eds) 1998. *Translators' Strategies and Creativity. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam: Benjamins). Another important publication of the conference was the national translation studies bibliography (Hrdlička, M. Čeňkova, I. [eds.] 1995. *Czech and Slovak Bibliography on Translation Studies*).

In the United States, theoretical research on translation, apart from Eugene Nida's classic works, has no traditions. In the recent past, however, some new centres have been created such as the Center for Research in Translation evolved on the Binghamton campus of the State University of New York led by Marilyn Gaddis-Rose and the one at Georgetown University, Washington, founded by

Margaret and David Bowen (1927–1997), where research is mostly conducted on interpreting (Bowen and Bowen 1990). The Binghampton centre of research has a predominantly philosophical and literary approach to translation, but in their guest research programmes they often have researchers dealing with the other aspects of translation.

This centre has its own publication series, *Translation Perspectives I–IX*, edited by Marylin Gaddis-Rose, who transformed the series from being a highly national forum publishing exclusively American literary scholars and philosophers, to one that is more open to European translation studies and other approaches. The thick volume published every year by the American Translators Association (ATA) after its annual general assembly offers a broad view of the situation in the US. American Translators Association, besides its conference proceedings, also has a series of monographs on translation, published in recent years jointly with Benjamins publishing house in Amsterdam (*ATA Scholarly Monograph Series I–IX*).

Translation studies can look back on rich traditions in bilingual Canada, where the total number of translation majors in ten universities is about 1500 annually, and both the Canadian Association of Schools of Translation and the recently established Canadian Association of Translation Studies (CATS) support and coordinate research on translation and interpreting. Two Canadian scholars, Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, have distinguished themselves by conducting research into the history of translation and in compiling the first comprehensive translation history monograph (Delisle and Woodsworth 1995).

7.4. New journals

Besides the traditional international translation journals *Babel* and *Meta*, a new theoretical journal was launched in 1989, under the name *Target* (International Journal of Translation Studies). Its editors are Gideon Toury (Tel Aviv) and José Lambert (Leuven), and its publisher is similarly to *Babel* John Benjamins (Amsterdam). After more than ten years of its existence it is safe to say that it is one of the highest quality journals of the profession.

We have already mentioned the journal *Interpreters' Newsletter* published since 1988 in Trieste, with the editorship of Laura Gran and John Dodds. Also in 1988, the first issue of *TTR* (*Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*) came out, published by the Canadian Association of Translation Studies, with Annie Brisset and Judith Woodsworth as editors.

In 1993, the first issue of *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* was published in Copenhagen by Museum Tusulanum Press university publishing house. The journal edited by Cay Dollerup is published twice a year with articles on issues related to the teaching of linguistic mediation.

In 1995, the first issue of *The Translator* edited by Mona Baker was published in Manchester. In line with its subtitle (*Studies in Intercultural Communication*) it is a highly interdisciplinary journal, looking at translation in the context of the entire process of linguistic communication, unwilling to commit itself to one particular approach. Based on the issues published so far, it has managed to do so. The title of one of its most exciting sections is “*Revisiting the classics*”, in which reviewers, themselves leading figures in the field, look back on the classics of translation

studies after 20 to 30 years. Christiane Nord, for instance, writes about Katharina Reiss (Nord 1996: 81-89), Juan Sager about Mounin (Sager 1995: 87-93), and Theo Hermans about Toury (Hermans 1995: 215-225).

We must also mention a thin, 14 to 15-page, but very significant publication, called *TRANSST (International Newsletter of Translation Studies)*, edited by Gideon Toury at the Tel Aviv University. *TRANSST* is a major international bulletin of research on translation and interpreting giving information about conferences, books to be published, new journals, dissertations in translation theory, possibilities of research and scholarships, etc.

The journal *Language International*, edited by Geoffrey Kingscott until 1996, is also an indispensable source of information for the profession. It was launched as a journal of linguistic professionals in 1988, but gradually it became a journal of translators and interpreters. In 1995, Geoffrey Kingscott published the bibliographical lexicon entitled *International Who's Who in Translation and Terminology*, containing details about several thousand translators, interpreters, and linguistic mediators (Kingscott 1995). In 1996, Geoffrey Kingscott left *Language International*, and founded a new journal, called first *Language Today* and later *Language and Documentation*.

7.5. New book series and encyclopaedias

Recent literature published in book form is so vast in translation studies that we cannot attempt even a superficial review. Still, the launching of a series presenting work done in the field marks an important stage in the establishment of a new discipline. So far books on linguistic translation theory have been published as part of applied linguistics series, for example in the linguistics series of Gunther Narr publishing house (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik*), or Longman's *Applied Linguistics and Language Study*, or *Language in Social Life* series. Now, at the beginning of the 1990s four publishing houses have launched independent translation studies series.

John Benjamins in Amsterdam, publisher of four translation/interpretation journals (*Babel*, *Language International*, *Target*, *Interpreting*), and two closely related corpus linguistics and terminology journals (*International Journal of Corpus Linguistics and Terminology*), has recently started to publish two translation studies series.

One of them, entitled *Benjamins Translation Library*, aims at providing space for the publication of the various approaches to translation (theoretical, historical, pedagogical, philosophical). The fact that the number of books within the series has reached 30 by 1998 neatly illustrates rapid development in the field. In this series, which has played such an important role in the emancipation of the discipline, there are six types of publications:

- (1) Long awaited comprehensive works by leading scholars of translation studies (Toury 1995), new editions of the classics, and English translations of basic works in translation studies originally written in French and German (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995, Wilss 1996), monographs on certain aspects of translation or translation studies such as the history of translation (Delisle and Woodsworth 1995);

- (2) Interdisciplinary studies reassessing the relationship between translation studies and other disciplines, e.g., text linguistics (Trosborg 1998), non-verbal communication (Poyatos 1997), or lexicography (Bergenholtz and Tarp 1995);
- (3) Pioneering works on new fields of research within translation and interpreting studies: on the relationship between information technology and translation studies (Sager 1994), terminological issues in translation (Rey 1995, Somers 1997), the psychology of interpreting (Lambert and Moser-Mercer 1994), court interpreting (Edwards 1995), conference interpreting (Gambier, Gile and Taylor 1997) community interpreting (Carr and Roberts et al. 1997) the development of ideas in translation studies (Chesterman 1997), machine translation (Melby and Warner 1995);
- (4) Studies on literary translation, e.g., on the oeuvre of literary translators (Orero and Sager 1997), the teaching of literary translation (Bush et al. 1997), or literary translation in Eastern cultures (de Beaugrande et al. 1994, Pollard 1997);
- (5) Studies dealing with the teaching of translation (Kussmaul 1995) and interpreting (Gile 1995) and with the training of translators and interpreters;
- (6) Proceedings of conferences on translation studies, such as the Language International I., II., III. conferences (Dollerup 1992, 1994, 1996), or those of the EST congress in Vienna (Snell-Hornby et al. 1994, 1996), or of the international conference organised at Charles University, Prague (Beylard-Ozeroff 1998).

The other series by Benjamins, *ATA Scholarly Monograph Series*, is also an important undertaking, since the results of American translation research are not very well-known in Europe.

Another publishing house which started a translation studies book series, entitled *Topics in Translation* is *Multilingual Matters*. The third one is Routledge publishing house, also based in Britain, which publishes the series *Translation Studies*, and claims that the emergence of translation studies as an independent discipline was the success story of the 1980s.

A fourth publishing house, St. Jerome in Manchester, has not only launched a new translation studies series, but it was specifically set up to publish translation studies literature. The first thing the founder of the company, Mona Baker, did was to bring out the journal *The Translator*, which was then followed by the publication of the series *Translation Theories Explained*, whose volumes present various subdisciplines in translation studies:

- (1) the functional approach (Nord 1997),
- (2) sexual roles in translation (Flotow 1997),
- (3) conference interpreting (Jones 1998),
- (4) linguistics and translation (Fawcett 1997),
- (5) translation and literary studies (Gaddis-Rose 1997).

St. Jerome has also published a dictionary of the terminology of translation studies, called *Dictionary of Translation Studies* (Shuttlework and Cowie 1997), and started the publication *Translation Studies Abstracts*, containing two issues a year and accompanied by a *Bibliography of Translation Studies*.

Another milestone in the establishment of a discipline is when its results are summarised in an encyclopaedia. The *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (Baker 1998) is an immense undertaking. The volume of 650 pages contains two main parts. *Part One*, focusing on the most important categories of translation studies, consists of 80 entries, ranging from *Adaptation* to the *Universals of Translation*; *Part Two*, discussing the translation traditions of different nations, contains 31 entries, going from *African tradition* to *Turkish tradition*. Among the editors and authors we may find the most outstanding representatives of the science of translation, from Eugene Nida to Gideon Toury, and the encyclopedia has several Hungarian authors as well, one being the late György Radó, who wrote the chapter on the history of Hungarian translation (Radó 1998: 448–456).

7.6. New research methods (empirical methods)

On the way from a normative to a descriptive science, the adaptation of empirical methods is an important step forward in translation research.

To be able to formulate truly generalisable statements about the process of translation, the traditional method of comparing source and target language texts can not be regarded as satisfactory any more, even if there has been considerable development in the criteria applied in the past few decades. What is needed now is that researchers should conduct studies under “laboratory conditions”, performing pre-planned and replicable experiments. Translated literature can no longer be regarded as a single data base from a single spontaneous experiment that is there just waiting to be analysed by the researcher.

The application of empirical methods in translation theory cannot be regarded as the result of internal development. James Holmes said in 1970 that researchers of translation theory all obtained their training in other fields. Researchers came not only from the field of linguistics and literature, but also from more distant areas, such as information theory, logic, mathematics, and all of them brought with them the paradigms, quasi-paradigms, models and methodologies of their original discipline. Many turned to translation research attempting to find new areas for research, where they can experiment with new methods. The science of translation has benefited from these imported methods, which have helped to transform it from a normative into a descriptive science (Toury 1991).

Translation research – be it theoretical or empirical – may move in three directions, depending on whether it is the product, the process, or the function that is in the centre of attention. In these three branches of research, naturally, the possibilities of empirical research also vary. Research on the product or function of translation investigates the reactions of the consumer, that is, the reactions of the reader. Therefore in these cases it is the reader who is the subject of study. Process-oriented empirical research, on the other hand, studies the process of translating independently of the final version. In such cases the subject of the experiment is the translator.

Gideon Toury in his article *Experimentation in Translation Studies: Achievements, Prospects and Some Pitfalls* (1991) gave a detailed overview of two product-oriented empirical research methods, used to measure readability, clozetests (Snell-Hornby 1983, Puurtinen 1989) and questionnaires (Tirkkonen-Condit 1986).

7.6.1. The cloze test

Cloze tests, as is well known, are very effective in measuring language proficiency in general and the reading skill in particular. Cloze tests can be prepared by deleting every *n*th (e.g., fifth, sixth, etc.) word from a continuous stretch of text, and the reader has to fill in the missing words. It has also been realised that cloze tests do not only measure how well students understand texts, but they can also show how understandable the text is. If we start out from the assumption that good translation is easier to understand than bad translation and it is easier to extract information from it, then cloze tests may be capable of measuring the readability of translated texts. Nida and Taber have mentioned the use of cloze techniques as early as in 1969: "Actually the only linguistically sound test of ease of comprehension is the Cloze Technique, which is based on the principle of translational probabilities" (1969:169–170).

The difficulty of such experiments lies in the fact that the readability (comprehensibility) of a target-language text produced as a result of translation cannot be assessed independently, only in comparison or relative to other texts, which might either be the original source-language text or other target-language texts. If we choose the first option, claiming that the comprehensibility of a translation should equal that of the original text, then testing can only be done with two native speaker groups, speaking different native languages. It is maybe more beneficial if we compare the different translations of the same text with the help of a cloze test. This is what Tiina Puurtinen did when comparing two translations of *The Wizard of Oz*. She considered one of the translations, containing difficult syntactic structures, more difficult to read, and the results of the cloze test confirmed her hypothesis (Puurtinen 1992).

7.6.2. The questionnaire method

Another method to measure readers' reactions is the use of questionnaires, in which readers, having gone through the translation(s), write down their intuitive impressions about the text(s) read.

In the following, we shall present some of our own questionnaire surveys. The first one was conducted in 1978 where participants had to judge whether a text was an original Hungarian text or a translation as a part of an experiment to demonstrate the phenomenon of so called "quasi-correctness" in translated Hungarian texts. (Klaudy 1981abc, 1984, 1987). The other experiment was conducted in 1993, to explore, on the one hand, what explication strategies translators had used in two different Hungarian translations of the same source text (Klaudy 1993), and on the other hand, how explication affects readers' perceptions of the translations.

7.6.3. Quasi-correctness and the testing of reader perceptions

In our research in the 1970s we called the Hungarian texts produced via translation “quasi-correct” (following Ferenc Papp’s term from 1972, 1984) in order to avoid negative labelling which leads to regarding such texts as in some way spoiled or imperfect texts. Instead we wanted to treat translated texts as text type which is worth studying in its own right (Klaudy 1981abc). This same idea, following Gideon Toury’s descriptive approach and Mona Baker’s corpus investigations has now become so widely accepted in translation studies that even the term “quasi-correct” is coming to be regarded as derogatory. The term was also used by Inkeri Vehmas-Lehto, who wrote a book with a similar title comparing Finnish texts translated from Russian with original Finnish texts (Vehmas-Lehto 1989).

As discussed in the chapter on text linguistics, quasi-correctness refers to the difference between whole target-language texts produced as a result of translation and authentic (original) target-language texts. Here we are talking about very subtle differences that are imperceptible on the sentence level: it is the whole of the translated text that differs from original target-language texts. Readers sense some light oddity about the text but cannot identify its source. One of the reasons for this oddity is that the cohesive devices of the source language do not always work in the target language. Another reason for the perceived oddity may lie in slight shifts of stress, and slight distortions in the functional perspective of sentences, which the reader does not even notice if it happens in one or two sentences, but if it happens more often, then it may contribute to the feeling of strangeness.

In our survey, we sought answer to the question whether readers can perceive this strangeness in the translated texts, and whether they are capable of distinguishing between translated texts and original Hungarian texts and then explaining the reasons for the strangeness, etc. The texts used were social science texts, and the readers were experienced readers of such texts, university teachers and students.

Each participant received five texts on different social science topics, out of which the first, the second, and the fifth were translated Hungarian texts, and the third and fourth were original Hungarian texts. They were asked to read the texts, at their speed, neither more closely or more superficially than usual, but exactly in the same way as they generally read. After each text they had to answer three questions:

- (1) Do you think the above text is an original text or a translation? (decision)
- (2) How do you know? (explanation)
- (3) If you believe it is a translation, how would you rate it? (evaluation)

The test papers were filled out by 650 participants, and as everybody answered 5 test papers, we evaluated altogether 3250 answer sheets. We cannot go into a detailed description of the results here (for the details see Klaudy 1987), only present some of the most interesting findings. The results of the decision and the evaluation of its quality mostly coincided with our preliminary assumptions: the participants distinguished separated original Hungarian texts from translations, i.e. from quasi-correct texts with a reliability of 70%. The divergent reasons given for their decisions, however, showed that the perception of strangeness is to a great extent intuitive. Let us cite just a few examples to illustrate the contradictory reasons:

- (1) *a)* It is a translation, because it contains many foreign words.
b) It is original, because it contains many foreign words, which a translator would have translated.
- (2) *a)* It is a translation, because it contains many complicated, complex sentences.
b) It is original, because it contains many complicated, complex sentences, and a translator would have cut them up into shorter ones.
- (3) *a)* It is a translation, because it contains many leftward branching attributive structures, which are not typical in Hungarian.
b) It is original, because it contains many leftward branching attributive structures, which are only possible to create in Hungarian.
- (4) *a)* It is a translation, because it contains many clumsy, unstructured sentences.
b) It is original, because it contains many clumsy, unstructured sentences, which a translator would have structured better.

On the basis of such contradictory reader reactions, some might say that translators have a very hard task when trying to meet reader expectations. It is even more interesting that as the findings show the intuitive evaluation of readers worked very well despite the contradictory nature of reader responses. In other words, even if they cannot formulate rules for what they really expect from a translator, they are able to tell whether a particular text meets their expectations or not.

7.6.4. The testing of explicitation strategies

Explicitation is the technique of making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text. Explicitation (implication) strategies are generally discussed together with addition and omission strategies in the literature on translation theory, even though the notion of explicitation is broader than addition or insertion, since it is possible to make something clearer in translation without the actual insertion of additional elements (for more details see III. 3.5.).

In our experiment we intended to find out how one of the explicitation strategies, namely addition, affects the readability of the text. We distinguished between two types of additions:

- (1) Obligatory additions, which are necessary to create grammatically well formed target-language sentences. They occur due to missing categories (e.g., article or grammatical gender may exist in one language and not in another). These additions are always carried out by translators, because otherwise they do not get grammatically correct target-language sentences.
- (2) Optional additions, which are needed to create a unified coherent target-language text. These may be textual additions, necessary because of the different discourse conventions of languages; or pragmatic additions required because of differences in the background knowledge possessed by source-

and target-language readers. These additions are not always carried out by translators, because they may get grammatically well formed target-language sentences even without such additions, the only thing they risk is that equivalence will not be created on the textual level.

Our initial hypothesis was that if readers are to evaluate the quality of translations and choose the translation they like most, then those translations will be rated the most positively which are easier to read, due to being more explicit, containing many additions, insertions and explanations.

The participants in the experiment were 100 second-year English and German majors and teacher trainees from the Faculty of Humanities, University of Miskolc. Their task was to evaluate two different translations of the same source-language text.

We were lucky in selecting our texts, because it is rare for two Hungarian translations of the same text to be published at the same time. This happened in 1993 in the case of the so-called “Yeltsin dossier” (“Jelcin-dosszié”) (1) *A “Jelcin-dosszié”. Szovjet dokumentumok 1956-ról.* Budapest: Századvég; (2) *Hiányzó lapok 1956 történetéből. Dokumentumok a volt SzKP KB levéltárából.* Budapest: Móra). The 1956 documents brought back from Russia aroused such an enormous interest among Hungarian readers that two publishing houses, Móra and Századvég both published their translations at the same time.

Both translations were made by professional translators, and both publishers carefully edited the texts, so neither of them contained mistakes or mistranslations. The contents of the two volumes were not exactly the same, and comparing the translations that appeared in both volumes, the most striking difference between them was that the translations published by Századvég (henceforward “S”) were considerably longer, than those published by Móra (“M”). In the “S” translations the following additions could be found:

- (1) addition of linking devices at the beginning of clauses,
- (2) addition of linking devices at the beginning of sentences,
- (3) addition of emphasisers,
- (4) explanatory translation of toponyms (names of streets, squares),
- (5) spelling out of abbreviations,
- (6) explanatory translation of military terms,
- (7) apparently unjustifiable additions which might only be explained by the individual preferences of translators.

In the first part of the questionnaire (**global reading**), participants were asked to read the two translations and to decide whether they perceived any differences between the two versions, and if so, which translation they considered to be better. They had 20 minutes to do this task. In the second part (**text analysis**), they had to find additions in both translations. They had 25 minutes to complete this task.

The answers given to the first part of the questionnaire confirmed our hypothesis, according to which readers will prefer more explicit translations. On the basis of global reading, that is, intuitive judgments, “S” translation (420 words passage

chosen randomly) was given a higher rating by 70% of the participants than the “M” translation (375 words passage chosen randomly).

The second part of the experiment, however, brought surprising results. After the actual analysis of the texts, i.e. after the identification of additions, several readers modified their opinions. The analysis raised the question whether it is correct to provide easy-to-read, fluent translations in the case of military documents. Many claimed that the less reader-friendly version was a better reflection of the atmosphere of the times.

This questionnaire-based survey of reader reactions showed that explicitation may have favourable effect on readability. At the same time, however, it raises the question, whether it is desirable to consciously aim at ease of reading, because attempts to enhance readability may risk authenticity (Klaudy 1993b).

7.6.5. The introspective method

The introspective method is typically one that has come into translation studies from other disciplines. In psychology, it was used as a research tool by the Würzburg school for the experimental investigation of thinking processes as early as in the first decades of our century. Thinking aloud was used by Claparède in the 1930s to explore what hypothesis-making processes take place in the minds of the participants during the process of problem solving (more details in Lörschner 1991). In the 1970s, data obtained from introspection were used to investigate language acquisition strategies (Cohen 1984).

To investigate thinking processes during translation introspection was first used by Hans Krings (1986). He asked language learners to speak into a tape recorder and tell everything that comes into their minds while translating. The recordings were transcribed and these think aloud protocols were analysed according to various criteria.

Königs' experiments (1987) aimed at determining the proportion of automatic and non-automatic processes. The analysis showed that in translation, thinking takes place in two blocs: the automatic bloc (Adhoc Block) contains the use of the translator's internal vocabulary and previous experience, whereas the non-automatic bloc (Rest Block) contains the conscious linguistic and stylistic decisions, the adjusting of the text to the aim of the translation and the needs of the audience, and taking into consideration information regarding the author of the text, etc. Börsch (1986) pointed out that for professional translators many processes are likely to be highly automatised and therefore not accessible via verbal report procedures (for more details on TAP research see Jääskeläinen 1998).

7.7. New research methods (corpus analysis)

What is new about it?, one might ask, since translation studies in drawing conclusions on the principles of translation has always relied on the use of corpora. The difference is that here we are talking about computer corpora, previously used only in dictionary making and machine translation. Such corpora are now increasingly used in the study of human translation, too (Baker 1993, 1995).

While in earlier times the term “corpus” denoted any collection of texts from a particular author, now a corpus must meet the following three criteria:

- (1) It must be a collection of texts that can be read by machine and is thus analysable automatically or semi-automatically.
- (2) A corpus may include not only written texts, but also spoken discourse.
- (3) A corpus is not the work of a single author, but it is a collection of texts from various sources and on various topics (it does not even have to be a continuous piece of text), the only important thing is that it must be compiled on the basis of pre-established criteria.

According to Baker “Corpora are generally designed on the basis of a number of selection criteria, the most important of which are:

- (i) general language vs. restricted domain
- (ii) written vs. spoken language
- (iii) synchronic vs. diachronic
- (iv) typicality in terms of range of sources (writers/speakers) and genres (e.g., newspaper editorials, radio interviews, fiction, journal articles, court hearings)
- (v) geographical limits. e.g., British vs. American English
- (vi) monolingual vs. bilingual or multilingual” (Baker 1995: 229).

The fact that corpus linguistics and translation studies are beginning to move closer together now has two reasons: one of them lies in the internal development of corpus linguistics and the other in the development of translation studies.

7.7.1. The development of corpus linguistics

One of the reasons is the rapid growth in the size of computer corpora. At the end of the volume entitled *English Corpus Linguistics*, dedicated to Jan Svartvik, an overview of English language computer corpora can be found. It describes the development of computer corpora from the one-million-word *Brown* corpus to the 20-million-word *Collins-Cobuild* corpus and the *Oxford Text Archive*, containing several hundred million words (Aijmer, K. and Altenberg, B. (eds.) 1991). In Hungary, work on a *Dictionary of Hungarian Literary and General Language* started in 1985 in the Institute of Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the computer corpus reached 17 million words in 1999 (Pajzs 1990, 1997).

With this immense growth in corpora, the question arises what other purposes could these computer corpora be used for in addition to the compilation of dictionaries, since they are not merely texts stored in computers, but are huge data bases that can be accessed and used in many different ways.

At present, the use of already existing computer corpora in translation research is hindered by the fact that these data bases rarely contain data from translated texts. The corpus of the *Dictionary of Hungarian Literary and General Language* contains only one translation, that of Milne’s *Winnie the Pooh* by Frigyes Karinthy, which cannot be regarded as a translation, and was included in the corpus as an authentic piece of Hungarian literature. Often the builders of a corpus make it clear that they will include only “clean”, “real” or “authentic” texts, which means

they exclude translations. To a certain extent, translation studies is responsible for this, because translated texts are often treated by researchers as “incorrect”, “distorted” target-language texts. Thus, in order to make co-operation between corpus linguistics and translation studies possible, thinking in translation studies research also had to change (for more details see Kohn 1996).

In the interests of co-operation with corpus linguistics two important aspects of thinking about translation had to change: first, the excessive source-language text orientation of translation studies had to be given up, and the target-language text had to be recognised as a legitimate subject of research. The second, closely related change was the acceptance of the existence of a so-called translation norm, which is a descriptive category, and can only be described on the basis of a large number of target-language texts.

7.7.2. The use of bi- and multilingual corpora

Since translation studies, or at least its descriptive branch, is interested in studying corpora of translated texts, in recent years it has paid increasing attention to large corpora of machine readable texts. As mentioned before, though, current corpora do not contain translated texts. What can they be used for then? What kind of corpora would translation research need? For translation research, obviously, bi- and multilingual corpora are interesting. Baker (1995) proposes three main types: (1) parallel corpora, (2) multilingual corpora, (3) comparable corpora.

Parallel corpora contain the original A language text and its B language translation. According to Baker, “their most important contribution to the discipline is that they support a shift of emphasis from prescription to description” (Baker 1995: 231) by showing how experienced translators overcome translation problems.

Multilingual corpora contain texts selected on the basis of identical criteria, which are not translations of each other. The advantage of these is that they “enable us to study items and linguistic features in their home environment, rather than as they are used in translated texts” (Baker 1995: 232).

The term “**comparable** corpora” was created by Mona Baker. They consist of two groups of texts in the **same** language. Corpus “A” can be any, even already existing computerised corpus that can be analysed mechanically, containing original source language texts; corpus “B” contains translated texts, preferably of the same genre and style, selected on the basis of identical criteria. This means that original English texts are not compared to their translations: instead, authentic English texts are compared to translated English texts.

7.8. A new auxiliary science: intercultural communication

One of the consequences of communication becoming globalised is that the number of original texts reaching people is decreasing and the number of translated texts is increasing. Furthermore, these are translated texts whose origins are obscure and not at all typical, since international companies and multinational firms intend them specifically for international use, so that they can be spread all over the world via translations. These new international standards undeniably get into conflict with local traditions (Lambert 1993).

This is why the study of intercultural communication is gradually becoming a new auxiliary science of translation studies. The category pairs identified by Hofstede (1980, 1991), Trompenaars (1995) and Hall (1976, 1990) (e.g., individualist vs. collectivist cultures, cultures with high and low context) appear with increasing frequency in studies on translation or interpretation. From this point of view, the translator is an intercultural expert, mediating not only between languages but also between cultures.

Interpreters are regarded as intercultural mediators to an even greater extent, especially consecutive interpreters working in business environments. On the 7th *Hungarian Applied Linguistics Conference* dedicated to the problems of intercultural communication, Zsuzsa Láng gave a paper on what cultural differences lie behind the different negotiation styles of foreign and Hungarian businessmen (Láng 1997: 129-131). She examined the behaviour of Hungarian and predominantly Anglo-Saxon participants on the basis of several parameters, e.g., power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and linear or concentric nature of reasoning in three situations: at a business seminar, during public speaking, and during a business negotiation. She found that Hungarian businessmen are characterised by keeping power distance, mentioning and respecting titles and ranks, avoiding risks, and reasoning in concentric circles.

One might ask the question whether interpreters should take on the responsibility for potential communication breakdowns resulting from the above differences. As in these situations the interpreter is the only person who knows both codes, if his/her aim is to facilitate communication, then he/she has to take the role of a cultural mediator as well.

The cultural mediator role of translators and translations has been evident even so far, but now, with research on intercultural communication becoming an independent branch of science, research on cultural differences may receive new perspectives within the science of translation as well.

Translation studies, for instance, has always assumed that translators are consciously aware of the characteristics of their own and other cultures, only they do not always think of using this knowledge in translation. Researchers of intercultural communication, on the other hand, do not take intercultural competence for granted, but treat it as something that a bilingual language user can and has to develop in him-/herself, even if he/she intends to be merely a citizen of the European Union, but if he/she intends to be a translator, then even more so.

It also constitutes a difference of perspective that while translation studies has always treated cultural differences **statically**, as a knowledge basis to be learnt, researchers of intercultural communication approach intercultural competence **dynamically** and interpret it as the ability to use certain situation-dependent behavioural patterns (Witte 1996).

7.9. New topics – media translation

The translation of advertisements, commercials, films, TV and radio broadcasts have long been an important topic in translation studies, investigated by many of the classics of translation studies. Albrecht Neubert (1968) dealt with the pragmatic aspects of translation, Aleksandr Shveitser (1973) with the sociolinguistic

aspects of translation, and Katharina Reiss (1971) with the translation of appeal-focused and audio-medial texts. So far, however, this topic has only been regarded as an interesting addition to the “more serious” topics – in Reiss’s work, for example, it appeared after the discussion of the translation problems of content-focused and form-focused texts – the mass communication revolution of our time has increased the importance of media translation as a topic of research.

Media translation as a research topic offers a lot for the researchers of intercultural communication, as the translation of TV commercials, advertisements and media events are a rich source of problems resulting from intercultural differences. Culture-specific traits characterising a particular culture do not exist in themselves, they can only be seen from the perspective of another culture. New phenomena can only be seen when compared to known phenomena. If we come into contact with a foreign culture, we contrast it with one that we already know. In such cases our own culture serves as a means of orientation.

Many Hungarian people who watch TV, listen to the radio, and read papers are made to realise the characteristics of their own everyday culture by the inappropriateness and inadequacy of international advertising. Thus, the responsibility of the translators and localisers of commercials is enormous. First, they themselves must be able to realise intercultural differences, and then they must persuade their employers, in relation to whom they are often in a rather subordinate position. In order to get employers to accept their opinion, translators must prove that besides being linguistic mediators they are also cultural mediators, and that intercultural competence is part of their expertise in the same way as proficiency in two languages. This in turn increases the importance of intercultural communication as becoming a regular subject in translator and interpreter training, i.e. it should become an organic part of these programmes instead of just appearing occasionally as an optional course (Witte 1995).

Zuzana Jettmarová conducts primarily empirical research to explore the prevailing translation norms in genres not existing in the target-language system: she makes interviews with advertising agencies and with the translators working for them, and collects and analyses consumer opinions. In several studies she described how advertising translation strategies changed in the Czech Republic between 1990 and 1996, from complete transfer characterising the beginning of the period to complete substitution characterising the end of the period. The four advertising translation strategies described by Jettmarová also reveal the temporal development of the methods of advertisement translation. As regards the linguistic aspects of advertisement translation, development goes from word-level and meaning-level translation, through idiomatic translation to ultimate adaptation.

The principal advantage of Jettmarová’s research method lies in its complex approach. She approaches the causes of changing advertising translation strategies from a sociocultural point of view. She distinguishes five factors as possible causes of change: (1) the initiator, i.e. the firm ordering the translation of the advertisement, (2) the domestic advertising genre and language, (3) the translator, (4) the receiver, and (5) the cultural and economic environment of the receiver. She regards all the five factors as dynamic, rapidly changing and interdependent. This mutual dependence is very important, because one must ask the question of who dictates the norm. Is it the consumer, the client, or the translator? (Jettmarová 1997:161).

Jettmarová studies each factor in the process of development. Her remarks concerning the changing taste of clients are especially interesting. At the beginning, clients expected word-for-word translation, and via back translation they checked whether there were any differences between the source- and the target-language text. Consequently, consumers often found advertisements irritating. Even though at the beginning, according to surveys, “foreignness” did have some positive appeal among consumers, later on, with the changing taste of consumers, advertising companies were increasingly forced to consider the sociolinguistic characteristics of the target-language audience, or in other words, to go into adaptation (Jettmarová 1997: 164).

Research on media translation also involves the investigation of questions related to the translation of TV and radio genres, and the characteristics of film subtitling and dubbing (Goris 1993). Media translation is an especially warmly welcome topic at the international research seminar (CETRA) held every year for young researchers at the University of Leuven (Remael 1992, Ballester 1993, Canos 1993).

It was interesting to observe how the topic of media translation made progress in Budapest, at the second *Transfere necesse est* conference (Budapest 1996). At conferences on general topics and presenting all the different trends in a particular branch of science, the topics of presentations – “fashionable” and “outdated” – are symptomatic. At this 1996 translation studies conference, the number of papers on media translation and the attendance in that sections showed, without a doubt, that this field of research is on the rise. There were papers on the translation of film scripts (Natalia Izard, Spain), the interpretation of TV live shows (Bistra Alexieva, Bulgaria), translation for the written media (Stephen Pearl, England), and the teaching of film subtitling (Maximilian Brändle, Australia). The written versions of these papers have been included in the proceedings of the conference (Klaudy and Kohn [eds.] 1997).

7.10. How are new topics born?

Let us give an example of how strongly research in translation studies is inspired by the practice of translation, and that the daily work of translators and interpreters raises issues one might never have been able to think of in the silence of his/her study. In autumn 1991, the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) and the Hungarian Association of Translators and Interpreters held a one-day workshop in Budapest, to discuss the conditions of employing Central and Eastern European interpreters at international conferences. This was motivated by the fact, that at that time local interpreters were not employed even at conferences held in Central and Eastern Europe because they work in such a different system.

What is this different system? Western European interpreters work only in one direction, that is, they only translate into their mother tongue, but from two or more foreign languages. Central and Eastern European interpreters, on the other hand, work in two directions, but only in one language. At the workshop the advantages and disadvantages of both systems were discussed, when someone raised the idea that interpreting in two directions possibly involves greater intellectual (and physical?) pressure than doing it in only one direction. This hypothesis, of course,

would have to be studied scientifically and supported by neurophysiological evidence. I believe it is safe to say that at that moment we witnessed the birth of a new research topic in translation/interpreting studies.

7.11. The second and third periods of linguistic translation theory

In the 1980s translation theory, born on the borderline of literary studies and linguistics, was exposed to an increasing number of outside influences. Since at that time there were no translation researchers trained anywhere, researchers came to translation studies from many directions. Besides literary scholars and linguists, researchers from several other fields were also inspired by the new discipline: sociologists, psychologists, philosophers and experts in information technology tried their hand in this new area with varying degrees of success.

The **second** great period in the development of translation theory starting in the 1980s is best described as the **interdisciplinary period**. The apparatus and terminology of ancillary sciences within linguistics (semantics, text linguistics, pragmatics) and outside linguistics (philosophy, sociology, psychology) brought novel ideas and research methods into translation theory. This interdisciplinary nature dominated the studies born in the 1980s: Wilss 1982, Newmark 1982, Larson 1984, Reiss and Vermeer 1984, Lvovskaya 1985, Neubert 1985, Riabtseva 1986, Tirkkonen-Condit 1985, 1986, Toury 1986, Shveitser 1988, Latishev 1988, Newmark 1988, Snell-Hornby 1988, Vehmas-Lehto 1989, Hatim and Mason 1990, Komissarov 1990, Hewson and Martin 1991, Bell 1992, Baker 1992.

Although it might be too early to divide translation theory into periods, let us make an attempt. The first period, from the 50s of the 20th century to the end of the 70s was the period of becoming an independent discipline, of breaking away from the literary approach (described in the first chapter of this part). The second period, that of the 1980s, was the interdisciplinary period, when translation studies, already strong and independent, incorporated the results of other social sciences.

The **third** period, our times, naturally cannot be observed from the necessary perspective. We can, however, already identify some of the characteristics of this period, e.g., such as the launching of empirical research (Tirkkonen-Condit 1991, Toury 1991, Lörschner 1991, Toury 1994), establishing the theoretical foundations of teaching translation and interpretation (Dollerup and Loddegaard 1992, Dollerup and Lindegaard 1994, Dollerup and Appel 1996, Kussmaul 1995, Király 1996), the beginnings of research into interpreting theory (Bowen and Bowen 1990, S. Lambert and Moser-Mercer 1994, Dodds and Gran 1988-1995, Gile 1995), and a new approach to studying the relationship between translation and culture (J. Lambert 1993, 1996).

The most striking new development, and one whose impact is hard to predict and present, is the enormous growth in the demand for translation, due to the increased needs of multinational companies and various international organisations, such as the European Union, the Council of Europe, etc. This increased need for translation has faced translators and interpreters, and consequently translation and interpreting research with new challenges.

There are also new technologies available that can help to meet the new challenges, waiting to be introduced in the everyday work of translators and interpreters (on the use of the Internet, video, and computer conferences see Herring 1996). The idea of machine translation and CAT (Computer Assisted Translation) has been raised again, and centrally financed international research projects have also been launched (Linguistic Research and Engineering 1993), relying upon improved technology and huge computerised data bases and data banks containing parallel texts in different languages (Sager 1990, 1994, Snelling 1992, Newton 1992, Baker 1993, 1996, Wright and Wright 1993, Wright and Budin 1994, Pennington and Stevens 1994).

Based on all that has been said so far, the third period may be claimed to have a very good chance to become **the science of European integration**. It is the future that will show whether this chance will indeed become reality.

7.12. The development of linguistic translation theory in Hungary

Linguistic translation theory in Hungary emerged rather late (for the reasons see Bart and Klaudy 1996), and its development cannot be considered rapid, either. This is due to several reasons, of which we shall mention here only two: the isolation of Hungary from the international research community, and the lack of a centre coordinating and financing translation research.

Still, in 1973, with the establishment of the Interpreter and Translator Training Centre (ITTC) of Eötvös Loránd University, and the launching of postgraduate training for translators and interpreters at the Centre, linguistic research on translation started. At the beginning, these research programmes pursued practical purposes and manifested themselves in the publication of translation course books based on the translation-oriented comparison of particular language pairs.

To co-ordinate the work of researchers working at different universities and colleges, the Translation Theory Section of the Applied Linguistics Working Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was formed in 1983, acting as an independent Working Committee from 1990 until 1996. The Committee organised seven national conferences, providing opportunities for Hungarian translators and teachers of translation to share their views with each other on translation related topics. The proceedings of these conferences were published with the title *Fordításelméleti Füzetek I–VI*. (Papers on the Theory of Translation). The Committee co-ordinated research in the country, and made efforts to develop ties with the international community of translation scholars.

The development of theoretical work in the field is marked by a series of Ph.D. dissertations in translation theory (Klaudy 1981b, Pongrácz 1983, Dániel 1984, Lendvai 1986, Bendik 1987, Albert 1988, Cs. Jónás 1989, Heltai 1992). From the 80s increasing numbers of Hungarian researchers participated at international translation studies conferences, and many translation theory scholars visited Hungary. The isolation of Hungarian translation studies was coming to an end.

One of the important milestones in breaking out from isolation were the two international “*Transferte necesse est*” conferences (November 1992, Szombathely; September 1996, Budapest).

The paraphrase *Transfere necesse est* was created by György Radó, and the first international *Transfere necesse est* conference was held in his honour on his 80th birthday at Berzsényi Dániel Teacher Training College in Szombathely. The conference was not a large one, but because of György Radó's international reputation, many outstanding representatives of international translation studies including Ewald Osers (England), Gideon Toury (Israel), Anthony Pym (Spain) took part, and Eugene Nida (USA), a living classic of translation studies also sent an article to be published in the proceedings of the conference (Kohn et al. 1993). What is even more important, though, is that this conference brought together those Hungarian researchers who felt a need to join the international research community.

The second *Transfere necesse est* conference was held in Budapest in 1996, which was a major international event by all standards drawing participants from all over the world.

Since Budapest does not belong to the most "frequented" conference sites in the field of translation studies, like Vienna or Prague, the organisers did not want to set its focus too narrowly. Therefore, in accordance with the comprehensive subtitle (*Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting*), participants could submit proposals for papers in 15 topics: (1) Preparation for EU accession, (2) The present situation of translation and interpreting studies, (3) Sociolinguistics and translation studies, (4) Psycholinguistics and translation studies (5) Text-linguistics and translation studies, (6) Contrastive linguistics and translation studies, (7) Experiments and observations in T/I research, (8) Quality assessment and consumer needs, (9) Literary translation, (10) Scientific and technical translation, terminology, (11) Business and court translation and interpretation, (12) Media translation and interpretation, (13) The teaching of translation and interpreting, (14) Translation and technology (corpora and machine translation), (15) Translation and the Internet.

Why was the second *Transfere necesse est* conference important for Hungary? In Hungary, because of the overriding importance of literary translation, theoretical research was conducted for a very long time only on literary translation, despite the fact that – as discussed in previous chapters – in other parts of the world translation was studied in a much broader perspective, thus becoming a more and more interdisciplinary field of study. Hungarian translation scholars, due to their meagre travel opportunities also missed most of the development in translation studies in the 1970s and 1980s. In this way, the second *Transfere necesse est* conference had to make up for decades of missed opportunities.

At the beginning of the 1990s, besides the traditional centres of translator training, most Hungarian universities and colleges launched some form of translator training programme. One of the main purposes of the organisers was to involve as many Hungarian participants in the conference as possible. This aim was fulfilled: more than 150 Hungarian participants had the opportunity to get acquainted with the latest results of translation and interpreting studies.

Another important achievement was that the volume *Translation Studies in Hungary* was published by the start of the conference. It was edited by José Lambert, Kinga Klaudy, and Anikó Sohár, containing studies in English by 16 Hungarian researchers (Sándor Albert, István Bart, József Bendik, Erzsébet Cs. Jónás, Pál Heltai, Zsuzsa Láng, Kinga Klaudy, János Kohn, Endre Lendvai, Zsolt Lengyel,

Judit Navracscics, Anikó Sohár, Krisztina Szabari, Zsuzsanna Ujszászy, Zsuzsa Valló, Tamás Vrauko). An important part of the volume is the bibliography listing the authors' publications in the field of translation studies, and a **Who's Who**, containing the authors' resumes. This volume was the first attempt to inform the international translation studies community about research conducted in Hungary (Klaudy, Lambert and Sohár 1996).

Why was the second *Transfere necesse est* conference important for international translation studies? The process by which a relatively new area of study becomes an independent discipline can easily be traced by looking back on at the history of its international conferences, the number of people attending them, the number of sections, etc. For translation studies to become an independent discipline, it is not sufficient to create its own terminology, its own literature, its methods of research, and to produce its own classics, but it is also necessary to have its own conferences, where its scholars have a chance to meet and be persuaded as well as persuade each other that the field of research they pursue is an important one and has good prospects. It may be symbolic that James Holmes's paper entitled *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*, which even today provides a valid programme for translation studies research, was presented at the 3rd *Applied Linguistics World Congress* in 1972 in Copenhagen. AILA Congresses have continued to include a translation section, but the really important papers in translation studies are now presented at the discipline's own congresses.

From this point of view, the second *Transfere necesse est* conference in Budapest was a really historic event in the life of the discipline (Kingscott 1996). The plenary speakers included outstanding representatives of translation studies, such as Eugene Nida, Peter Newmark, Mary Snell-Hornby, José Lambert, Daniel Gile and Geoffrey Kingscott. A year after the conference the proceedings were published on 560 pages, containing all the plenary lectures and 82 selected papers (Klaudy and Kohn 1997).

The two *Transfere necesse est* conferences may undoubtedly be regarded as significant milestones in the development of Hungarian translation and interpreting studies. However, the problems of a research centre and research financing are still unresolved, and thus we can only hope that Hungarian translation studies will be prepared by the millennium to be able to contribute, by its own means, to Hungary's European integration.

Part II.

**THE TEACHING
OF TRANSLATION**

1. The study of translation – the teaching of translation

Can translation and interpretation be taught? What is it exactly that can be taught in them and what is that cannot? How can the results of translation studies be applied in organising translation courses and making the teaching of translation more efficient?

1.1. The relationship between the study and the teaching of translation

The interdependence of the study and the teaching of translation is evident. In describing the development of a linguistic approach to translation in the first part of this book, one of the most important driving forces we mentioned were the needs of translator training. Translation studies grew out of the needs of teaching translation and training translators. Translation and interpreter training institutions provide the professional context and the scientific background for the creation and evolution of theories related to translation.

But does teaching really benefit from the results of translation research? James Holmes, creator of the term “translation studies” takes it for granted that it has a third branch beside its theoretical and descriptive branches, namely the branch of **applied translation studies**. The principal fields within this branch are **translator training**, translation aids, translation policy, and translation criticism (Holmes 1972, 1988).

It is unquestionable that the teaching of translation should rely on some kind of theoretical foundation. Translators, as a rule, work intuitively, and in most cases are unable to draw general conclusions from their experience, which might be needed in translation training. It is symptomatic that works dedicated to the evaluations of the oeuvre of great translators are usually confined to discussions of the circumstances in which the translator found an exceptionally good or brilliant solution. Translators working in specialised fields report even less about their experience than literary translators do; they are only rarely motivated to produce generalisations, and if so, these concern mainly the problem of translating technical terms.

In fact, making generalisations and advancing theories is not the duty of translators. The translator uses language in the same way as anyone else does, except that he works with two languages. As explained in I.3, this constitutes a considerable difference, but it does not alter the fact that it is not his/her job to describe the rules and regularities of bilingual language use. This is the job of the linguist engaged in translation research.

1.2. What can be of use in teaching?

Or, in other words, what can applied translation studies really apply? Let us cite James Holmes's classification again. He separates theoretical translation studies from descriptive translation studies, dividing the latter one into product-, process-, and function-oriented translation studies. He divides theoretical translation studies into general translation theory and partial (special or concrete) translation theories, which investigate the various partial problems of translation, depending on who carries out the act of translation, man or machine (medium-restricted translation theories), what languages the act of translation involves (area-restricted translation theories), and what text type is being translated (text-type restricted translation theories), etc (Holmes 1972, 1988).

It is self-evident that from the above categorisation the first branch of theoretical translation studies, **general translation theory** cannot be applied directly in the teaching of translation. This would be like trying to make general linguistics an organic part of foreign language teaching. Theoretical translation studies, however, have some considerably more practical branches, i.e. **partial translation theories**, which, instead of examining the general rules of bilingual communication, look into the problems related to specific language pairs and text types.

1.3. The role of contrastive linguistics in the teaching of translation

The comparison of specific language pairs and text types belongs to the field of contrastive linguistics and contrastive text linguistics. Therefore, one may rightly ask what distinguishes partial translation theory from contrastive linguistics.

In I.1. we listed the differences between translation theory and contrastive linguistics. We also made a distinction between translation theory and contrastive text linguistics. Contrastive text linguistics compares texts in languages A and B which are produced independently (as a result of primary text production), whereas translation theory works with texts in language B which have been produced on the basis of a text in language A (as a result of secondary text production), but which are expected to operate and function as authentic language B texts. Thus, translation theory is also concerned with comparison, but the object of study is not primary but secondary text production.

It is widely known that contrastive linguistics, which at the birth of the science of translation played an important role in the study of translation (Komissarov 1973, Shveitser 1973, Barkhudarov 1975, Kühlwein, Thome and Wilss 1981), went into decline in the 1980s, and what is more, was fiercely criticised as an approach which illegitimately simplifies the complex processes of interlingual communication.

Opponents of the linguistic approach can be divided into three groups. The first group denies the role of linguistics and linguistic consciousness-raising from the point of view of the **sense**, the second from the point of view of the **function**, and the third from the point of view of **culture**.

The first group's main argument is that focusing on linguistic forms diverts attention from the sense. Seleskovitch's theory, the "theorie de sans" claims that in order to be able to grasp sense, the translator has to distance him/herself from

the linguistic form (cf. “deverbalisation” in Seleskovitch 1978, Seleskovitch and Lederer 1986, 1989).

The so called “functional approach” also denies the role of linguistics. In the translation methodology chapter of *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* Vermeer labels the linguistic approach “conventional” and contrasts it with the “functional” approach. According to him, translation “is no longer the mere transformation of a text from one language to another, but rather the production of a target text that can function within a different context for recipients from a different culture” (Vermeer 1998: 61).

The third group denying the role of linguistics attacks it from the point of view of culture. In their opinion, translation is predominantly mediation between cultures. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere launched a new translation studies series at Routledge publishing company in the 1990s, and stated in its introduction that a “cultural turn” took place in translation studies, which was putting an end to the comparison of the source and target-language texts. They argue that translation studies, using the most recent advances of culture studies or cultural studies, must explore how social relations, dominant ideologies, power relations, social roles, sexual roles, etc. are reflected in the translator’s activity, in the function of translations, etc. (in Baker 1996).

Although we share the view that grasping sense (Seleskovitch), autonomous discourse production (Vermeer), and awareness of cultural differences (Bassnett and Lefevere) are equally important in the complex process of translation, one must not forget that translation is dominantly a bilingual speech activity. This means that no matter from what language into what language we are actually translating, the process of translation always depends on the similarities and differences between the two languages in contact in the process of translation. Linguistic similarities and differences are treated here in the broadest possible senses of the words, involving not only the linguistic systems, but also language use, discourse markers, the creation of coherence, theme-rheme relations, etc.

It should be noted that contrastive linguistics has also been developing and undergoing profound changes, moving from the mere comparison of language systems to the comparison of differences in language use. Selinker in his work, *Rediscovering Interlanguage* (1992) looks back on the history of contrastive linguistics, to find the reasons for its demise. One of the reasons why contrastive linguistics was almost abandoned was that psycholinguists refuted the language learning theories that contrastive linguistics was linked to. Selinker predicts an upsurge in interest in contrastive linguistics at the end of the 20th century.

In a book called *Communication Across Cultures* with the subtitle *Translation Theory and Contrastive Linguistics* Basil Hatim attempts to reconnect translation studies and contrastive linguistics.

One useful way of seeing contrastive linguistics at work is through translation, and an interesting way of looking into the translation process is perhaps through an examination of the kind of decisions which translators make in handling texts (Hatim 1997: 1).

The *Preface* to this book was written by R.R.K. Hartmann, who urged the introduction of the term “contrastive textology” as early as 1981 (Hartmann 1981).

Hartmann notes with satisfaction that “Both contrastive linguistics and text linguistics are now in their prime...the application of contrastive text linguistics to translation studies is long overdue (Preface to Hatim 1997).

In our view, as discussed in I.1, translation studies looks at translation in a complex manner, i.e. taking into consideration all the linguistic and extra-linguistic factors influencing the process of translation. Contrastive linguistics and contrastive text linguistics can be helpful **only** in the analysis of the **linguistic factors** of translation, but in this they have a **crucial** function. It would be wrong to exclude them from the number of auxiliary sciences to translation studies only because human and cultural factors also play a role in the process of translation.

Holmes’s categorisation also emphasises the same idea. It clearly shows the place of a translation-based comparison of languages within translation studies: in partial translation theories, which deal with the problems of specific language pairs, genres, and directions of translation.

1.4. The translational “behaviour” of languages and transfer operations

Thus we do not deny the relationship between translation theory and contrastive linguistics but approach it from a more **dynamic** perspective. We argue that depending on the similarities and differences between languages a certain type of “translational behaviour” (Klaudy 1999a) can be observed. This means that each and every language has characteristics, which becomes manifest only in the process of a text written in that language being translated into another language. (cf. “friendly” and “unfriendly” language pairs in Klaudy 1999a). English, for instance, behaves completely differently when translated into French or German – indeed, in a considerably more friendly manner – than when translated into Hungarian. Depending on the language pair and the directions of translation the typological features of particular languages determine the difficulties of translation, which cannot be regarded as irrelevant only because the translator also has to deal with numerous other, non-linguistic problems.

The behaviour of language pairs towards each other determine some of the transfer operations as well. The term “transfer operation” is used here instead of the more often used term “transformation”, to avoid reference to the generative approach to language description (for more on the use of the term “transfer operation” see III.1).

Of course, “transfer operation” in translation research is exactly the same type of abstraction as “transformation” in generative grammar. Nothing happens to the source language text in translation, it remains the same as composed by its writer. Transfer operations take place in the mind of the translator – if they exist at all – when the translator enters the target language from the direction of source language, and **on the basis** of the source-language text (and **not from** it) he/she produces a target language text. The reason why the hypothetical nature of this statement is emphasised is that in translation studies no empirical research has yet provided evidence for the psychological reality of transfer operations.

The system of transfer operations will be described in a more detailed manner

in the third part of this book. Here we have merely referred to their relevance in the teaching of translation, because this field of study may provide important data for the teaching of translation.

1.5. The transfer competence of translators

The fact that contrastive linguistics and contrastive text linguistics can provide important data on the translation behaviour of particular language pairs does not entail that a translation-based comparison of languages may be of use in the teaching of translation. Is the description of the translational behaviour of languages a necessary and/or sufficient factor in the development of translation competence? Is there a direct connection between, to use Selinker's terms, interlinguistic awareness and interlinguistic competence?

We regard translational competence as a composite of five elements: (1) linguistic competence, (2) subject-related competence, (3) intercultural competence, (4) transfer competence and (5) communicative competence. In this list, the word *competence* refers partly to a particular type of knowledge (language proficiency, subject knowledge, knowledge about culture) and partly to skills (transfer skills, communication skills). The various elements of translational competence will be dealt with in detail in the next part of this book: here we shall focus on transfer competence.

Transfer competence, as part of the translator's professional competence, means that he/she is capable of developing strategies to overcome problems resulting from the differences between the two languages. It is part of a translator's professional competence that he/she can "freely move" between the two languages, and can traverse the road from thought to linguistic form and from linguistic form to thought in two ways. So, he/she does not only possess general translation strategies, but also particular language-pair-specific strategies. The easy and effortless application of these **transfer strategies** distinguishes the translator from, on the one hand, the monolingual speaker, and on the other hand, the bilingual speaker who is not a professional mediator.

In describing the linguistic models of the translation process (I.5), I claimed that every theoretical model has its own practical implications. The model that one adopts will also determine one's views about the teachability of translation. Donald C. Kiraly (1995) devotes his book *Pathways to Translation. Pedagogy and Process* to the road between the modelling of the process of translation and concrete pedagogical strategies. Naturally, our view on the use of awareness raising also depends on the way we look upon the process of translation. Let us therefore make an attempt to present a theoretical model of the process of translation from the point of view of the didactics of translation.

1.6. Modelling the process of translation

A translator, a professional bilingual person, differs from a speaker of language "A" or language "B" in that he/she knows and consciously or instinctively operates two rule-systems:

- (1) He/she knows the rules according to which signs of language “A” are used by speakers of language “A” to refer to reality (“A” system of rules);
- (2) He/she knows the rules according to which signs of language “B” are used by speakers of language “B” to refer to reality (“B” system of rules).

How does the translator work with these two systems of rules in his/her everyday work? Rozentsveig calls the translator as a coordinative bilingual, who, unlike subordinative bilinguals, never refers from one language to the other. He/she conducts analysis in language “A” according to the rules of language “A”, and conducts synthesis in language “B” according to the rules of language “B”. Transfer from one language to the other occurs through a logical-semantic deep structure, in which features of the two languages are not reflected (Rozentsveig 1972: 80).

Ferenc Papp puts transfer to a similar level, i.e. to a deep structural level, “where the national traits of thinking are already visible, but no real sentences are yet created...”. What is more, he assumes that there are some translators, particularly literary translators, who “make even more efforts: they take what they have perceived to an even deeper level first, to the level of ‘all human’ understanding, and from there they let the sentences of the other language emerge...” (Papp 1979: 247).

Thus, the act of translation should be imagined as a process in which the translator, with the help of the language “A” rule system, decodes the language “A” text and reaches reality (denotative model) or a semantic deep structure (one subtype of the transformational model); then he/she re-encodes this reality with the help of the language “B” system of rules to ultimately reach the language “B” text. Ideally, he/she always goes along the **language “A” → reality → language “B”** path without referring directly from one language to the other.

1.7. The characteristics of the “C” system of rules

But then how come that Hungarian texts translated from a foreign language differ from original Hungarian texts? And they differ linguistically. A Hungarian surface text translated from a foreign language is different from a genuine Hungarian surface text.

Two explanations may be offered: (1) The translator goes down to the deep structure from the language “A” surface, but then takes the wrong path towards the language “B” surface. (2) The translator does not go down to the deep structure from the language “A” surface, but directly switches to the language “B” surface. In other words, he/she creates for him-/herself an intuitive translational rule system, a so-called “C” system of rules, and, consciously or unconsciously, applies this system during his/her work.

How can this “C” system of rules be characterised? It is

- (1) **abstract** – while the rules of systems “A” and “B” relate language signs to reality, rules in the system “C” relate language signs to language signs;
- (2) **subjective** – while the rules of systems “A” and “B” are acquired within an institutional framework by speakers of language “A” and “B”, rules in the

system “C” are created intuitively by translators on the basis of their own experience;

- (3) **incidental** – the “C” system of rules may be distorted if the translator has received inadequate training in one of his/her languages, or if he/she has received good training in both languages but for some reason cannot relate them appropriately.

1.8. The dilemma of translator training

How should translator training deal with this “C” system of rules? Be it undergraduate or postgraduate translator training, it must reckon with the existence of the “C” system of rules. Beginner translators use the same intuitively created system of rules when translating from language “A” to “B” as professional translators do, except that their systems of rules are not so rigid, not so unchangeable yet as those used by the latter.

In this way, translator training can choose from one of the following two alternatives:

- (1) It can try to **eliminate** the “C” system of rules, and discourage translators from believing in a direct relationship between languages “A” and “B”; what is more, it can attempt to completely erase interlinguistic awareness-raising from the teaching of translation, saying that translators should not bother with linguistic form, but should try and grasp content (sense, meaning) instead.
- (2) It can try to **improve and refine** the “C” system of rules, accepting the assumption that some form of relationship does exist, but in a considerably more complicated form than the one intuitively created by the translators. In other words, language “A” effects should be avoided by proposing a more sensitive and complicated system of relations.

According to the first approach, which denies the role of linguistics, the translator should not deal with linguistic forms, because that only diverts his/her attention from the real sense of the text (Seleskovitch 1978). Translation is predominantly seen as a target language text production, whose main objective is to take into consideration the social and cultural needs of the target language audience.

We follow the second approach, which does not deny the role of linguistics, and argues that interlanguage awareness-raising plays an important role in the teaching of translation. Although we fully recognise the importance of social and cultural factors, we do not believe that target-language discourse production depends solely on extralinguistic factors.

1.9. The benefits of linguistic awareness-raising

Linguistic awareness-raising is equally beneficial for teachers of translation, trainee translators, and practicing translators.

1.9.1. The benefits of linguistic awareness-raising for teachers of translation

On the basis of extralinguistic factors it is very difficult to design translation curricula and teaching materials. Although we do acknowledge the fact that the quality of translations could also be improved (i.e. the intuitive rule systems of trainee-translators could be made more precise) if they simply translate large amounts of text with the teachers correcting their works, and the trainees learning from the corrections, but we still believe that in organised translator training, where teachers of translation have to achieve results in a limited amount of time, one cannot build on the slow accumulation of experience but should take the advantage of the help offered by linguistics and linguistic translation theory.

And here we are not talking about factual knowledge of linguistics. The results of linguistic translation theory could be more useful in designing translation courses (see II.2), selecting texts to be translated, evaluating translations, and justifying teachers' and readers' corrections.

1.9.2. The benefits of linguistic awareness-raising for translator trainees

For trainees, who learn from the corrections of the teacher (reader, editor), it is by no means insignificant how the teacher explains his/her corrections in the given translation and to what level he/she is capable of generalising from them. It is our strong conviction that without linguistics only very low-level generalisations can be made from the translators' experience. Uninformative explanations such as, for instance, "this does not sound nice in Hungarian", "we say this differently in Hungarian", "this doesn't sound OK", or "maybe you should phrase it differently" are very hard to generalise to a large number of cases. If, however, the teacher explains his/her corrections by highlighting the differences between the two language systems and their typical usages, then he/she will equip future translators with a frame of reference on the basis of which, later on, they will be able to individually evaluate their own translations and select the best solution out of a number of target-language alternatives.

1.9.3. The benefits of linguistic awareness-raising for practicing translators

One of the benefits of linguistic consciousness is that the translator can multiply his/her own transfer experience. He/she may get an answer to the question bewildering all translators of how much one can distance him-/herself from the original form in order to preserve content. It might very well happen that the translator hesitates to carry out a transfer operation, unsure whether he/she can follow his/her intuition or not, and the given operation is perfectly legitimate and regular in

the case of a particular language pair or translation direction, and is therefore desirable if not obligatory.

The other benefit of awareness-raising is that it contributes to increasing the prestige of the profession. To make translation a respectable profession and to avoid people looking down on translators as bilingual machines, translators should also be able to provide clients and users with professional explanations to the solutions they have selected. It often happens that the client, who knows the source language, criticises the work of the translator for omissions and insertions, changing the information structure, changing the addressee in the case of public speeches, using a different metaphor/picture in the case of advertisements, telling a different joke to the audience when translating jokes, etc. A conscious translator, who has received an adequate theoretical training, can explain these choices knowing the rules of bilingual language use.

Naturally, linguistic awareness-raising by itself is not enough. Translators should be aware of all the elements of the bilingual communicative situation. Taking into consideration, however, the sender, the receiver, the channel, the cultural context, etc. does not exclude the importance of knowing the “translation behaviour” of the two languages.

2. Designing translator training courses

A sensitive issue in translation pedagogy is the question of grading. Is it possible to apply some sort of grading in teaching translation? Is it possible to move from the simple to the more complicated? Is it possible to identify pedagogical units? Is it possible to define aims to be reached in a certain amount of time, to plan the way leading to these aims, and to plan the stages of this process? Apparently, most of these aims are impossible to achieve in the teaching of translation. Every text to be translated, even one that seems perfectly simple, contains hundreds of problems, and one cannot dismiss a problem temporarily to be dealt with later on, perhaps in the second semester of the training (as is often done with, for example, the tenses in the teaching of foreign languages).

2.1. Organising principles in designing translation courses

In designing translation courses three approaches, or three organising principles can be followed: (1) the inductive approach, (2) the deductive approach, or (3) the functional approach (cf. Klaudy 1977).

(1) The **inductive approach** – In this case, the process of teaching is organised by **text-selection**. The teacher chooses the 10 to 15 texts to be translated during the half-year semester, the students translate these texts at home or in class, the teacher corrects the translations at home or in class, they discuss the mistakes in class, on the basis of these mistakes the teacher makes recommendations concerning the solution of translation problems, and makes certain generalisations. Since in a text-based class only problems occurring in the given text appear, it might happen that important translation problems remain untackled.

(2) The **deductive approach** – In this case, teaching is based on certain **topics** related to **translation techniques**. The teacher goes through the various translation problems (e.g., translation of place names, institutions, measurements, quotations, references, etc.), maps the translation problems characterising the given language pair or translation direction (e.g., transfer from passive to active in translations from English into Hungarian), and finds illustrative examples for these in texts. In such cases it is teachers who determine what happens in class, which increases the chance of covering everything in the given semester that they find important.

(3) The **functional approach** – In this case, teaching is organised around particular **skills** to be developed. Teachers decide what skills are necessary for translation and aim to develop these skills without necessarily using translation tasks. For instance, the skill of distancing oneself from the linguistic form may be developed with the help of **intralingual** transformations, that is, paraphrasing sentences within the same language – be it SL or TL – and the skill of grasping the essence of a particular text by searching for key words and writing summaries, etc.

2.2. The inductive approach

Let us investigate the advantages and disadvantages of the **inductive** approach. An evident advantage of this approach is that the translator meets translation problems the way they are found in life too, i.e. embedded in texts. Its disadvantage is that the success of the programme depends on the selection of texts. In choosing the texts, several principles can be followed:

- (1) selection according to topics,
- (2) selection according to genres,
- (3) selection according to difficulty level.

(1) Selection **according to topic** – If translator training is linked to a particular profession and all the students represent the same profession, then the topic of the texts used in the course is given. If, however, the group is heterogeneous, then text selection is not so simple any more, because there is no such text as a “general text”. Should this be the case, one chooses texts on topics of general interest (e.g., environmental protection, the Internet, the European Union), and failure is very probably unavoidable, because in a single semester it is impossible to tackle four to five topics satisfactorily. The best idea then is to ask students to collect parallel texts, i.e. source and target language texts on similar topics. Texts selected thematically will probably not contain all of the problems of translation, but on the basis of thematic collections of texts, thematic wordlists and glossaries can be made.

(2) Selection **according to genre** – In such cases, our starting point is that similar genres contain similar translation problems for the students, and that raising students’ awareness of genre-specific traits (cf. Reiss 1971, 1984, Tirkkonen-Condit 1985, Vannikov 1987) will contribute to the solution of translation problems. It involves choosing some typical genres: letters, advertisements, invitations, conference programmes, popular science articles, research reports, resumes, etc. This method also has a number of disadvantages: it is impossible to include all of the genres, there is not sufficient time to delve into any of them, and it is very hard to find texts which exhibit all the characteristics of the given genre.

(3) Selection **according to difficulty level** – In this case, one establishes a rank order among the texts to be translated according to some criteria. This criterion may be

- **lexical**: moving from lexically (terminologically) simple to lexically (terminologically) rich texts, or
- **structural**: moving from texts with a similar discourse structure to texts with a considerably different discourse structure, or
- **cultural**: moving from culturally neutral texts on international topics (e.g., advertisements of multinational companies, call for papers, legal documents) to culturally marked texts (birth certificate, university diploma, etc.).

It should be noted, though, that the difficulty level of a text always depends on the competence of the translator. The translation of a birth certificate or a school diploma may be easy for someone who translates such documents every day, but

someone who does it for the first time may meet the most unexpected difficulties while trying to cope with it.

Peter A. Schmitt combines all the three aspects of grading at his courses in Leipzig and Germersheim:

In their first technical translation exercises students would learn how to handle consumer oriented product documentation such as car owner's manuals or simple software manuals. Expert oriented texts such as service manuals, require much more technical and terminological knowledge, have different textual characteristics and are covered in later courses. A typical example for texts translated at the end of translation studies are patents, due to their combined natures which adds a legal quality to a technical subject (Schmitt 1997: 128–129).

2.3. The deductive approach

Let us now look into the **deductive** approach. In this approach, teaching does not begin with a text but with a translation problem (e.g., the translation of realia, or of impersonal sentences from English into Hungarian) and the teacher must find texts, which will illustrate the problem under study satisfactorily. One of the difficulties related to this approach is to find real-life texts (not sentences or adaptations!) properly illustrating the particular translation problem that the teacher would like to discuss. Thus teachers are forced to illustrate such problems with sentences taken from a number of different texts, which is methodologically incorrect.

Another weakness of the deductive approach relates to how one should go about selecting translation problems. Technical problems in translation can be divided into two main groups: (1) **topics related to general translation problems** independent of language pair and translation direction and (2) **topics related to special translation problems** depending on language pair and translation direction.

Topics related to **general** translation problems include for instance the translation of

- (1) realia
- (2) institutional names
- (3) personal names
- (4) geographical names
- (5) lists
- (6) issues of punctuation
- (7) tables, formulae
- (8) tables of contents
- (9) quotations
- (10) foreign words
- (11) measurements and their conversions
- (12) certificates, diplomas, etc.

Topics related to **specific** translation problems may be selected on the basis of

- (1) Contrastive linguistics
- (2) Contrastive text linguistics
- (3) Techniques of translation or transfer operations

(1) Selecting translation problems on the basis of **contrastive linguistic** comparisons have been heavily criticised. Such criticism is voiced e.g. by Vermeer, who cites the example of German training institutions with their endless repetitions of equivalence rules of the type “translate German adverbs by a Spanish final verb + que construction and vice versa” (Vermeer 1998: 60).

The teaching of equivalence rules of this nature does not make much sense, and prescribing them as obligatory may even be harmful. Looking at the problem from another angle, however, it may be beneficial for translators to know about the most favoured and frequent ways of condensing information in a particular language: some languages do it by the use of participles and infinitives, others multiply the number of clauses.

In pinpointing problematic areas in translation, contrastive linguistics may be of use on condition that we avoid two traps. One is that we should not assume that behind every linguistic difference there lurks a translation problem, and the other is that contrastive analysis should only be used to pinpoint or predict translation problems and not to provide a recipe for their solution.

(2) Topics may be selected also on the basis of **contrastive text linguistics** including Nida and Taber’s previously mentioned list, whose essence is that each language has its own different means to mark certain discourse universals: (1) the marking of the beginning and end of the discourse, (2) the marking of major internal transitions, (3) the marking of temporal relations between events, (4) the marking of spatial relations between events and objects, (5) the marking of logical relations between events, (6) the identification of participants, (7) highlighting, focus, emphasis, etc., (8) author involvement (Nida and Taber 1969: 152). It is also worth dealing with the various devices used to create textual cohesion in different languages.

(3) Topics can also be selected according to particular **translation techniques**. Vinay and Darbelnet, who gave the first systematic description of translation techniques (1958, 1995) distinguished seven “methods” or “procedures” of translation: (1) borrowing, (2) calque, (3) literal translation, (4) transposition, (5) modulation, (6) equivalence, and (7) adaptation (1995: 41).

And finally, the typology of lexical and grammatical **transfer operations** (described in the following chapters of this book) can also provide material for a one-semester long translation workshop. This approach has been followed since 1993 in the translator training courses at the Department of Applied Linguistics of the University of Miskolc.

2.4. Types of translation course materials

Both the inductive and the deductive approaches have their advantages and disadvantages. The advantage of the inductive approach is that translators meet the problems in the same way as in real life, i.e. in texts, while its disadvantage lies in its

incidental nature. The advantage of the deductive method is that it can be planned, but its disadvantage is that it is not life-like, it often builds on textbook-like sample discourses and sentence-level illustrations.

The choice between the inductive and the deductive method affects the preparation of teaching materials as well.

The most ardent followers of the inductive method claim that **there is no need at all for textbooks** in translator and interpreter training, because the texts in such books quickly become outdated. They argue that teaching should always be built on recent texts of topical interest.

The proceedings of the second international *Transfere necesse est* conference contains an interesting paper on the various types of translator training materials (Yermolovich 1997). The author first examines the traditional textbook types published in his country over the past 30 years.

He encounters the following problems in text-oriented coursebooks: the choice of texts is incidental, the difficulties are not graded, the order of chapters can be freely interchanged, commentaries are closely linked to the text, and therefore it is hard to generalise from them to a larger number of texts; the comments are highly heterogeneous, and are not focused, and references to details of minor importance do not form a coherent system.

He considers problem-oriented coursebooks more advantageous, although some typical mistakes should be avoided. These are the following:

- (1) Substitution of language teaching for translation teaching. The tables of contents in some textbooks are almost identical with those in grammar books.
- (2) Implied formalistic approach to translation (...) temptation to establish “direct” links between speech elements in the source and target languages... (Yermolovich 1997: 400–401).

Such mistakes can be avoided, says Yermolovitch, if the chapters of the book are organised around “informational units”. In other words, it is the different kinds of information to be rendered that should be the topics of the book: rendering referential relations, situational elements (spatial and temporal relations), the subjective logic of the message, and the pragmatic and emotional elements of the message.

This approach could also help to create a gradual sequence. In the majority of translation coursebooks, the order of the various chapters can freely be changed. “The informational approach to translation teaching does make it possible to build a course in a more logical and coherent way. The suggested sequence of topics looks like the following: rendering of the objective referential content of the message, rendering of the subjective logic of the message, rendering of the pragmatic and emotional component of the message” (Yermolovich 1997: 402–403).

2.5. Integrative teaching materials

In the following, we shall enumerate some translation coursebooks that successfully combine the various approaches.

The above approaches are neatly combined by Hervey and Higgins (1992). They start out from general translation topics (the translation of connotations, cultural

words, inscriptions, etc.) and general translation operations (compensation, contraction, etc.) and discuss them according to language pairs, always providing illustrative texts too. In their book entitled *Thinking Translation*, they first designed a theoretically well-founded translation skills development coursebook for the English-French language pair (Hervey and Higgins 1992), which was so popular that it was soon followed by the English-German (Hervey, Higgins and Loughridge 1995), and the English-Spanish version (Hervey, Higgins and Haywood 1996).

Another popular translation coursebook series was launched by Beverly Adab (1993). The series published by Multilingual Matters is entitled *Annotated Texts for Translation*, and its first volume deals with translation from French to English. The book contains three parts: the first part consists of 30 French texts, the second consists of the English translations of these 30 texts, and the third part contains the so-called annotations, i.e. the comments related to translation problems in the following order:

- (1) general stylistic introduction
- (2) sentence structure problems
- (3) syntactic problems
- (4) lexis
- (5) rhetorical tools
- (6) cultural references
- (7) punctuation.

The 30 texts represent various genres, the explanations are well grounded from the point of view of linguistics, and the introductions provide guidance concerning the theoretical issues of translation. The “reverse” of the first book, based on the problems of translating from English into French, was also soon published (Adab 1996).

Corvina Publishing House in Budapest also started a series with a similar structure to tackle the translation problems in the English-Hungarian, Hungarian-English, and Hungarian-German language pairs (Bart, Klaudy and Szöllősy 1996, Zalán 1997). The first volume of the series entitled *Angol fordítóiskola* (English translation school) belongs to the group of text-oriented coursebooks. It contains two main parts: the first part deals with translation from English into Hungarian and the second part with translation from Hungarian into English. Both parts contain nine chapters. The structure of the chapters is the following:

- (1) Text to be translated
- (2) Preparatory tasks
 - textual work
 - lexical preparation
 - multioption translation
- (3) Suggested translation
- (4) Comments
- (5) Further tasks
 - guided translation
 - editing
 - individual task

In selecting texts the authors attempted to find varied and lifelike texts. Neither literary nor technical and scientific texts were included, as the objective of the book was the development of general translation skills. This idea guided the selection of texts, which include job advertisements, opening speeches, reports, tourist brochures, contracts, popular science texts, etc.

The texts are not all “perfect” English texts (and the Hungarian texts in the second part are not “faultless”, either), nor is the author invariably a native speaker of the source language, in the same way as in real life, where translators often meet texts, which they have to edit first to be able to translate into the target language. The “pre-editing” of vaguely and unclearly composed texts is also part of translation competence. In this way, the selection of texts was based on practical considerations.

The authors also made an attempt to grade the texts. As mentioned before, in teaching translation the sequencing of texts according to difficulty level is a demanding task. For translators there are no easy texts. All texts are difficult in one way or another. Different texts are difficult in different ways, and individual translators experience different degrees of difficulty in the same text. In spite of this, authors ranked the nine texts according to difficulty level: the first one is a job advertisement containing merely a list, while the ninth text is an extract from an ironical essay on the philosophy of discourse organisation, from a quality literary journal. Contributing to the idea of gradation, the comments after the translations gradually increase in length and complexity.

The commentaries embody the basic principle of the authors’ “translation philosophy”, according to which translators’ solutions are not always unique and unrepeatable. If it were not so, then translators’ experiences could never be generalised and, of course, transmitted. Thus, in their commentaries, the authors explain, generalise, and, wherever possible identify the kind transfer operation used in the suggested translation. This feature helps the user to follow up identical solutions in the book, which will hopefully enable him/her to replicate them in real life. Translators often do not dare to perform certain operations because they are afraid of translating too freely. If, however, they know that certain lexical operations (e.g., expansion, contraction, disintegration, omission and addition, transposition and compensation, etc.), grammatical operations (e.g., the elevation of nominal structures, the transformation of *-ing* participles into separate clauses), and discourse-level operations (e.g., the insertion of emphasisers, sign-posting elements, and discourse markers) are legitimate, and frequent transfer operations, then they will use them with greater confidence.

3. Methodological issues in the teaching of translation

If we intend to discuss methodological issues in translation pedagogy, we must delimit ourselves from translation as it is practised in foreign language teaching (Duff 1989). That could also be regarded as a type of translation, but with a fundamentally different focus from what is needed in professional translator training. The two types of translation may be distinguished by the terms “pedagogical translation” versus “real translation”.

3.1. Pedagogical translation – real translation

Pedagogical and real translation can be distinguished on the basis of **function**, **object** and **addressee**. As regards function, in the case of pedagogical translations translation is a **tool**, whereas it is the **goal** of real translations. We can speak of pedagogical translation when the aim of teaching is not the development of translation skills, but the improvement of language proficiency. In such cases, translation tasks serve merely as a means of consciousness-raising, practicing, or testing language knowledge. We can speak of real translation only if the aim of translation is to develop translation skills.

The two types of translation can be distinguished on the basis of the object of the translation: while in real translation the translator communicates information about reality, in pedagogical translation the translator provides information about his/her level of proficiency.

And finally, a distinction can be made on the basis of the addressee of the translation: while in real translation the addressee is a reader, who wants information about reality, unsuspecting and well-intended, not set to find mistakes, in pedagogical translation the addressee is the teacher or examiner, who wants to find out about the language proficiency of the translator and feels compelled to find mistakes.

From all this it follows that real translator training starts where foreign language teaching ends. In other words, in secondary schools and even in the foreign language departments of universities and colleges we may only speak of pedagogical translation, while the teaching of real translation remains the task of translator and interpreter training colleges and postgraduate courses, designed specially for this purpose. Note, however, that even in these institutions the “client” or the “consumer” of translation is the teacher, so we cannot speak of real translation even in translator training.

3.2. Creating lifelike situations in the teaching of translation

The greatest paradox in the teaching of real translation is that the teaching situation itself makes real translation impossible. The teacher, even if he/she is a highly experienced translator, is not a real customer or consumer. Therefore, a frequently asked question in the literature on translation methodology is how to bring teaching closer to life, i.e. how to create lifelike situations in the translation class.

According to Jean Vienne (1994), in translation classes realistic situations should be created, in which the teacher acts as a “requester”. If the texts to be translated are real texts translated previously by the teacher, then he/she has already analysed the translation situation, and can thus act as a client and answer questions, like: “Who wrote the source text? Who are the target group? What is the context of use? Has the source text been translated into other languages? What is the status of these translations?” etc. etc.

According to Peter A. Schmitt, real translation situations can be created through the selection of texts (1997). In his view, only **authentic texts** should be used, which should not be adapted or shortened. Only texts satisfying realistic communicative needs should be translated, i.e. texts that are commonly translated in the case of a particular language pair in either direction. The users’ manual of a car is obviously more often translated from German to Portuguese than vice versa. Therefore, the selection of texts should be preceded by market research and by the mapping of frequent topics and discourse types. Since the range of texts translated by freelance translators is wider than that translated by contracted translators, the mapping of translation types should start with freelance translators. Taking the German-English language pair as an example, a typical task would be the translation of a manual in the field of mechanical engineering, electronics, or information technology (Schmitt 1997: 128).

Adriana Pagano (1994) criticises the teacher-centred practice of traditional translator training classes. In her opinion, it is wrong that the teacher is the only reader of the translations. This practice reinforces the dominance of the source language text and continues to fuel error-oriented thinking. Her suggestion is that translated texts should be exchanged among students and assessed together in groups, preferably without comparing them to the source-language text.

The concept of the teacher as a “repository and dispenser of knowledge” is also criticised by Kiraly (1997). On the basis of a series of experiments in translation pedagogy, conducted in Mainz-Germersheim, he suggests a “constructivist approach” instead, where the teacher “would serve as a project coordinator and an English language advisor – but not as the teacher in the traditional sense of a dispenser of knowledge and truth” (Kiraly 1997: 386).

3.3. Teacher vs. editor or reviser

In our view, neither the imitation of realistic situations, nor the occasional switch between teacher and students can change the fact that if the end-point of the “translation chain” is the teacher, then we cannot speak of real translation. Unless, of course, the teacher acts as a reader or editor. Readers and editors have a natural role in the “translation chain”; they represent the last stage before the con-

sumer is reached. The difference between editors and teachers lies in their error-correction strategies: the aim of teachers' error-correction strategies is to develop students' translation skills, while the aim of editors' error-correction strategies is to make sure that communication between the source-language writer and the target-language consumer is achieved.

Thus, editors have no choice but to correct all errors and mistakes, whereas teachers may possess various types of error-correction strategies. In fact, they often develop strategies of their own. While editors must always follow a product-oriented approach, teachers can choose between a product- and a process-oriented approach.

3.4. Different approaches to error correction

The **process-oriented approach** to translation teaching and translation skills development radically denies the importance of error correction. Gile (1994), for instance, disapproves of the "traditional" method of translation teaching, in which the teacher corrects mistakes, accepts or rejects students' solutions, and shows his/her solution as the example to follow. He favours a process-oriented model instead, in which teachers do not expect perfect end products from students, but use translations to gain insights into the process of translation and raise questions rather than criticise.

The **product-oriented model** to translation pedagogy does not reject the idea of error correction, but tries to reform its nature instead. There are three methods to be mentioned: (1) the method of systematic feedback, (2) the method of student-centred correction, and (3) the humanistic approach to students' errors.

The method of "**systematic feedback**" was proposed by Dollerup (1994). He started out from the idea that teachers' error corrections should be organised in a way that students benefit from them. His feedback consists of three components: (1) "corrections in translations which the students have handed in", (2) "oral discussion in the class covering adequate as well as inadequate renditions", (3) "feedback form assessing strengths and weaknesses with each student" (1994: 125). Dollerup's study contains this feedback form (1994: 128), consisting of 42 problem areas, which the teacher has to fill in when evaluating the students' performance in a given translation assignment by adding positive or negative signs to the particular areas (e.g., ellipses, insertions, word order, sentence structure, collocations, punctuation).

Maria Julia Sainz (1994) recommends the filling in of a similar form. In her "Correction Card", it is not problem areas that must be evaluated, but four columns, named "Mistakes", "Possible correction", "Source", and "Type of mistake", must be filled in by the students themselves.

Sainz also proposes a "**student-centred approach**" in error correction: which involves two ideas: (1) the human rights of students should not be disregarded in error correction, that is, students have the right to know the criteria according to which their translations are evaluated and also who assessed their translations, etc. (2) error correction should not be aggressive. In Sainz's view, "The traditional method of re-writing the correct version on the student's sheet is ... very disruptive, frustrating and stressful for students ... (1994: 138). Instead, she recommends a

so-called “Correction Card”, which, as mentioned before, must be filled in by the students for self-assessment.

The “**humanistic approach**” to error correction was proposed by Candace Seguinot (1989). She regards errors committed by translators not as violations of linguistic norm, but rather as valuable pieces of information. In this view, mistakes/errors are natural consequences of translation, “...the surface manifestations of the phenomena which are the object of study” (1989: 74). Errors “can give interesting insights into the normal process of translation, and make possible better predictions about what kind of errors are likely to occur in translation” (1989: 74). She also claims that there are errors which arise because the translator does not understand the source language or cannot manipulate the target language well enough, while other errors “are a normal by-product of the translation process” and are “normal in learning to translate” (1989: 80).

3.5. Different strategies in error correction

After having reviewed the various error correction strategies, let us return to the assumption that, unlike teachers, revisers and editors have no other choice but to be product-oriented, correct the errors they find, and what is more, must do so in the text itself and not on various types of feedback forms. Therefore, in our view, translation teaching could be made more lifelike by having the teacher do editing rather than error correction. Consequently, the strategies listed below are not for professional translator training:

- (1) Teachers should not make corrections in the text; they should write their suggestions on the margin.
- (2) Teachers should not make corrections in the text; they should attach their remarks on a separate sheet of paper.
- (3) Teachers should make a list of the mistakes and attach it to the translation.
- (4) Teachers should not correct errors; they should appreciate good solutions, and disregard incorrect ones.
- (5) Teachers should not include their correct solutions in the text, because this would suggest that those are the only correct solutions, and it is well known that all translation problems have several possible good solutions.

The above strategies cannot be used in professional translator training because future translators who are treated so tactfully and whose mistakes are not treated as mistakes but are looked upon as starting points for interesting debates in the classroom will be shocked to see their revised translation corrected by a professional editor.

Thus, in professional translator training it is recommended that the following principles should be followed:

- (1) The work of teachers of translation should resemble the work of revisers and editors in publishing houses, which is of course only possible if the teacher has practice and experience in translation, revising and editing.

- (2) The teacher-student relationship should resemble the relationship between an experienced translator (reviser, editor) and a beginner translator.
- (3) Pedagogical corrections should be similar to revisers' corrections (teachers should use the standard correction symbols and not wavy, dotted or broken lines).
- (4) All errors should be corrected, and not only those that are interesting from the pedagogical point of view.
- (5) Corrections must be included in the text.
- (6) Corrections must be made not only on the sentence level but on the discourse level as well, the outcome of which should be a coherent, publishable text.
- (7) Each and every text should be of publishable quality.

The latter requirement also contributes to the evaluation of translations. In translator training, the assessment of translations should be based on a single criterion: how much work (correction, editing) is needed to obtain a publishable translation. If revising and editing takes more time than the translating itself, then the translation is obviously unusable as a translation.

Translators and translation teachers trained originally as language teachers should be warned that revising and editing is not the same as marking tests. The task of the reviser/editor is not to underline mistakes and indicate them on the margins to prepare a subsequent pedagogical discussion, but to make the text publishable. If the text is translated for publication in a daily newspaper or a professional journal, then all the corrections necessary to make it publishable should be included. If the translation is not intended for publication (e.g., user's manual, information leaflet for patients, technical description, documentation, etc.), the reviser/editor's task is to make all the corrections that will promote the interests of the prospective users.

Edited translations can also be used for purposes other than teaching. Corpora containing edited student translations provide valuable data for research in translation studies. The daily routine of revisers at translation agencies or editors at publishing houses is an interesting form of speech activity, which has not been researched systematically so far (for more detail see Mossop 1994). One could contrast, for instance, the correction strategies of different editors, or the strategies of editors and teachers. If translations are handed in in an electronic format and the editors also correct them on the screen, then computer programmes recording pre-editing solutions should be used (for more details see Klaudy 1996a).

3.6. Types of translation tasks

Translator training differs from language teaching also in that it is very hard to find varied tasks for trainees. In translator and interpreter training, practical work consists in actual translating and interpreting. This can be done in class or assigned as homework. The translator training coursebooks mentioned previously do the same thing: at the end of each chapter they ask the students to translate one or two texts using what they have learnt in class.

The first volume of the new translation coursebook series published by Corvina Publishing House, Budapest entitled *Angol fordítóiskola (English Translation School)* by Bart, Klaudy and Szóllósy (1996), tries to break with this tradition. The various chapters, besides the texts and the comments, also contain varied tasks to develop the different translation skills, and these tasks are not presented at the end of chapters, but as organic parts of the preparatory work for the subsequent translation assignment. These task types will be reviewed below.

3.6.1. Text-preparation tasks

Textual work is aimed at familiarising students with the texts before translating them. It is often voiced in translation classes that before translating, the whole text should be read. However, it is not enough to just say so, the students should be taught to **read as translators do**. And it is exactly this that the text-preparation tasks are designed to promote by asking questions like the following:

- (1) Could you make a guess as to who ordered the translation of the above article and with what purpose?
- (2) Is it for internal use or for publication?
- (3) Is it for the radio or for the printed media?
- (4) To what extent does the supposed use of the translation affect the translator's solutions?
- (5) What is the text about?
- (6) Mark the key words of the paragraphs.
- (7) On the basis of the key words, summarise briefly (in 5-10 sentences) the main points in the text, etc.

These questions help the students to familiarise themselves with the text before actually translating it. They try to find a communicative situation in which the text would need to be translated. They discuss who the client might be, for whom the original text was written, and assess the consequences of where the text is supposed to be published.

It might sound strange to ask them to summarise the text before they translate it, but experience shows that not all novice translators read the text before translation, or even if they read it, they do not read it as translators should.

The marking of the key words of paragraphs is also important. It is crucial to clarify what new information the given paragraphs add to the development of the line of thought, because only in this way can we find the "sign-posting" elements so essential to making the translation.

3.6.2. Lexical preparation

The lexical preparation of texts consists of dictionary research. In every text, one can separate the genre-specific general vocabulary and the topic-specific special vocabulary. Both can give rise to problems.

Dictionary work could, of course, be done parallel to translating the text, but preparatory work has its own pedagogical purposes, such as vocabulary development, or the demonstration of the difference between context-dependent and con-

text-independent solutions. An important component of lexical preparation is working with various dictionary types (monolingual, bilingual, specialised, dictionaries of synonyms, slang, etc).

3.6.3. Suggested translation with variants

After familiarising themselves with the text and lexical preparation, the students may begin to translate. To help them in translations, they are sometimes given “multioption” translations, in which several different but possible translation options can be found.

Let us illustrate this type of translation task with an example taken from the Hungarian-English part of the book (Bart, Klaudy and Szöllősy 1996: 149).

THIRTY YEARS OF ROCK

Suggested translation with variants

The (highly) popular singer Kati Kovács will celebrate thirty years as performer tonight at a gala concert to be held at the Buda Park Theatre (...)
The singer is *against / not enthusiastic/ far from enthusiastic/ less than enthusiastic about the commercialisation* of today's pop culture. She is planning nevertheless two new CDs.

Within a few short months /the space of just a couple of months/ within a couple of months / within a matter of months, in the mid-sixties Kati Kovács, a doctor's assistant from Eger became a nationally known singer, a real star.
(...) In the wake of Kati Kovács's first/ early successes there soon came film offers *too/ in addition / as well.*

(...)

Any of these solutions can be used, even though the various options are not necessarily of equal value. These tasks illustrate the various possible (although not always identical) sentence-building strategies, each of which lead to different consequences.

In the case of multioption translation, students are required to evaluate the options offered, and with this help they can choose their own version of the text.

3.6.4. Guided translation

The idea of “guided translation” is that certain parts of some target-language sentences have been translated in advance by one of the authors of the book. Such guidance, recommended words and sentence structure elements is not intended as suggestions that the translator may either accept or reject. On the contrary, the authors ask the trainee translators to include them in their translations. The idea is to develop translators' word selection and sentence construction skills by making them do things they would not have done otherwise.

Let us see an example for guided translation taken from the English-Hungarian part of the book (Bart, Klaudy and Szöllősy 1995: 75).

THE GREAT BRITISH BANGER

Guided translation

The sausage (1) is one of the oldest forms of processed food (2). The name is derived from Latin “salus”, meaning salted – and thereby preserved – meat or mixtures of meat encased in animal gut (3). The first authentic reference (4) appears in the Greek poet Homer’s *Odyssey*, written (5) around the 9th century BC. Later (6), Greek literature frequently mentions (7) sausages using the term *oraye* (8).

1. a virsli- vagy kolbász (készítés)
2. az élelmiszer feldolgozásának
3. ami ... (és ezáltal ...) ... töltött húst jelent
4. hiteles említés / utalás (kolbászra)
5. íródott
6. a későbbiekben
7. esik/ történik említés
8. néven/ -nak neveznek

3.6.5. Revising

The revising of already existing translations, their comparison with the original may provide useful information for novice translators. It is also a suitable task to practise editing strategies. It is by no means easy to correct somebody else’s translation: many would rather translate the text instead of bothering with corrections. However, translators are often faced with such tasks, and they must learn to do corrections “with the least possible effort”, which does not involve rewriting the text, but “mending” it to make it functionally “usable”.

3.7. Translation pedagogy as a new field of research

With translation studies becoming more and more an independent field, translation and interpretation pedagogy is also turning into an independent area of research. In launching research on the methodology of teaching linguistic mediation, Cay Dollerup’s work including the three international *Language International* conferences he organised marked an important new stage.

While the teaching and training section was just one of many other sections in previous translation studies conferences, Cay Dollerup started a series of conferences in Elsinore, Denmark devoted entirely to the problems of translation pedagogy. The other initiator of the Elsinore conferences was Geoffrey Kingscott, who was the editor-in-chief of the journal *Language International* at that time, and this is the reason why the conferences were called *Language International Conference I–II–III* (1991, 1993, 1995).

The main topic of all three conferences was the teaching of translation and interpreting, but within this, topics such as the teaching of cultural differences, assessment, the teaching of media translation, the role of the extra curricular world, that is, the role of professional requirements in training, and the technolog-

ical tools aiding the teaching of translation also formed part of the different sections.

The Elsinore conference series, according to the original plans, ended with the third conference (the fourth *Language International Conference* was organised in Shanghai), but its influence will remain for a long time, since the proceedings of all three conferences have been published: Dollerup, C. and Loddegaard, A. (eds.) 1992. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 1.; Dollerup, C. and Lindegaard, A. (eds.) 1994. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 2.; Dollerup, C. and Appel, V. (eds.) 1996. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

It is worth noting that all the three volumes were published by John Benjamins Publishing Company, one of the most prestigious publishers of theoretical works in translation studies. The fact that this company undertook the publishing of these conference proceedings also shows the high professional level of the conferences and the increasing importance of translation training in the world. Papers not included in these volumes, together with several other methodological studies, can be found in *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* (Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen), one of the most important forums of translation and interpreting pedagogy and related research, edited by Cay Dollerup and published twice a year.

4. Teaching translation and translator training in Hungary

Development of translation studies as an independent academic field is closely related to developments in translator training, i.e. the establishment of independent translation departments in universities. Even if we can find examples for the creation of independent research centres for the study of translation and interpreting, or for governmental or non-governmental organizations dealing with immigration and minority issues placing orders such research activity, in general there is a very close relationship between translation studies research and translator and interpreter training.

4.1. Teaching translation in Hungary between 1973 and 1990

4.1.1. Teaching translation on postgraduate courses

The Fordító- és Tolmácsképző Központ (Interpreter and Translator Training Centre – ITTC) was established in 1973 as an independent teaching unit within the framework of the Faculty of Humanities, at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. The programme consists of a one year postgraduate course in translation and interpreting in the English-Hungarian, French-Hungarian, German-Hungarian, and Russian-Hungarian language combinations with the aim to train professional translators and consecutive interpreters.

Candidates wishing to join the programme are required to hold a university degree or college diploma of any kind (not necessarily in a foreign language), and a Certificate of Proficiency in their first foreign language. The training is intensive: the number of contact hours is 600, and group sizes range from eight to twelve students for each language combination. On completing the course, students are awarded either a “Certificate in Translation” or a “Certificate in Consecutive Interpreting”, or both, enabling them to apply for a professional license at their local authorities, a prerequisite of employment by public institutions.

The Interpreter and Translator Training Centre, the oldest translator training institution in Hungary, has trained as many as 1000 professional translators and interpreters and in the translation and interpreting examinations it has conducted more than 1500 candidates have obtained qualifications in the period between 1973 and 1990. It has been the most influential translation training institution in Hungary with a relatively small but highly qualified and experienced full-time staff and a cooperating part-time team of the best practising translators and interpreters of the country. The staff carries on intensive research in the field of translation and interpreting, organises teacher training courses and professional conferences, and its publication activity is also significant.

4.1.2. Special language translator training

Almost simultaneously with the establishment of postgraduate training at ITTC, in 1974 undergraduate translator training courses were also started, although not as independent courses, but as supplementary courses within the framework of training at technical, natural sciences, agricultural, economics, and medical universities.

The model for special language translator training was developed under the leadership of János Gárdus at the Foreign Languages Department of the University of Heavy Industry and Metallurgy, Miskolc. Subsequently this model was adopted by the following universities: Faculty of Natural Sciences, Kossuth Lajos University, Debrecen (1976); Faculty of Natural Sciences, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest (1979); Agricultural University, Debrecen (1978); Agricultural University, Gödöllő (1979); Faculty of Economics, Janus Pannonius University, Pécs (1979); Horticultural University, Budapest (1980); Medical University, Szeged (1986).

4.1.3. Translation training in faculties of humanities

In this period, the faculties of humanities and teacher training colleges offered no independent undergraduate training programmes in translation and interpretation for language majors. Translation only appeared in the training of foreign language teachers, in the form of literary translation workshops. In other words, translation appeared occasionally and often randomly as part of foreign language teacher training. Yet, the faculties of humanities produced a number of excellent literary translators, thanks to the literary translation seminars conducted by outstanding translators such as Marcell Benedek and László Kardos, and subsequently by István Géher, Miklós Györffy, László Lator, János Benyhe.

In the 80s, there was only one pioneering initiative to establish an independent undergraduate translator training programme. The Faculty of Humanities of József Attila University, Szeged launched an English and Russian translator and interpreter training programme at BA level, but despite a successful start, the educational authorities at that time did not permit the continuation of this successful programme.

4.2. Changes in the 1990s

Due to changes in foreign policy and educational policy in the 1990s, both the social needs for translator training and the opportunities available at universities and colleges have undergone radical changes.

As a result of Hungary's strengthening international relations and attempts at integration into the European Union, the demand for linguistic mediators and professionals with foreign language negotiation skills increased considerably compared to the previous 20 years, and it became evident that traditional training institutions cannot cope with this task in the traditional manner.

There were also radical changes in the structure of higher education in Hun-

gary: new universities and colleges were created, three-year English and German foreign-language teacher training courses were launched, Russian language departments ceased or almost ceased to exist, new applied linguistics departments were established, etc. These changes affected all the three forms of translator training mentioned earlier, so we shall review these in the following.

4.2.1 Changes in postgraduate training

4.2.1.1. *Renewal of the ELTE programmes*

The transition of Hungary into a democracy and market economy at the end of the eighties and early nineties gave rise to new needs that called for a complete overhaul of the existing training programmes in the Interpreter and Translator Training Centre of Eötvös Loránd University (ITTC, ELTE).

The first developments took place in 1995-96 within the framework of a large-scale World Bank project (Catching up with Higher Education in Europe), which provided both the technical assistance and the infrastructure needed to upgrade translator training. A computer-assisted translation course was added to the training programme, held in a newly-equipped computer laboratory. Interpreter training was improved by introducing advanced note-taking techniques for consecutive interpreting, and a course for simultaneous was also introduced; more systematic terminology research was started, and links were established with centres of excellence in research and training. Several textbooks and other teaching material have also been produced as part of this project, including *General introduction to the theory and practice of interpreting; Interpreting skills development; Note-taking practice EN-HU, DE-HU, R-HU; Coursebook and recorded speeches for simultaneous interpreting; Public speaking for interpreters; Business basics; Legal and business translations; Translations into English.*

Due to the complete overhaul of the programme and the new infrastructure, the quality of training improved considerably, and by 1996 it was up to international standards. The *Postgraduate Course in Translation and Interpreting (with legal and business specialisation)* was accredited in Hungary in 2000.

4.2.1.2. *Advanced courses with European specialisation*

From the 1990s, there was a growing demand for qualified translators and interpreters who were also familiar with the topics related to Hungary's integration into Europe, and with the procedures followed in and language used by the European institutions. Addressing those needs, the Centre developed a new translation and conference interpreting course with European specialisation. These one-year specialised training courses were intended primarily for graduates who have already completed the combined T/I course in translation and consecutive interpreting. The Y-shaped structure of the training enabled them to have a combined foundation course first and then opt for an advanced course with European specialisation, either in translation or in conference interpreting.

The project for the development of the new courses received full support from European institutions (SCIC, Translation Service of the European Commission

and European Parliament). The TAIEX Office of the European Union provided funding for a new conference laboratory (six booths with conference equipment) and a resource centre, in order to provide the necessary infrastructure for the conference interpreter course. Technical assistance was provided by two leading training schools (ESIT-Sorbonne Nouvelle and the University of Westminster) on the basis of a cooperation protocol signed in 1998.

The *Postgraduate Translation and Conference Interpreting Course with EU Specialisation* was accredited in Hungary in 2000.

4.2.1.3. European Masters in Conference Interpreting

In 1998, the Centre was accepted as a full member in the Partnership for European Masters in Conference Interpreting, established for helping the integration of new languages in the EU, and for quality assurance and dissemination in the training of conference interpreters in Europe. A core curriculum, uniform course requirements, and a joint *Certificate of European Masters in Conference Interpreting* has been established and introduced by all members.

Quality assurance was further strengthened by student and staff mobility, funded jointly by SCIC and European Parliament, who are also represented in the international jury at the final exams. After the completion of the project, the universities decided to form a Consortium and to keep on working together on joint projects (*Technical Services Supporting Conference Interpreting, Distance Learning, Interpreting into Language 'B'*). The ceremonial signing of the Consortium Agreement by the rectors of the 15 universities took place in May 2001, in Brussels.

4.2.1.4. Translation with European Specialisation

The development of the Postgraduate Course in Translation with European Specialisation received a fresh impetus when cooperation with the University of Westminster was extended to the training of translators as part of the Hungarian-British Joint Research Programme (1999–2002). The academic year 2001/2002 provided further opportunities for increasing staff mobility and the Centre also held a conference on terminology research, with the participation of guest speakers from ETI, Geneva, the University of Westminster, representatives of leading Hungarian translation agencies, and terminologists and jurist-linguists working in the Translation Coordination Unit of the Ministry of Justice. The advanced translation course was introduced in September 2002.

4.2.1.5. Postgraduate courses at ELTE

Currently, the Interpreter and Translator Training Centre is running the following courses.

- One-year postgraduate courses in translation and interpreting in four language combinations: English, German, French and Spanish → Hungarian, offering a Diploma in Translation and/or Interpreting with legal and business specialisation.

- One-year conference interpreter courses with European specialisation, in AB and ABC language combinations, offering a Diploma in Conference Interpreting with European Specialisation *and* a European Masters Certificate in Conference Interpreting.
- One-year translation courses with European specialisation, in AB and ABC language combinations, offering a Diploma in Translation with European Specialisation.

In the 90s, postgraduate training courses in translation and interpreting were also launched by three other universities: the Budapest Technical University, the Post-graduate Centre of the University of Pécs and the University of Szeged.

4.2.2. Changes in special language translator training

The traditional form of special language translator training seemed to lose importance in the 1990s. One of the reasons was that with Russian losing its importance, the need for the Russian translator training programme decreased considerably. What is more, in some specialities it completely ceased to exist. The other reason was that the aim of special language translator training was never merely the training of professional translators, but always had the hidden purpose of training professionals with a very good command of foreign languages. This purpose, however, could not be disguised any more and it could not be retained a secondary aim offered only to a few of the whole student body.

However, the institutions that have been running special language translator courses (listed in 4.1.2) do not wish to give them up. On the contrary, other higher educational institutions (e.g., the University of Veszprém) also want to start new special language translator training programmes. Besides the prospect of European integration there is another reason why special language translation training has become so popular. Many Hungarian universities performed a forced reduction in staff in the mid 90s. Personnel was cut down and foreign language courses were made optional for students, although they are obliged to pass a state-recognised foreign language examination before they are allowed to sit for their final examination. This obviously made life for foreign language departments and institutes very hard, and the need for reforming the traditional model became clear. Launching new special language translation training programmes offered a means to save some full-time staff.

The new developments in special language translator training programmes included a change in language combinations offered and a shift of emphasis from written skills to oral aspects of language mediation. As regards the shift from Russian to English, German, and in some places French programmes, the transition was quickly achieved. The inclusion of spoken skills (e.g., presentation skills, negotiation skills) into the dominantly writing-oriented programmes, though, caused major problems.

4.2.3. Changes at faculties of humanities and teacher training colleges

The need for change was even more marked at faculties of humanities and teacher training colleges. At faculties of humanities it seemed most natural to specialise in translation and interpretation after completing the main tier. Such courses are offered, as special courses for the time being at the University of Szeged and Pécs.

At Eötvös Loránd University in the Comparative Literary Studies Department the traditional literary translation seminars were reorganised as an Independent Literary Translation Programme offering both theory and practice. The programme is very popular with students, thanks to the work of Irén Kiss, Andrea Papp and Anikó Sohár. This programme has assistance from outstanding translators such as István Bart, Tibor Bartos, János Benyhe, István Géher, Miklós Györfly, László Lator, András Soproni, etc.

Teacher training colleges and language teacher training centres which wanted to offer additional knowledge and qualifications to their students also launched translator training courses. Translator training courses were started at Bessenyei György Teacher Training College in Russian, English, French and German, at Berzsenyi Dániel College in Szombathely in English, and at Miskolc University, for the students of the three-year language teacher training course, in English and German.

4.3. The present situation

If we add up the above mentioned traditional and new translator and (in some places) interpreter training courses, we can see that by the end of the 1990s about 15 Hungarian institutions in higher education offer some form of language mediator training.

This is, on the one hand, an impressive fact, on the other hand, however, it gives rise to a number of questions. Let me just mention a few:

- (1) Translation and interpretation are not accredited as independent university subjects, and therefore lack a **unified set of qualification requirements**.
- (2) The **levels** of translator and interpreter training are not defined and are not built upon each other.
- (3) Each institution issues a **different certificate** or diploma.
- (4) The various institutions differ immensely in the **number of classes** they offer.
- (5) In the majority of institutions, the teaching is done **by language teachers** who are only sporadically engaged in professional translation, and only a few of them are qualified translators or interpreters.
- (6) The teaching of translation and interpretation is different from the teaching of foreign languages, it has its own **methodology**, and this methodology has its own theoretical background, which the teachers teaching translation should be aware of. Teachers currently teaching translation and inter-

- preting have no training in this methodology, as the methodology of translator and interpreter training is not taught anywhere in the country.
- (7) There is no independent **PhD programme** in translation studies, which means that research in translation studies, which might provide the theoretical background for the teaching of translation, has no proper centre; thus, foreign language majors cannot opt for a translation studies topic. Even though the PhD Program in Applied Linguistics headed by professor György Szépe at the University of Pécs does accept topics in translation studies, an independent doctoral program is clearly needed.
 - (8) As doctoral programmes can only be launched in institutions providing training at undergraduate level, we have got into a vicious circle: the faculties of humanities do not support the accreditation of translation as a degree subject because they do not accept it as an **independent discipline**.
 - (9) Since translation is not accredited as an independent university subject there are no **independent translation departments** at Hungarian universities and colleges. The translation courses are run by Departments of Foreign Languages, the Foreign Language Institutes, or in some places by Departments of Applied Linguistics.

4. 4. Future tasks in Hungarian translator and interpreter training

The most urgent task is the establishment of translation and interpretation as a **university degree subject** at undergraduate level. As long as it is not offered as a degree subject to foreign language majors, it remains rather hard to define the qualification requirements of other forms of training.

Leaders of the faculties of humanities are reluctant to support the idea of translation as a university subject not only because they do not possess the necessary funds, but also because they regard the teaching of translation and interpreting as a form of teaching designed to develop a practical skill. They do not regard translation studies as an independent discipline, and they do not accept the fact that translation and interpretation are independent professions in the same way as language teaching, and as such, require serious theoretical foundation and huge amounts of background knowledge.

In contrast, **undergraduate** training in translation and interpreting is provided all over Europe. It does not only involve practical training; research on bilingual speech production and translation studies, as shown in the previous chapters of our book, have made rapid advance in the past decade in the world; they have their monographs, journals, and they hide huge research potential. The vast majority of the 400 participants of the 2nd *Transferte necesse est* conference held in Budapest in 1996 arrived from translation departments of universities and colleges.

It seems the time has come for the establishment of **independent translation departments** within faculties of humanities and teacher training colleges. We must make decision-makers aware of the fact **that linguistic mediation is**

an independent profession, which requires much more than just proficiency in two languages: language majors will not automatically become translators and interpreters.

Following the example of the already existing applied linguistics doctoral programmes in Hungary, all of which have specialised in a particular field of applied linguistics, a **doctoral programme*** in translation studies should also be created. This is an indispensable requirement for the training of future generations of translation scholars who can produce the theoretical research necessary for university level training.

The introduction of translator and interpreter training courses as university or college degree subjects would also solve the problem of training **teachers of translation and interpreting**.

*It is expected that in 2003 a new PhD programme in translation studies will be launched at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.

Part III.

**THE PRACTICE OF
TRANSLATION**

1. The system of transfer operations

Is there, or can there be any systematicity in the numerous multilevel and multi-natured operations performed partly consciously and partly instinctively/intuitively by translators in the course of translation? And if there is, is it possible to describe it? And if it can be described, can a linguistic description go beyond a mere recording of the transfer operations triggered by differences between languages? This is exactly what this part of the book attempts to accomplish.

1.1. The concept of transfer operations

In translating any sentence from one language into another, even the simplest one, translators perform a highly complicated sequence of actions, which includes the **replacement** of SL lexical units by TL lexical units, the **restructuring** of the sentence structure, the **changing** of the word order, the **omission** of certain elements and the **addition** of others, etc. Due to the differences between SL and TL lexical systems, even the seemingly simplest action – the replacement of SL lexical units by TL lexical units – can become a complicated task, involving a very complex decision-making process to make the right **choice** from among the different options offered by the TL. We shall call these operations (replacement, transposition, omission, addition, etc.) “transfer operations”.

1.2. The history of the term

The term “transfer operation” will be used here as the English correspondent of the Hungarian term “átváltási műveletek”, introduced into the Hungarian literature in the 80s (Klaudy 1991a). We shall use the term “transfer operation” in a broad sense, involving all the operations translators perform, from automatic substitutions to the conscious redistribution of explicit and implicit information.

Both the term “transfer” and the term “operation” have surfaced several times in the literature in the past 40 years, but they were rather used as metaphors and not technical terms.

Vinay and Darbelnet, who give the first systematic description of translation techniques (1958, 1995), do not use the term “operation”. They distinguish between seven “methods” or “procedures” of translation: (1) borrowing, (2) calque, (3) literal translation, (4) transposition, (5) modulation, (6) equivalence, and (7) adaptation. (1995: 41). They use the word “transfer” as a generic term for methods of translation (1985: 351).

The word “operation” can be found right in the first sentence of Catford’s book: “Translation is an operation performed on languages”: ... but what follows:

“...a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another” makes it clear that Catford’s interest is in translation as a phenomenon rather than in operations carried out by translators (1965: 1).

In his *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964), Nida uses the word “operation” but not as a technical term. He uses the phrase “techniques of adjustment” as a term to refer to additions, subtractions and alterations (1964: 226–240). He makes a distinction between “techniques of adjustment” and “translation procedures” which can be divided into two categories: (1) technical and (2) organisational. “Technical procedures concern the processes followed by the translator in converting a source-language text into a receptor language; organisational procedures involve the general organisation of such work, whether in terms of a single translator or, as is true in many instances, of a committee” (1964: 241).

The concept of “technical adjustment” underwent a radical change in Nida and Taber’s *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), where the process of translation is divided into three stages, namely (1) analysis, (2) transfer, and (3) restructuring, while adjustments (“semantic adjustments” and “structural adjustments”), became part of the transfer stage.

In Russian literature the most widely used term was “transformatsiya” (transformation). Retsker (1974) distinguishes between lexical and grammatical transformations, while Barkhudarov (1975) describes four types of transformation in translation: “perestanovka” (transposition), “zamena” (substitution), “dobavlenie” (addition), “opushchenie” (omission). A very detailed typology of lexical and grammatical transformations in Russian-Bulgarian translation can be found in the work of the Bulgarian scholar Vaseva (1980). Translation scholars in the former USSR gave detailed description of lexical and grammatical and even pragmatic transformations in the process of English-Russian, German-Russian, French-Russian, Spanish-Russian translation (Barkhudarov 1975, Komissarov 1973, Shveitser 1973, Gak 1977, Lvovskaya 1985).

Our concept of transfer operation is different from the concept of “perevodcheskaya transformatsiya” used by Russian translation scholars, as they use this term only in cases of interlingual asymmetry. As Gak (1993) puts it: “We can speak of translational transformations in the strict sense of the term only when the translator has refrained from using the isomorphous units that exist in both languages” (Gak in Zlateva 1993: 34).

Newmark does not use the term operation. In his 1982 book, *Approaches to Translation*, one can find a chapter about *Techniques* (for example, deletion). In his 1988 book, *A Textbook of Translation*, he distinguishes “method” and “procedures”: “While translation methods relate to the whole text, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language (1988: 81). There are eighteen sections under the chapter *The Other Translation Procedures*, but the approach in these sections is not consistently operational (see titles like *Synonymy*, *Couplets*, etc.)

The main difference between our term “operation” and terms listed above, which also refer to the translators’ activity (“transformations”, “adjustments”, “techniques”, “procedures”) is that the latter are based only on structural or stylistic differences between languages, that is, on “problematic places”, while we use the term “operation” as a general term for the description of all the moves on the way from the TT to the ST, obligatory or optional, automatic or non-automatic, word-level or text-level, stylistic or pragmatic, etc.

This is the reason why we do not use the term “shift”. The concept of shifts is also based on the phenomenon of interlanguage asymmetry. As expressed by Catford, “By shifts we mean departure from the formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL” (1965: 73). The word “shift” suggests something special, unusual, due to the force of circumstances, while we would like to put emphasis on normality. Our term “transfer operations” suggests that we are dealing with the normal, everyday activity of translators, not excluding innovation and creativity.

We also use the term “transfer” in a broad sense not as a term for translation methods (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958,1995), not as a special stage of the process of translation (Nida and Taber 1969), not in the sense used in contrastive linguistics (positive interference of the foreign language in language learning), but rather as a synonym for the word *translation*. Looking for an English equivalent of our Hungarian term “átváltási műveletek”, we hesitated between two variants: “translational operations” and “transfer operations”, and we decided to choose the shorter one.

In general it is safe to say that although both the term “operation” and “transfer” have been used in the translation studies literature of the last 40 years (e.g., Komissarov 1990), they were less frequently used than the terms “transformations”, “techniques”, “methods”, and “procedures”, and as a matter of fact no one has attempted yet to provide a comprehensive description, explanation, and systematisation of transfer operations.

1.3. Transfer operations and the process of translation

Investigating the operational part of the translator’s activity was a rather neglected field in translation research in the 80s, one that was either left out altogether, or sometimes even accused of leading translation research astray, bringing it to a dead end.

Some claim that the investigation of translation operations diverts our attention from the real process of translation. According to such opinions, the translator having extracted the meaning (sense, content, message, etc.) from the source language text should immediately forget the SL form and should reformulate the message in his or her target language independently of the source-language form.

This would mean that the process of translation is nothing but an analysis of the source-language text followed by synthesis in the target language, or, in other words, decoding of the source text and encoding of the target text, while there is no direct transcoding from the source-language form to the target-language form. On this interpretation, the basis for transfer is a semantic representation, which is independent of the languages involved, thus languages do not influence the process of translation at all.

Empirical studies of target texts translated from different source languages nevertheless reveal striking differences according to different source languages. Translated TL texts possess quantifiable textual properties that distinguish them from original TL texts; moreover these properties differ according to the source language of the translated texts (Klaudy 1987, Vehmas-Lehto 1989). If the linguistic differences leave their mark on target texts, they also have to be studied together with other factors influencing the operational part of the translator’s activity.

Aversion to terms like “techniques of translation”, “transformations in translation”, or “operations in translation” can be ascribed to misinterpretation of operation research, and blaming it for giving “one to one solutions”, “recipes”, “rules”, “ready-made equivalents”, etc. This is certainly not the case; on the contrary, the description and explanation of transfer operations may provide new insights into the complex mental processes behind the decision-making process which is an integral part of all kinds of translation.

1.4. Transfer operations as mental transformations

Transfer operations are often identified with translational or interlingual transformations. The statement that in the course of translation the SL form is “transformed” into the TL form has been repeated so often in literature that we no longer perceive its absurdity. Transformation in this sense is nonsense, of course (Komissarov 1980). The translator does not do anything to the SL form. The SL form and the SL text remains unchanged. What really happens could best be described as the birth of a new entity, the TL text, which bears the mark of the circumstances of its birth.

A translated TL text, or in other words, a text originally conceived in a foreign language, and an original TL text, that is, a text originally conceived in the TL are two rather different things. The road leading from a mental representation to the linguistic form is never direct and never simple, even when we formulate our ideas in our mother tongues. But when a thought is first formulated in another language, the path from the mind to the linguistic form is incomparably more complex.

Transition from the mind to the linguistic form is a mental operation complex enough even within the same language, and how much more complex this process becomes if there are two languages involved in it! If the transition from thought to linguistic form requires the working of a mental switch even within one language, the same process between two languages certainly takes a double-switch at least. Double-switch here means transformation, but of course not of the SL form or the SL text (which, of course, remains unchanged), but rather various mental transformations, which finally result in a TL text based on the SL text.

The existence of these mental transformations is indisputable. The question is whether these mental transformations include only SL analysis and TL synthesis, that is, only the **decoding** of the SL text (transition from the SL form to the thought) and the **encoding** of the TL text (transition from the thought to the TL form), or whether they include at the same time a certain kind of **transcoding** as well. In other words, the question is whether there exist some more or less direct roads from the SL form to the TL form. This is the most important question to ask, and using the term “transfer operations” we suggest that in some cases there is a direct road between the two languages, leading, of course, through the translator’s mind.

By using the term “transfer operations” we have made two important tacit assumptions: (1) TL solutions are not entirely independent of the SL form, and (2) TL solutions are not natural phenomena, like the freezing of water below zero degree, but are the results of a conscious decision-making activity on the part of translators.

In the following chapters we shall use the term “transfer operation” in the sense

described above, as a manifestation of complex mental transformations, taking place when the road from the mind to the linguistic form is not direct but leads through another language.

1.5. Translation as a decision-making process

How can this decision-making process be traced back? The operations performed by translators are doubly **hidden from us**. It is not only that we cannot look into the minds of translators, but also that they themselves are unconscious of what they are actually doing. So the only way to try and draw conclusions about the operations of translators is by comparing the source- and the target-language texts. What rules are translators guided by? Are they guided at all by any rules?

Many claim that because of the infinite variety of text types and communicative situations each and every decision of the translator is in fact a unique one that cannot be repeated. This is further supported by the common experience that there exist no two translations of a text that are completely identical.

Those who believe in the existence of certain objective rules or regularities in the process of translation and in the fact that there is some systematicity in what translators do, partly consciously and partly instinctively or intuitively, search for regularities only in transfer operations triggered by differences in linguistic systems. We believe that the **range of systemic transfer operations is wider**. Besides the operations induced by differences in the systems, regularities can also be detected in translators' solutions when they have several alternatives to choose from. This will be illustrated in the example below.

1.6. A case study of selection criteria

The first sentence of Graham Greene's short story *The Innocent* was translated by Gabriella Prekop in the following way (the first sentence has been selected here to minimise the amount of contextual information needed):

English ST: It was a mistake to take Lola here. (Greene 451)

Hungarian TT: Hiba volt, hogy magammal vittem Lolát. (Prekop 278)

(lit.: It was a mistake to take Lola with me.)

Let us make an inventory of all of the operations the translator had to perform to come up with the translation above. Had she merely replaced the English lexical units with Hungarian ones, she would have produced a grammatically ill-formed sentence (cf. *Az volt egy hiba vinni Lola ide.*). To get a grammatically well-formed Hungarian sentence, she had to perform a series of operations:

- (1) she left out the English personal pronoun *it*,
- (2) the past tense of the English existential verb (*was*) was replaced by the past form of the Hungarian existential verb (*volt*),
- (3) she left out the English article *a*,

- (4) the English noun *mistake* was replaced by the Hungarian noun *hiba*,
- (5) the English verb-noun word order was changed to the Hungarian noun-verb word order,
- (6) the conjunction *hogy* ('that') was inserted in the Hungarian sentence,
- (7) the declined personal pronoun *magammal* ('with me') was inserted in the Hungarian sentence,
- (8) the English verb *take* was replaced by the Hungarian verb *vinni*,
- (9) the English infinitive (*to take*) was replaced by the Hungarian conjugated verb form (*vittem, I took*),
- (10) she left out *to*,
- (11) she added the past tense, first person singular inflection to the Hungarian verb *vinni*,
- (12) she added the transitive inflection to the proper name *Lola* (*Lolát*),
- (13) she left out the adverb *here*.

Here we can see that even in the case of this simple eight-word English sentence the translator had to perform at least 13 operations: four omissions (*it, a, to, here*), two additions (*hogy, magammal*), one change of word order (*was mistake* → *Hiba volt*), three lexical substitutions (*was* → *volt, mistake* → *hiba, take* → *vinni*), one grammatical replacement (*to take* → *vittem*), two structural changes (*mistake to take* → *hogy vittem, Lola* → *Lolát*).

This list of operations was described as if the translator worked like a machine which senses the words of the original sentence one by one and performs an operation with each and every one of them, on the basis of an in-built English-Hungarian dictionary and an English-Hungarian contrastive grammar.

In reality, however, the translator does not work in such a linearly fashion, even with a simple sentence like this; he/she does not process the words in a linear way and the various operations are also weighted differently. In translating this sentence, the most complicated operation is making a complex Hungarian sentence out of a simple English sentence. The rest of the operations listed all serve this major transfer operation, so we can claim that the most important transfer operation triggers the rest, some of which are performed by the translator consciously and others automatically.

Obligatory transfer operations, without which we do not get a grammatically well-formed Hungarian sentence, are generally performed automatically by translators. In the English sentence above, the omission of *it* or the addition of the transitive inflection to the proper name *Lola* are automatic transfer operations. The transfer operation affecting the whole sentence was not obligatory, i.e., changing the English infinitival structure into a *hogy*-clause (*that*-clause), because the noun *hiba* could have been followed by an infinitive in Hungarian as well (cf. *Hiba volt magammal vinni Lolát*. 'It was a mistake to take Lola with me.'). Lexical substitutions can not be considered obligatory transfer operations either, since the English noun *mistake* can also be translated as *tévedés* as well as *hiba*, and the English verb *take* can also mean *hozni* ('bring') as well as *vinni* in Hungarian. After performing the automatic and obligatory transfer operations, the translator is still faced with a number of choices even in the case of this simple English sentence. Let us list just a few out of these:

- (1) Hiba volt, hogy magammal vittem Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake that with me I took Lola.) (This was the translation provided by the translator.)
- (2) Hiba volt, hogy magammal hoztam Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake that with me I brought Lola.)
- (3) Hiba volt, hogy elvittem magammal Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake that I took Lola with me.)
- (4) Hiba volt, hogy elhoztam magammal Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake that I brought Lola with me.)
- (5) Hiba volt, hogy elhoztam ide Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake that I brought Lola here.)
- (6) Hiba volt, hogy Lolával jöttem ide.
(lit. It was a mistake that I came here with Lola.)
- (7) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát vittem magammal.
(lit. It was a mistake that it was Lola whom I took with me.)
- (8) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát hoztam magammal.
(lit. It was a mistake that it was Lola whom I brought with me.)
- (9) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát magammal vittem.
(lit. It was a mistake that Lola with me I took.)
- (10) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát magammal hoztam.
(lit. It was a mistake that Lola with me I brought.)
- (11) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát hoztam el ide.
(lit. It was a mistake that it was Lola whom I brought here.)
- (12) Hiba volt, hogy Lolát elhoztam ide.
(lit. It was a mistake that Lola was brought here by me.)
- (13) Hiba volt magammal vinni Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake to take Lola with me.)
- (14) Hiba volt magammal hozni Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake with me to bring Lola.)
- (15) Hiba volt elvinni magammal Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake to take with me Lola.)
- (16) Hiba volt elhozni magammal Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake to bring with me Lola.)
- (17) Hiba volt elhozni ide Lolát.
(lit. It was a mistake to bring here Lola.)
- (18) Hiba volt Lolával jönni ide.
(lit. It was a mistake to come here particularly with Lola.)
- (19) Hiba volt Lolát vinni magammal.
(lit. It was a mistake to take particularly Lola with me.)
- (20) Hiba volt Lolát hozni magammal.
(lit. It was a mistake to bring particularly Lola with me.)
- (21) Hiba volt Lolát magammal hozni.
(lit. It was a mistake to bring Lola with me.)
- (22) Hiba volt Lolát magammal vinni.
(lit. It was a mistake to take Lola with me.)
- (23) Hiba volt Lolát hozni ide.
(lit. It was a mistake to bring particularly Lola here.)
- (24) Hiba volt Lolát elhozni ide. (lit. It was a mistake to bring Lola here.)

- (25) Tévedés volt ... (lit. It was faulty to ...)
- (26) Nem volt helyes ... (lit. It wasn't right to ...)
- (27) Nem kellett volna ... (lit. I needn't have ...)
- (28) Helytelen volt ... (lit. It was wrong to ...)
- (29) Nem lett volna szabad ... (lit. I shouldn't have ...)
- (30) Nem tettem jól, hogy ... (lit. I didn't do it right that ...)

We shall not continue listing the unrealised solutions, since we are far from having compiled a complete list. After starting the sentence by *Tévedés volt ...* ('It was faulty to ...'), *Nem volt helyes ...* ('It wasn't right ...'), *Helytelen volt ...* ('It was wrong to ...') all the 24 different continuations are possible; after starting the sentence by *Nem kellett volna ...* ('I needn't have ...') and *Nem lett volna szabad ...* ('I shouldn't have ...') only the 12 clausal variants can follow, but still the number of possible choices exceeds one hundred. These are grammatically well-formed sentences and all display the transfer operations triggered by the differences between the systems of the two languages. Taken out of the text, all of them can be translations of the English sentence *It was a mistake to take Lola here.*

Was the one the translator finally chose from the possibilities listed above the result of the translator's subjective decision alone? Not quite. We have said that the above variants may all be possible translations of the sentence under study taken out of the text. But only when taken out of the text.

Considering the full text, the number of options is substantially lower. **Emphasising** the proper name *Lola*, for example, by placing it into focus position does not make sense, because it would have been just as bad for the main hero to have taken anyone else to the scene where he spent his young days. As a result, all the Hungarian variants where the proper name *Lola* is in focus (cf. versions 6, 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 20, 23) may be disregarded.

The choice between the **infinitival phrase** and the **clause** is also not the result of a subjective decision either. Although theoretically both solutions produce a grammatically well-formed Hungarian sentence, the Hungarian translator has to change Indo-European nominal structures into clauses in Hungarian so often that she found the clausal version more "Hungarian sounding". This is probably why the translator disregarded versions 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.

Now we have only the lexical choices (*hiba* or *tévedés*, *hozni* or *vinni*, etc.) left. Here it is only the general characteristics of the genre (short story), the individual style of the author (Graham Greene), and the characteristic features of the short story itself (*The Innocent*) that influence selection.

The choice between *hoztamlvittem* ('brought'/'took') is determined by the storyteller's spatial and temporal position. Although the Hungarian equivalent of *take here* would be *hozni*, *elhozni*, *idehozni* ('bring', 'bring here') outside of the text, the storyteller relates his visit to his native town only **afterwards**, when he has already left the town. The forms *hoztam*, *elhoztam*, *idehoztam* would only be appropriate if the protagonist were still in the town at the time of speaking and if he were not only looking back but he would still be an active participant in the events. This is why the translator could not choose variants 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24. Version 6 also has to be excluded because of the position of the speaker: *Hiba volt, hogy Lolával jöttem ide.* ('It was a mistake, that I came here with Lola.').

As we can see, the number of possible solutions is gradually decreasing. If we exclude from the 24 *Hiba volt ...* versions those in which the emphasis is wrong, the ones which are not clausal, and the ones which contain an incorrect word regarding the position of the speaker, there remain only two more versions: version 1, chosen by the translator (*Hiba volt, hogy magammal vittem Lolát.*), and version 9, which is very close to version 1 (*Hiba volt, hogy Lolát magammal vittem.*).

As for the beginning of the sentence it is hard to choose from the various translations of *It was a mistake*: *Tévedés volt ...* ('*It was faulty to ...*'), *Nem volt helyes ...* ('*It wasn't right ...*') *Helytelen volt ...* ('*It was wrong to...*') *Nem kellett volna ...* ('*I needn't have ...*') and *Nem lett volna szabad ...* ('*I shouldn't have ...*'), because all of them can be naturally aligned with the next sentence in the narration: *I knew it the moment we alighted from the train at the small country station.* The translator chose the translation *Hiba volt...* probably because this was the simplest solution. Her choice may be explained by a widely held and followed maxim among translators, which says: "Always choose the simplest solution, don't depart from the original unnecessarily, beware of overtranslation!" In the light of this statement, the most obvious translation of *It was a mistake* is *Hiba volt...*, and the translator had no reason to opt for a more complicated solution.

One might raise the question here whether we are not overcomplicating the process of translation. It is most unlikely that the translator considered several dozens of solutions before translating this simple English sentence. It is more probable that she wrote down the version that we selected after a lengthy process of analysis without giving it too much thought. One cannot tell whether the choice between *hoztamlvittem*, or the one between the infinitival structure and the clausal variant was conscious or not. The identification, description and explanation of transfer operations, however, may shed light upon the objective regularities behind the seemingly subjective decisions of the translator. The fact that translators do not always consciously do what they do does not mean that it is not interesting to describe from the point of view of translation studies what they actually do.

2. The classification of transfer operations

Transfer operations can be classified in several ways: according to the cause, aim, level, nature, etc. of the operation. Probably because of the complex nature of translation, all existing classifications represent a mixture of the different aspects. Suffice it to mention “equivalence” as one of the seven main translation “procedures” in Vinay and Darbelnet’s system. Before we present our own classification, however, it might be helpful to survey the various possible classifications and to assess their advantages and disadvantages.

2.1. Obligatory and optional transfer operations

We shall distinguish between **obligatory** and **optional** transfer operations. Obligatory transfer operations are those performed by translators due to the differences between the lexical and grammatical systems of the two languages. These are considered obligatory because without them the translator would produce semantically or grammatically ill-formed sentences. Optional transfer operations are those performed over and above obligatory transfer operations.

This division hides the following pitfalls. It is unclear what the word “obligatory” exactly refers to: is it only to the source-language form that must be transformed, or does it also mean that it is obligatory to choose a particular target-language equivalent. It is important to note that a source-language form to be obligatorily transformed (cf. for example, the Hungarian translation of possessive structures in Indo-European languages) can have numerous equivalents in the target-language (possessive adjectival phrase, post-positioned adjectival structure, compound word, etc.), which do not or only partly depend on the source-language form to be transformed. In other words, the choice between them is not determined by the source-language form, but by completely different considerations. Even so (and this is a crucial point), such transformations cannot be considered optional transfer operations.

2.2. Automatic and non-automatic transfer operations

We can also make a distinction between **automatic** and **non-automatic** transfer operations. Automatic transfer operations are those that are (or should be) obligatorily performed by translators as a result of differences between the systems of the two languages. In the case of translation from English into Hungarian, translators automatically omit English prepositions and insert Hungarian inflections and postpositions, change word order, etc., while the replacement of infinitives and participles by finite verb phrases in the translation is not always an obligatory transfer operation.

Distinguishing automatic transfer operations from the rest is important because if they are always automatically performed their teaching may be unnecessary in translator training. It would be enough to merely call trainees' attention to these operations, and even such awareness-raising might be more interesting for linguists than for trainees. Oddly enough, however, although translators perform some of these transfer operations automatically, sometimes even the simplest transfer operation may cause difficulties, such as the insertion of an article. It often happens in the case of novice translators that they translate Russian tables of contents almost entirely without articles inserting in the Hungarian text. This means that the extent to which a transfer operation may be considered automatic greatly depends on the competence of the translator. For beginner translators even the insertion of an article might not come automatically, while an experienced translator may automatically perform such complicated operations as the insertion into the target-language text of a contextual subject recovered from other parts of the text and not present in the given sentence.

2.3. Classification according to level of operation

Transfer operations may be classified according to the level at which they are carried out. Thus we may distinguish **word-level**, **phrase-level**, **sentence-level**, and **discourse-level** transfer operations. **Word-level** transfer operations refer to the replacement of source-language lexical units with target-language lexical units, **phrase-level** transfer operations are, for example, changing the word order within adjectival phrases, **sentence-level** transfer operations are, for instance, changing the passive in English into an active structure in the Hungarian translation, and **discourse-level** transfer operations involve, for example, the unification of subjects, within the paragraph.

The danger of this classification is that many times even a simple passive-active change within a sentence may be determined by the whole text. Of course, there are clear cases of discourse-level transfer operations. These are, for instance, the specification or abbreviation of sentence-initial thematic subjects to maintain coherence in the translation, or the specification of references in the translation of dramatic dialogues. Since the translator may have constant access to the mental representation of the whole text, it is hard to decide at which level a seemingly word-level transfer operation was actually performed.

2.4. Classification according to the scope and cause of the operation

Russian literature on translation theory (Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Shveitser 1973) usually makes a distinction between **lexical**, **grammatical**, and potentially **stylistic or pragmatic** transfer operations. **Lexical** transfer operations are the following: (1) differentiation and specification (identifying the context-bound sense of a polysemous source-language word and then selecting an equivalent with a narrower sense for the target-language text), (2) generalisation (using a target-language item with a wider sense than the source-language item), (3) conceptual expansion

(e.g., the replacement of a word denoting the cause of a process in the source-language with a word that denotes its consequence in the target-language), (4) antonymous translation (rendering a source-language word by a negated target-language word which is opposite in meaning to the source-language word), (5) total transformation (the replacement of a source-language word with a target-language word that carries a completely different meaning), (6) compensation (rendering the meaning of a source-language word at a different place, using different means) (Retsker 1974).

Grammatical transfer operations are generally grouped into four categories: (1) replacements, (2) transpositions, (3) insertions, (4) omissions. Within these four categories, depending on language pair and the direction of the translation, several subgroups may be identified (Vaseva 1980).

We have also mentioned **stylistic and pragmatic** transfer operations. **Stylistic** transfer operations are necessitated by the requirements of the genre or text type. Even though Russian-Hungarian translations are often characterised by the transfer operation that change the passive verbs into the active, this operation cannot be performed without considering the genre. Although in literary translations it is desirable to perform this change, in scientific texts one must not forget that Hungarian academic prose also tends to sound impersonal, in the same way as English or Russian. The only difference is that it reaches this impersonal tone using different means, and not the passive or nominal phrases. According to this view, the choice between the various forms of expressing impersonality in Hungarian (e.g., first and third person plural verb form, infinitive) may be considered to be a stylistic transfer operation.

Pragmatic transfer operations are necessitated by the requirements of the target-language culture. Although, for instance, Russian diminutive suffixes can easily be translated into Hungarian using morphological devices (*teácska, vizecske, vodkácska, vagonocska* etc.), if the use of the diminutive suffix in Hungarian is considerably less common than in Russian, then the number of people who would use it will also be lower both with respect to sex and age. Middle-aged men in Hungary, for example, cannot use diminutive suffixes, because it would not suggest the informal relationship between them as in Russian: it would make them sound childish and simple-minded instead. In such cases, the author's intention should be rendered by other means, i.e., by the use of pragmatic transfer operations, or pragmatic "adaptation".

The classification according to lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, and stylistic transfer operations also suffers from certain **weaknesses**. What do "lexical" or "grammatical" transfer operations exactly refer to? Do they refer to the scope or to the cause of the operation? If they refer to its **scope**, then all the transfer operations, which affect the lexical elements of the sentence, can be considered lexical irrespective of the cause of the operation. If they refer to its **cause**, then all the transfer operations, which are triggered by the different lexico-semantic systems of the two languages, may be called lexical, even if they affect several words.

The same dilemma applies to the term "grammatical transfer operations". If they refer to **scope** of operation, then all the transfer operations, which affect the grammatical structure of the sentence, can be considered as grammatical ones, independently of the cause of the operation. If they refer to **cause** of operation, then all the transfer operations, which are caused by the different grammatical systems

of the two languages may be called grammatical, even if they affect only one word in the sentence.

The status of stylistic and pragmatic transfer operations is also unclear in this classification, because genre-specific and cultural differences are manifested in the lexical units and grammatical structure selected for the target-language sentence. This calls our attention to the paradox that lexical correspondences which cannot be found in bilingual dictionaries become examples illustrating stylistic and pragmatic transfer operations.

2.5. Classification according to the manner of operation

The problem whether the nature or the cause of the operation should serve the basis of classification is solved to a certain extent by Barkhudarov, who categorises transfer operations based on the **manner** in which they are performed, i.e., based on their “technical performance”: **transposition** (perestanovka), **replacement** (zamena), **omission** (opushchenie), and **addition** (dobavlenie); and within these categories he distinguishes lexical or grammatical replacements, lexical and grammatical insertions, etc. (Barkhudarov 1975: 191). This classification forms the basis of the operational typology discussed below.

2.6. What can be considered a transfer operation?

The most important question is what exactly may be considered a transfer operation? Can all the operations carried out by the translator to transform the source-language text into the target-language text be regarded as transfer operations, or should we narrow down the scope of transfer operations?

There are two ways to “narrow” it down. One of them regards those operations as transformations (or transpositions, etc.), which must be performed by the translator as a result of the lexical and grammatical differences between the systems of the two languages (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, Catford 1965, Newmark 1982). The other view narrows the scope even further: according to this view, the operations which are performed due to the differences between the systems of the languages should also be excluded, since they must be carried out anyway and translators perform them automatically. Only those operations are worth researching which are not induced by differences between language systems, but by differences in stylistic traditions, or are made necessary because of the expectations of target-language audiences, etc.

In this regard we shall adopt the broader view of transfer operations: all operations conducted by the translator in order to transform the source-language text into the target-language text are considered transfer operations. The following two questions are related to this issue.

Question 1: Is it worth dealing with **obligatory** transfer operations (e.g., changing the word order in translating possessive structures from English, German, and Russian into Hungarian and vice versa), knowing that without such transformations the translator cannot produce a well-formed target-language sentence, so he/she has to perform them anyway?

We believe that the obligatory nature of transfer operations only means the ability to distance oneself from the source-language text and not to actually **select the target-language equivalent**. In the case of obligatory transfer operations, the only thing that is clear for the translator is that “this way is not viable”; but the way leading to the best solution out of several alternatives will depend on a number of factors.

Question 2: Is it worth dealing with transfer operations generally performed on an **automatic** basis by translators (e.g., the insertion of an article when translating from a language which does not use articles into one that does, omission of the object in translating into Hungarian made possible by the existence in Hungarian of the transitive declension, etc.)?

In our opinion, dealing with automatic transfer operations is worth the effort partly because for novice translators many operations are not automatic, and partly because an interesting asymmetry can be observed with regard to automaticity depending on the direction of translation. It often happens that the insertion of a particular grammatical category is automatic in one direction (e.g., the insertion of the personal pronoun in translating from Hungarian into English, French, German, and Russian) whereas its omission is not automatic in the other direction.

2.7. The operational typology developed in this book

Now that we have decided to treat every change that the translator carries out in order to “transform” the source text into the target text as a transfer operation, we must also decide what basis we shall use for a typology of operations. One possible classification, as mentioned before, divides transfer operations into word-level, phrase-level, sentence-level, and discourse-level operations. In our view, these levels are extremely hard to distinguish in the process of translation. Thus, we must specify whether we are looking at translation as a **product** or as a **process**. If we speak about translation as a product, we may legitimately investigate at which level equivalence is realised (Komissarov 1980, Baker 1992). If, however, we speak about translation as a process, it is very hard to determine the various levels of the translator’s decisions, i.e., to identify the exact level at which the selection of the target-language equivalents took place. Therefore, the “level of decision” does not serve as a basis for classification: it is only taken in providing explanations.

Another possible classification divides transfer operations into lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and pragmatic transfer operations. Here we must note first of all that the terms “lexical” and “grammatical” in this context are ambiguous. They may refer to the **scope** of the operation (depending on whether it affects the lexical or grammatical elements of the sentence) or to the **cause** of the operation (the lexical or grammatical differences between the systems of the two languages). This ambiguity, however, cannot and need not be avoided, since it reflects an ambiguity that exists in reality. As will be seen later in this book, one of the interpretations (scope) is used in the classification, in determining the two main types, while the other interpretation (cause) is used in explaining the operations and providing a rationale for them.

As regards the status of stylistic or pragmatic transfer operations, these may be claimed not to exist by themselves, since they can only be manifested in lexical or grammatical changes. Therefore, in this case it is the cause of the operation that

counts and not its nature. Thus, we do not consider stylistic or pragmatic aspects starting points either, we only take them into consideration in the explanations.

Finally, it was decided that confusion among the various aspects can only be avoided if we concentrate on the “operational” nature of transfer operations, and the manner of their performance; this means that their “technical performance” will serve as the basis for classification. Therefore the cornerstones of our typology will be the following operations: broadening, narrowing, contraction, division, omission, addition, transposition and replacement.

2.8. Main types and types

In the description of the types of the above operations it was possible to clearly distinguish **lexical** operations from operations affecting **grammatical** structure. By way of illustration, let us take the case of addition. If the word *foljó* (‘river’) is inserted into the text next to the name of a river, (due to lacking background knowledge on the part of the target-language reader), this will be categorised as lexical addition, since it does not affect the structure of the sentence. If, however, a multicomponential nominal phrase is “eased” by the addition of the present participle *foljó* (‘going on’), then it will obviously be regarded as a grammatical transfer operation affecting the structure of the sentence, even if only one word is inserted into the text of the translation.

This made the distinction between lexical and grammatical transfer operations relatively simple. The only question that remained to be decided is whether lexical and grammatical transfer operations should be distinguished within transfer operations as main types (e.g., whether within addition one should distinguish between lexical addition and grammatical addition), or the individual transfer operations should be classified as types under the two main types, the lexical and grammatical transfer operations. Finally, the latter version was chosen, and within lexical and grammatical transfer operations as the two main types, we identified ten types of lexical and seven types of grammatical transfer operations.

Main types (classification according to the scope of the operation)

1. Lexical transfer operations
2. Grammatical transfer operations

Types (classification according to manner of performance)

The types of lexical transfer operations

- 1.1. Narrowing of meaning (differentiation and specification)
- 1.2. Broadening of meaning (generalisation)
- 1.3. Contraction of meanings
- 1.4. Distribution of meaning
- 1.5. Omission of meaning
- 1.6. Addition of meaning
- 1.7. Exchange of meaning
- 1.8. Antonymous translation
- 1.9. Total transformation
- 1.10. Compensation

2. The types of grammatical transfer operations

- 2.1. Grammatical specification and generalisation
- 2.2. Grammatical division
- 2.3. Grammatical contraction
- 2.4. Grammatical omission
- 2.5. Grammatical addition
- 2.6. Grammatical transpositions
- 2.7. Grammatical replacements

2.9. Subtypes

The two main types and the 17 types provide an appropriate framework to systematise, define, describe, and explain more than a hundred transfer operations (subtypes) performed by translators in translating from Hungarian into English, French, German and Russian and vice versa. In determining, describing, and explaining the subtypes, some factors that have not been regarded as essential in the typology will gain importance.

The two **main types** of transfer operations were thus distinguished on the basis of the **scope** of the transfer operations (whether the operation affected the lexical or the grammatical elements of the sentence), the 17 **types** were distinguished on the basis of the **manner of performance** (omission, addition, division, contraction, etc.), and in defining the **subtypes** several factors were considered, especially the **causes** of particular transfer operations: **linguistic** causes (the differences in the lexical and grammatical systems of the given languages, their discursal peculiarities, stylistic traditions, etc.) and **extra-linguistic** causes (the differences between the historical, geographical, social, cultural, etc. traits of the source-language and target-language community) alike.

3. Transfer operations from the point of view of the translator

In this section, we shall approach transfer operations from the point of view of the translator. As mentioned before, in classifying transfer operations we intend to concentrate on the actual “technical performance” of the operation (omission, addition, narrowing, broadening, etc.), and in explaining them we shall consider linguistic (lexical, grammatical, stylistic) and extralinguistic (cultural, historical, geographical, etc.) differences. However, we have not yet tackled two important aspects in the discussion: the study of translation as a **special bilingual speech activity** and the study of the translator as a **professional language mediator**.

The most important feature of translation as a bilingual speech activity is code switching, which has its own specific characteristics (cf. natural losses, the role of redundancy, the role of the channel, etc.) irrespective of the language pair and the direction of translation. Approaching translation from the point of view of communication theory is not a new departure in the theory of translation, it was especially thoroughly studied in the 70s (Kade 1968). There is, though, a new focus in translation studies represented by research on the existence of transfer operations that translators **always** apply in the case of code switching, when moving from one language to the other, irrespective of the language pair, the genre, and the direction of translation (cf. translation universals, Baker 1993).

Let us have a look at the main principles followed by translators as professional language mediators in their everyday work.

3.1. The principle of following the target-language norm

The aim of the translator as a professional language mediator is to facilitate communication between two communities who speak different languages. Due to this mediator role, translators develop certain **characteristic forms of behaviour**. The principal goal of the translator as language mediator is to make sure that the information is passed on to the target-language reader, and he/she adjusts his/her whole activity to this purpose. Therefore, the translator follows certain **general translation principles** and is guided by these principles in choosing the most suitable solution from among the different target-language options available.

The most important principle of translation is to **take into consideration the target-language reader**. To make sure that the target-language reader understands the translation, the translator must follow the norms of the target-language. This may be called the **principle of following the target-language norm**. Naturally, there are translators for whom the **principle of respecting the source-language text** is stronger and thus they reject the target-language norms, but such translators remain in minority.

3.2. The principle of cooperation

If the translator can choose from among several solutions, all of which conform to the target-language norm equally well, then he/she will opt for the more explicit alternative.

Translation studies devotes more and more attention today to the research on **explicitation** (Blum-Kulka 1986, Klaudy 1998a). Explicitation is defined as expressing something in the target-language text in a clearer and more open manner, and possibly with the help of more words than in the source-language text. Research on explicitation has recently become a central issue due to the fact that the use of gigantic, several-million-word computer corpora allows the identification of the **universal** characteristics of translated texts (Baker 1995).

If empirical data support the assumption that explicitation is more typical in translation than implicitation, then one may rightly ask why. In seeking explicitation, the translator, in our view, is guided by the **principle of cooperation**. This is not meant exactly in the Gricean (1975) sense, since the cooperative principle characterising human conversation presupposes the cooperation of two parties present, whereas in translation there is a special type of interaction, where the receiver is absent.

In translation the principle of cooperation is realised with a receiver who is not present. Since the reception of translation is not realised directly and immediately, that is, the translator receives no direct feedback, he/she will use all possible means (explanations, additions, supplementations) to enhance the comprehensibility of the target-language text. The translator generally **relies less on the readers' imagination** than authors of original texts do, preferring to "play it safe", and one means of playing it safe is by using the strategy of explicitation.

3.3. The principle of following the translation norm

The translator, as a professional linguistic mediator, is not only a mediator, but also a **professional**: he/she has a profession (or trade), which has its own rules that he/she has mastered either via organised training or through oral tradition.

The immense translational experience of previous generations has always been handed down from one generation of translators to the next, even at times when there was no translator training. Many of the operations are performed by translators because that is how they have seen their elders do it and that is what the experienced translator or editor taught them when he/she looked at their trial translations. The principle of following tradition is also a principle that can guide translators in their decisions. Tradition is sometimes more highly valued by translators than the target-language norm, which raises the possibility of the existence of a "**translation norm**" beside the target-language norm. This means that we can also speak of the **principle of following the translation norm**.

"Normativity" is a delicate question in translation studies. Earlier, the creators of linguistic translation studies distinguished it from literary translation studies by claiming that linguistic description is free of normativity, is not prescriptive, and does not deal with what good translations *should be* like but what translations *are*

like in general. In other words, they identified normativity with prescriptivity (cf. Revzin and Rozentsveig 1964, Komissarov 1980, more recently Hermans 1991). Many disagree with this view nowadays (Chesterman 1993), and emphasise the descriptive nature of norm research.

It was undoubtedly Gideon Toury who again legitimised norm research in translation studies (1980). He pointed to the fact that translators have an infinite number of possible alternatives that they could use (translator competence) but their actual solutions (translator performance) follow certain regular patterns. This is called translation norm, which can be studied empirically. Translation norm includes the conventions followed by translators at a given time, in a given style, and among particular circumstances.

Norm research, following Toury's work, has produced an ever increasing body of literature (Harris 1990, Delabastita 1991, Nord 1991, Chesterman 1993). Andrew Chesterman offers an especially detailed overview of the problem of norm in a study entitled *From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies*, in which he discusses how descriptive translation research should move from the concept of "is" to the concept of "ought". In other words, he claims that rules need to be formulated, since if a particular group of people, considered as translators by society, behaves in a certain manner under particular circumstances, then this will become the norm for those who wish to join this group.

We intend to follow a descriptive approach as much as possible. Thus, in using the term **norm** or **translation norm**, we shall refer to the descriptive notion of norm, which means that under particular circumstances translators tend to use particular solutions in their translations.

3.4. General transfer strategies

The general principles (following the target-language norm, the principle of cooperation, following the translation norm) imply certain **general transfer strategies**, according to which translators plan and perform their activities irrespective of the language they translate from or into and the type of text being translated.

Transfer strategies are **particular series of transfer operations** carried out by translators consciously in order to transform the source text into the target-language text. The assumption that such transfer strategies exist does not, of course, provide a solution to every translation problem, but in certain cases it might provide an explanation for certain choices made by the translator. Since we regard explicitation as one of the most characteristic general transfer strategies, we shall deal with it in more detail.

3.5. Explicitation as a general transfer strategy

Explicitation is a technique whereby information that is implicit in the source text is made explicit in the target text. Explicitation (implication) strategies are generally discussed together with addition (omission) strategies (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958). Some scholars regard "addition" as the more generic and "explicitation" as the more specific concept (Nida 1964), while others interpret "explicitation" as

the broader concept which incorporates the more specific concept of “addition” (Seguinot 1988, Schjoldager 1995). The two are treated as synonyms by Englund Dimitrova who uses the terms “addition-explicitation” and “omission-implicitation” (Englund Dimitrova 1993).

The concept of explicitation was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet, who included a glossary of translation techniques in their book, which contains the following definition of explicitation: explicitation is “a process which consists of introducing information into the target-language which is present implicitly in the source-language, but it can be derived from the context or the situation” (1995: 352.) They give a definition of implicitation as well: implicitation is a “process which consists of letting the target-language situation or context define certain details which were explicit in the source-language” (ibid: 344). Defining the units of explicitation/ implicitation as gains and losses they mention among others, that due to the lack of gender in Hungarian, part of the meaning of the English personal pronoun ‘she’ is lost in Hungarian translation.

The concept of explicitation was further developed by Nida, without using the term “explicitation” itself. Nida deals with the techniques of adjustment used in the process of translating. The main techniques of adjustment identified in his work are additions, subtractions and alterations. He lists the following types of additions: *a)* filling out elliptical expressions; *b)* obligatory specification; *c)* additions required because of grammatical restructuring; *d)* amplification from implicit to explicit status; *e)* answers to rhetorical questions; *f)* classifiers; *g)* connectives; *h)* categories of the receptor language which do not exist in the source-language; *i)* doublets (1964: 227).

“Amplification from implicit to explicit status” in Nida’s work is one of the various kinds of additions required in translation. It takes place when “important semantic elements carried implicitly in the source-language may require explicit identification in the receptor language” (1964: 228). He lists several examples from Bible-translation to illustrate the range and variety of this type of addition. For example “... *queen of the South*” (Luke 11: 31) can be very misleading when neither ‘*queen*’ nor ‘*South*’ is familiar in the receptor language... Accordingly, in Tarascan one must say “*woman who was ruling in the south country*” (1964: 229).

Throughout the 1970s and the 1980s most of the authors who wrote on the subject of “partial translation theories”, especially in the field of “language-restricted, area-restricted and culture-restricted theories” (the terms introduced by Holmes 1972) in discussing additions and omissions in translation mention explicitation only in passing or in a broad sense as the transformation of implicit information into explicit information and vice versa, as one of the many reasons for additions and omissions.

The Russian term “*eksplitsirovanie*” (‘explicitation’) was introduced by Komissarov in 1969. The terms “*eksplitsirovanie*” (‘explicitation’) and “*implitsirovanie*” (‘implicitation’) became widely used in Russian translation studies in connection with the text-linguistic approach to translation (Shveitser 1988a).

It was Blum-Kulka who first examined this phenomenon systematically, introducing the term “explicitation hypothesis” (1986). Applying the concepts and terms of discourse analysis, she explored discourse-level explicitation, that is, explicitation connected with shifts in cohesion and coherence (overt and covert textual

markers) in translation. Shifts in cohesive markers can be partly attributed to the different grammatical systems of languages (for instance, in English-French translation markedness for gender makes the French text more explicit), and partly to the differences in stylistic preferences for various types of cohesive markers (in English-Hebrew translation, for instance, the preference for lexical repetition instead of pronominalisation makes the Hebrew text more explicit). Blum-Kulka suggests that shifts on the level of cohesion may change the general level of textual explicitness in the target text:

The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text, which is more redundant than SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as “the explicitation hypothesis”, which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation (1986: 19).

Critical remarks on Blum-Kulka’s explicitation hypothesis were made by Seguinot in 1988. Firstly, she finds the definition too narrow, stating that “explicitness does not necessarily mean redundancy” (108). Secondly, she points out that “the greater number of words in French translation, for example, can be explained by well-documented differences in the stylistics of English and French” (*ibid.*). She would reserve the term “explicitation” for additions, which cannot be explained by structural, stylistic or rhetorical differences between the two languages.

According to her argumentation, addition is not the only device of explicitation. Explicitation takes place not only when “something is expressed in the translation, which was not in the original” (*ibid.*), but also in cases when “something which was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text, is overtly expressed in the translation, or an element in the source text is given a greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice” (*ibid.*).

Seguinot examined translations from English into French and from French into English, and in both cases she has found greater explicitness in translation, which was the result of improved topic-comment links, the addition of linking words, and raising subordinate information into coordination. The greater explicitness in both cases, according to her research, could be explained not by structural or stylistic differences between the two languages but by the editing strategies of the revisers.

In 1989 the Finnish scholar, Vehmas-Lehto brings up the issue of explicitation in her book on the quasi-correctness of Finnish journalistic texts translated from Russian. Examining the frequency of connective elements in translated Finnish texts in comparison with authentic Finnish texts she argues that “...considering the many inevitable losses in cohesion which take place in the process of translation, one might ask whether the Finnish translations would be much worse even if they contained more connectives than the authentic Finnish texts” (204).

The author points out the greater explicitness of Finnish translation in comparison not with Russian originals but with authentic Finnish texts, thus suggest-

ing an entirely new idea: translated target-language texts are more explicit than authentic target-language texts of the same register, because of the use of explicitation strategies.

In Hewson and Martin's view, the implicating/explicating technique "consists in shifting certain elements from the linguistic to the situational level and vice versa" (1991: 104). They illustrate their argumentation by examples of drama translations, where "meaningful elements are transferred from situation into the staging text (stage directions) or integrated into character's words" (*ibid.*).

In the 1990s, explicitation research gained a new impetus from the experimental study of consecutive and simultaneous interpretation. In the case of interpretation, time pressure may make implicitation strategies (compression, condensation) more important than explicitation strategies (Schjoldager 1995).

The concept of translation-specific explicitations is related to the explicitation hypothesis according to which translations are always longer than the originals, regardless of the languages concerned (Blum-Kulka 1986, Seguinot 1988). The validity of this hypothesis can be proved by "large scale of empirical studies ... by examining different types of interlanguages, from those produced by language learners to the products of both non-professional and professional translators" (Blum-Kulka 1988: 19).

New results in explicitation research can be expected from the use of experimental methods in translation studies (Tourey 1991). Collecting introspective data in the investigation of the translation process, and the analysis of think aloud protocols are particularly promising (Krings 1986, Lörchner 1991).

Finally, crucial quantitative evidence can be expected from the use of computerised corpora, especially parallel and comparable corpora (Baker 1993). Only massive quantitative data can substantiate the validity of the "explicitation hypothesis", by confirming that although explicitations and implicitations, additions and omissions are inseparably intertwined in the process of translation, yet the tendency of explicitation in translation is always stronger than the tendency of implicitation, regardless of language pair, direction, registers, etc.

3.6. Specific transfer strategies

3.6.1. Language specific transfer strategies

It would be a mistake to conclude from the above that the translators' professional competence is manifested solely in the application of general translation strategies. The translator is not only a "professional mediator" but also a "**language mediator**".

It is part of the translator's professional competence that he/she has developed his/her own individual strategies to overcome difficulties resulting from the differences between the two languages. It is part of his/her professional competence to be able to "move freely" between the two languages, to be able to move from the thought to the linguistic form and from the linguistic form to the thought in two different ways. Therefore he/she does not only use general translation strategies but also **language pair specific transfer strategies**. The facile and routine-like application of these transfer strategies distinguishes translators from simple monolingual speakers or from bilingual speakers who are not professional mediators.

The skill of being able to use transfer strategies is often called translating routine and is evaluated negatively, despite the fact that the **routine of transfer** is an inseparable part of the translator's competence.

The basis of **language specific** transfer strategies is the routine-like use of transfer operations developed to **overcome difficulties resulting from differences between languages**.

3.6.2. Culture specific transfer strategies

Translators are not only linguistic but many times also "**cultural mediators**" in the broadest possible sense of the word. It is also part of the translators' professional competence that they know two cultures, and can compare and assess the geographical, historical, social, and cultural aspects of two language communities. Thus they do not merely have language pair specific transfer strategies, but they have also developed strategies to bridge the gaps between different cultures.

The routine-like use of transfer operations developed by the translator to **bridge cultural gaps** serves as the basis for **culture specific** transfer strategies.

3.7. Individual transfer strategies

During their translation practice, translators develop their own **individual strategies** as well. Some translators, for instance, "chop up" the sentences while others would never do so because the principle of respecting the source-language text is more important for them than the principle of respecting the target-language reader (for more on this issue, see GR 2.1). Certain translators "augment" lexical elements, for example reporting verbs, and others find it unacceptable, because for them the principle of respecting the source-language text is stronger than the principle of following the translation norm (for more on this issue, see LEX 1.3). There are some translators who keep "verbalising" structures, whereas others only do so depending on the genre, because they consider abiding by the "genre norm" more important than following the "translation norm" (for more on this issue, see GR 7.4.1). In other words, in addition to general transfer strategies we must also reckon with individual transfer strategies.

4. A framework for an Indo-European-Hungarian transfer typology

Four languages – English, French, German, and Russian – will be contrasted with Hungarian which is a Finno-Ugric language, and will be briefly referred to as **Indo-European languages** (abbreviated as **IE** languages). Despite the systemic differences inside the IE group, we decided to treat them together in relation to Hungarian. Our decision was based (1) on the literature on language typology, (2) experiences of practising translators, editors of translations and translator trainers, and (3) the evidence of our corpus.

Data collection began in the 80s (cf. Klaudy 1991a. *Transfer Operations in Translation*. Budapest: College of Foreign Trade), long **before** corpus studies became common in translation studies. Therefore, when we use the word “corpus”, “parallel corpus”, “multilingual corpus” we do not refer to a collection of machine-readable texts, as described in Baker (1993, 1995).

4.1. Language-typological reasons

It is commonly known from the literature on language typology that the lexical and grammatical systems of the four IE languages under investigation differ in similar ways in their basic features from the lexical and grammatical system of Hungarian (cf. the analytical morphological and lexical structuring in IE languages versus the synthetic morphological and lexical structuring in Hungarian, synthetic sentence structuring in IE languages vs analytical sentence structuring in Hungarian, dominantly SVO basic word order in IE languages vs dominantly SOV basic word order in Hungarian, the complementation of nominal structures to the left in Hungarian vs. their complementation to the right in IE languages, subject-prominence in English vs. topic-prominence in Hungarian, etc., cf. Bárczi 1975, Dezső, 1980, 1982b, Ferenczy 1973, É Kiss 1982). On the basis of all of this, contrasting the four IE languages as a group with Hungarian seemed a legitimate undertaking.

4.2. Experience as a practising translator

I was also stimulated to do so by my experience as a translator and translator-trainer. Generations of Hungarian translators have passed on their experience about potential trouble spots translating from English, French, German and Russian into Hungarian. These intuitive, experience-based observations strongly **resemble** one another. Various pieces of advice – to “verbalise” (i.e., use verbs), to use “*hogy*” (‘that’), to “chop up” sentences, to use the singular for paired organs, to search for active subjects, etc. – all came in handy for translators, independently of whether they were translating from English, French, German or Russian. These

intuitive explanations contained a lot of very witty intuitive observations about the differences between Hungarian and IE languages:

- (1) “Hungarian likes to use verbs when IE languages use nouns.”
- (2) “Hungarian likes to use active when IE languages use passive.”
- (3) “When you translate from IE languages into Hungarian you have to begin the translation from the end of the sentence.”
- (4) “Hungarian cannot manage the long chains of complements in preposition to the nouns.”
- (5) “IE languages force Hungarian to use this long nominal chain, but we do not like it.”
- (6) “IE languages cannot evoke the whole richness of Hungarian verbs.”
- (7) “When translating from Indo-European languages an impoverishment of the Hungarian language takes place – against which translators have to fight etc.”

As a novice translator I myself also got similar advice from the readers and editors of Európa Publishing Company. These views were so unanimously held by writers, poets, translators, readers and editors working there that I felt as if there existed a “translation norm” typical of Európa Publishing Company. So I decided to explore the linguistic basis of this translation norm, in order to describe it in a more systemic way and to use in my work as a translator trainer. Later on, acquainted with the practice of several Hungarian publishing companies I realised that this “translation norm” was followed not only at Európa Publishing Company, but was held widely in the Hungary’s translator community, even though no-one volunteered to codify it.

4.3. Evidence of the corpus

Since one of the main objectives of this book is to reveal the rules behind intuitive translator decisions and to linguistically describe the experience of several generations of translators, I was naturally also interested to see whether these four languages really behave in a similar way in being translated from or to Hungarian.

The data collected confirmed the assumption that the four Indo-European languages in many aspects “contrasted” with Hungarian in a similar way. I found the following example beautifully illustrating this phenomenon on the first page of a Budapest travel guide published by Corvina Publishing Company (for explanation see GR 4.3)

- Hol is kezdjük? (lit.: Where shall we start?) (Bart 1)
Where shall we begin *our journey*? (Gorman 1)
Par ou commencer *notre flaner*ie? (Chehádé 1)
Wo sollen wir *unseren Spaziergang* beginnen? (Dira 1)
Otkuda nachat’ *nasu progulku*? (Voronkina 1)

4.4. The difficulties of a joint investigation

Of course, I am aware of the abundant differences **inside** the IE group. The lexical and grammatical systems of all four Indo-European languages under investigation have their own typical features, which **distinguish** them from the others. These differences have been studied in detail by translation scholars: the specific problems of translation **within** the IE group were studied e.g., by: Vinay and Darbelnet 1959, 1995 (English-French), Hervey and Higgins 1992 (English-French), Adab 1993, 1996 (English-French), Doherty 1987, 1992 (English-German), Malblanc 1944, 1968 (French-German), Gak 1977 (French-Russian), Komisarov and Korolova 1990 (English-Russian), etc.

As for the internal differences within the IE group it is enough to think of the lack of the article or the difference between continuous and perfect verb forms in Russian, the obligatory second position of the verb, the sentence frame and related word order problems, or to refer to the possibilities of long compounds in German, or to mention the differences in word formation of English and German and so on.

The different traditions in the linguistic description of English, French, German, and Russian also caused problems. Let me illustrate this with a simple example. While Russian linguistic description distinguishes between adjectival participles (present, past, active, passive) and adverbial participles (perfect, continuous), German linguistic description only distinguishes the category of the present participle, and English grammars merely mention the various types of *-ing* form and *-ing* clause. I solved this problem by following the Hungarian tradition of linguistic description, sometimes, even forcing onto it the foreign language categories as well (for example I will use the distinction between “parts of speech” such as verb, noun, adjective, numbers, pronouns etc., and “parts of sentence” such as predicate, subject, object, attribute and adverb, which is strictly followed by the traditional Hungarian grammars, but not by English grammars).

It should also be mentioned that all along I tried to use the concepts and terminology of traditional descriptive grammars, in order to avoid confusion that might arise from different approaches to language description.

4.5. The framework of an IE-Hungarian transfer typology

Following the description of IE–Hungarian and Hungarian–IE transfer operations, the framework of a general Indo-European–Hungarian and Hungarian–Indo-European translation typology, or in other words, transfer typology is outlined, which has already been referred to sporadically, but has not yet been systematically studied on the basis of a large corpus.

The contrasts between Hungarian and English, French, German, and Russian are widely discussed in the literature (Hungarian–German: Juhász 1970, 1980, Hungarian–English: Dezsó and Nemser 1980, Dezsó 1982b, 1984, Stephanides 1986, 1989, Heltai 1992, Hungarian–Russian: Papp 1979), and investigations in language typology have also shown that with regard to certain universal traits (Greenberg 1963) the lexical and grammatical systems of Indo-European languages differ from the lexical and grammatical system of Hungarian in a similar fashion (Bárczi

1975, Dezsó 1982b), but no-one has applied this knowledge in the description of translational operations so far.

The examples also show (and we shall often refer to this in the summary comments at the end of each section) that in translations from Indo-European languages into Hungarian a typical **translation norm** can be observed, which is not always identical with the mother tongue norm, i.e., translators seem to insist on certain native language norms more than non-translator language users do.

4.6. The sources of the examples

We intended to work with a wide range of materials in constructing the transfer typology. We tried to include the translation of many texts and the work of several translators, because we did not want to explore special translation feats, but rather the typical solutions (cf. the difference described in I.1. regarding the linguistic and the literary approach).

The examples are taken from five languages (English, French, German, Russian and Hungarian) and eight directions of translation (English → Hungarian, Hungarian → English, French → Hungarian, Hungarian → French, German → Hungarian, Hungarian → German, Russian → Hungarian, Hungarian → Russian). Approximately 50 English, 50 French, 50 German, and 50 Russian literary works and their Hungarian translations, and about 100 Hungarian literary works and their 25 English, 25 French, 25 German, and 25 Russian translations, altogether about 300 book-length original work and their translations that is 600 literary works have been examined on the basis of given criteria, and the systematic analysis of the resulting note-cards (typed into a computer in the meantime) produced transfer types and subtypes.

Literary works were selected to avoid the database becoming quickly outdated. The masterpieces of Hungarian and world literature are only used as sources of language examples, and we do not intend to make relevant assumptions from the point of view of literary translation theory. The present discussion will not tackle the problem of how to translate Dickens, Balzac, Thomas Mann or Pasternak into Hungarian and Mikszáth, Krúdy, and Örkény into English, French, German, and Russian; instead, it will look at what happens to these languages and how these five languages **function together** during the process of translation.

After every example used in the book we shall indicate the page number, together with, in the case of an original work, the name of the author, and in the case of a translated work the name of the translator (e.g., Kafka 140, Györffy 141). If the same author has been translated several times by the same translator, then the source will include numbering as well (e.g., Mann 1. 234, Lányi 1. 23). The exact bibliographical data of the original works and the translations are listed, according to language pairs in the **Sources** section.

Part IV.

**LEXICAL TRANSFER
OPERATIONS**

Introduction to lexical transfer operations

The concept of lexical transfer operations used here is different from the concept of **techniques** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958/1995, Newmark 1982), **adjustments**, **procedures** (Nida 1964, Nida and Taber 1969), **shifts** (Catford 1965), **lexical transformations** (Shveitser 1973, Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Komissarov 1980, 1990, Vaseva 1980) used in the literature.

In our interpretation, “lexical transfer operations” is a collective term for all the systemic and routine-like operative moves developed by generations of translators to handle the difficulties stemming from the different lexical system and cultural context of the two languages functioning together in the process of translation.

Since the lexical systems of different languages reflect human experience in different ways, the lexical transfer operations carried out in translation may shed light on a number of interesting differences between languages. Some of these differences are described by **contrastive lexicography** and are recorded in **bilingual dictionaries**, but the huge number of lexical decisions translators make continuously in the course of their work cannot be foreseen by contrastive lexicographers or recorded in a bilingual dictionary. In investigating lexical operations, we are not concerned with the description of the differences between languages in terms of their lexical systems, but instead with the problem of how these systemic differences are brought into motion in the process of translation, and how they are handled in the daily routine of translators.

In discussing lexical operations we use the word “lexical” in two senses, referring both to the reason for and the scope of operations. We call them “lexical” because (1) these operations are triggered by the differences in the lexical systems of different languages, and (2) they influence the lexical structure of the sentence.

Lexical operations in translation are seemingly very simple, since the translator does nothing more but replaces an SL word with a TL word of identical meaning. Yet the term “identical meaning” immediately raises two difficulties. Can any word in any language be identical in its meaning with any other word in any other language? And is it indeed the meaning that has to remain unchanged in the course of translation?

It seems to be firmly embedded in public opinion that in translation it is the meaning that has to remain unchanged. Language teachers frequently advise students to “Translate the sentence so that its meaning is the same as in the original”. Even textbooks in linguistics frequently define translation as the replacement of a SL text with a TL text of the same meaning. Meaning is regarded as the invariant of translation also by some translation scholars (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, 1995, Barkhudarov 1975, Larson 1984).

As even a cursory overview of the problem of meaning in translation would make this introductory section prohibitively long, we shall content ourselves with

presenting our own interpretation of meaning. **Meaning** is just as much a characteristic of a given language as are its formal properties (e.g. morphology and syntax). The meaning of the English word *chair* will never be the same as that of the Hungarian word *szék* since the two linguistic communities relate them to reality according to two different rules of usage. Hungarian *szék* for instance – unlike English *chair* – cannot be used to refer to ‘the person, who is chosen to preside over a meeting or who is the permanent president of a committee, board’. As meaning in our interpretation is nothing else but the rule of usage of a linguistic sign **within** a given language, it cannot and should not remain unchanged in the process of translation.

What remains unchanged during translation is not the meaning but the **sense**. Sense is not the criteria for the usage of a linguistic sign within a given language, but the relationship between the linguistic sign and a certain segment of reality (objects, events, persons, phenomena) here and now, i.e. an **actual relationship** becoming manifest in a certain communicative situation. It is this relationship that translators **recreate** in the TL instead of retaining the SL meaning. A frequent source of errors in translation is that translators try to relate TL signs to reality according to SL rules of usage. This can be successful only very rarely.

Here is a simplified description of the mental operation behind the lexical transfer operation: the translator, who is familiar with the rules by which SL speakers relate SL words to reality (SL meaning), and also with the rules by which TL speakers relate TL words to reality (TL meaning) is looking for a word in the TL with the **same sense**. Having the same sense means that the selected TL item in **a given communicative situation** will be related to the **same segments of reality** by TL speakers, as the SL item. However, in order to achieve the same sense, the SL meaning will unavoidably undergo various changes. Thus, for example, if the use of the selected TL word is restricted to a narrower circle of things, objects, persons or phenomena, but has the same sense in the given communicative situation, translators consciously or unconsciously will resort to mentally narrowing the SL meaning, or in the reverse case, broaden the SL meaning in the course of translation.

This complex mental activity, leading to lexical choices, generally remains hidden not only for readers of translations, but also for translation scholars. Lexical transfer operations will always seem to be simple substitutions. Grammatical transfer operations are more spectacular since the sentence resulting from the translation process has an obviously identical or obviously different structure. In the case of lexical transfer operations, we can only speculate about the thought processes the translator has gone through in arriving at this seemingly simple lexical substitution.

Naturally, it is quite common that a lexical transfer operation is indeed nothing but a simple substitution. In the case of international nomenclature, names of institutions, geographical names, etc., finding the corresponding term in the TL is a matter of identification and not a matter of choice. According to Retsker (1974), translators encounter three kinds of correspondence relationships between SL and TL lexical items: (1) **constant correspondence** where a SL item has only **one** appropriate corresponding lexical item in the TL and the task of the translator is to **find** it; (2) **variant correspondence**, where a SL lexical item appears to have **several** corresponding lexical items in the TL and the task of the translator is to

select the one that will fit the given situation, and (3) **occasional correspondence**, in which case there is **no** corresponding lexical item in the TL and the task of the translator is to **create** one.

The effort to define a limited number of correspondences may be regarded as a simplified approach to the problems of translation characteristic of early translation studies. Retsker's categories, however, reflect the different degrees of **creativity** in secondary lexical choices. We will not deal here with constant correspondence and substitution, and will discuss only those lexical operations where the translator's task is not simply to find the corresponding TL word, but rather select it, or even create it – as a result of a complex problem-solving and decision-making activity.

1. Narrowing of meaning (differentiation and specification)

Lexical narrowing – or, in other terms, **spécification** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958), **konkretizatsiya** (Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975), **particularisation** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995) or **concretisation** (Klaudy 1996b), – is a standard transfer operation whereby the SL unit of a more general meaning is replaced by a TL unit of a more specific meaning. The term specification (or concretisation) is generally discussed together with differentiation since the narrowing of SL meaning is achieved by distinguishing the various meanings of the SL word (differentiation) and then by selecting one of them (specification or concretisation).

Differentiation and specification of meaning in translation can be explained partly by the differences in the mental mapping of the world and by the linguistic consequences of this phenomenon. Individual language communities segment times of the day, various parts of the body, colours, kinship relations and spatial structures differently. If parts of the body, parts of the day or kinship relations are more finely subdivided in the TL, i.e. there is a higher number of words in these semantic fields there than in the SL, the translator must first identify the meanings of the TL words and then select one, which will than be narrower than the meaning of the SL word, or to put it differently, **more specific**.

The linguistic consequences of different segmentation of the world have been termed “**interlingual asymmetry**” (Gak in Zlateva 1993, Russo 1997). The phenomenon of interlingual asymmetry is recorded in bilingual dictionaries. Narrowing of the meaning takes place when interlingual asymmetry is manifested in the “one to many” relationship: one SL word has two or more dictionary equivalents in the TL and the task of the translator is to choose the right one (cf. Retsker’s **variant correspondences** in Zlateva 1993).

Specification can also be explained by differences in the word formation systems of languages. One of the most characteristic features of the Hungarian lexical system is that a number of productive affixes are used to form verbs. Numerous verbal **prefixes** e.g., *alá-* (‘under’), *át-* (‘across’), *be-* (‘in’), *bele-* (‘into’), *benn-* (‘in’), *egybe-* (‘together’), *el-* (‘from’), *ellen-* (‘counter’), *elő-* (‘before’), *előre-* (‘before’), *fel/föl-* (‘up’), *félbe-* (‘half’), *félre-* (‘aside’), *felül-* (‘above’) etc. and **suffixes** (e.g., frequentative, diminutive, causative etc) can be fitted to verbs and in this way new words and new meanings can be created. According to some calculations, there are 40 different frequentative suffixes and 36 suffixes indicating instantaneous activity in Hungarian (Balázs 1997).

With the help of verbal prefixes and suffixes, Hungarian verbs can express the smallest nuances of the same action (cf. E: ‘fly’ → H: *száll, le-száll* (lit.*: down-

lit.: = literal translation (in the case of literal translations of words or short phrases we merely indicate it with inverted commas)

fly’). *fel-száll* (lit.: up-fly), *alá-száll* (lit.: under-fly), *el-száll* (lit.: off-fly), *tova-száll* (lit.: away-fly), *száll-dos* (lit.: fly about), *száll-ing-óz-ik* (lit.: fly down or settle down slowly, softly), *száll-dogál* (lit.: fly about). If translators want the language of translated Hungarian texts to be as rich as the language of original Hungarian texts, and if they want to make full use of the resources provided by Hungarian, they will probably need to use more specific verbs in Hungarian than those directly triggered by the original IE text.

As specification of meaning is generally an **optional** transfer operation, which is rarely suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, it presupposes some kind of decision-making on the part of translators, and can be regarded as a manifestation of the translator’s creativity.

The specification of meaning as a standard transfer operation can also be examined from the point of view of so called “translation universals” (Baker 1993, Laviosa 1998). If we recall Baker’s definition of **normalisation** as a universal feature of translated texts, specification fits in well with her definition: “Normalisation (or “conservatism”) is a tendency to exaggerate features of the target language and to conform to its typical patterns” (Baker 1993: 183). Specification in the IE-H direction and generalisation in the H-IE direction (see LEX 2) can be regarded as part of a broader, universal translation strategy of normalisation.

Subtypes:

- 1.1. Specification of parts of the body
- 1.2. Specification of reporting verbs
- 1.3. Specification of inchoative verbs
- 1.4. Specification of semantically depleted verbs

1.1. Specification of parts of the body

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The reason for the specification of body-parts in translation lies in the different segmentation of the human body by different language communities. Specification takes place when there is a more detailed lexical representation of the face, mouth, hand and leg in the TL than in the SL.

English makes a distinction between *face* and *cheek*, *hand* and *arm*, *foot* and *leg*, *mouth* and *lips*, French makes a distinction between *visage* and *joue*, *pied* and *jambe*, German makes a distinction between *Gesicht* and *Wange*, *Fuß* and *Bein*, *Mund* and *Lippe*, Russian between the *rot* and *gubi*, *litso* and *shcheka*, etc. Although Hungarian does make similar distinctions, the correspondents of the more specific terms are less commonly used. As a result in translating Hungarian *arc* into IE languages, translators often have to decide whether they are dealing with the whole or with a part (*face* or *cheek*, *Gesicht* or *Wange*, *visage* or *joue*, *litso* or *scheka*)

Hungarian → English:

arc (generic term in H) → *face/cheeks* (specific terms in E)

Hungarian ST: Megvizezte és megdörzsölte piros, tizenötéves leány *arcát* ... (Csáth 5)

English TT: She wet her ruddy, fifteen-year-old's **face**, rubbed it, ... (Kessler 115)

Commentary: Hungarian **arc** → English **face**

Hungarian ST: A hentes volt. Ragyás **arcú**, szép bajuszú, izmos parasztember. (Csáth 6)

English TT: The butcher. A brawny peasant: grand mustaches pockmarked **cheeks**. (Kessler 116)

Commentary: Hungarian **arc** → English **cheeks**

Hungarian → French:

arc (generic term in H) → **visage/joue** (specific terms in F)

Hungarian ST: **Arcok** vigyorogtak feléje, sok-sok kis **arc**, mely egyetlenegy óriási, ijedelmes bálványarccá fancsalodott. (Kosztolányi 27)

French TT: En face de lui, des **visages** ricanaient, beaucoup, beaucoup de petits **visages**, qui ne formaient plus, dans leur grimace, qu'une unique, énorme et effrayante figure d'idole. (Komoly 27)

Commentary: Hungarian **arc** → French **visage**

Hungarian ST: **Arcuk** olyan volt, mint a tejbe ejtett rózsa. (Kosztolányi 24)

French TT: Leurs **joues** étaient comme des roses trepées dans du lait. (Komoly 25)

Commentary: Hungarian **arc** → French **joue**

Similarly, the translator has to narrow/specify the Hungarian lexeme **száj** when translating into English, German, French, Russian and decide what to use in the IE text: **mouth** or **lips**, **Mund** or **Lippe**, **bouche** or **lèvres**, **rot** or **gubi**).

Hungarian → English:

száj (generic term in H) → **mouth/lips** (specific terms in E)

Hungarian ST: A lány most már tele **szájjal** kacagott, mintha csiklandozták volna. (Csáth 85)

English TT: Now she laughed with her **mouth** wide open as though she were being tickled. (Kessler 169)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → English **mouth**

Hungarian ST: De mégis ellágyult, és megcsókolta a lányt a **száján**. (Csáth 3)

English TT: Still, he was touched, and kissed her **lips**. (Kessler 203)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → English **lips**

Hungarian → German:

száj (generic term in H) → **Mund/Lippe** (specific terms in G)

Hungarian ST: Kövér és piros **szájú** volt, ... (Krúdy 111))

German TT: Sie war dick, und ihr **Mund** war rot, ... (Meyer 15)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → German **Mund**

Hungarian ST: A **szájában** hosszú cigarettát tartott, ... (Krúdy 111)

German TT: Zwischen den **Lippen** hielt sie eine lange Zigarette, ... (Meyer 15)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → German **Lippe**

Hungarian → Russian:

száj (generic term in H) → **rot/gubi** (specific terms in R)

Hungarian ST: Felelet helyett Leszik kitétotta a **száját**. Mutatta, hogy nincs több. (Molnár 71)

Russian TT: Vmesto otveta Lesik razinul rot, pokazivaya: net. (Rossiyanov 51)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → Russian **rot**

Hungarian ST: Az őrmester megnyalta a **szája szélét**. (Rejtő 146)

Russian TT: Serzhant obliznul gubi. (Aleksandrov 118)

Commentary: Hungarian **száj** → Russian **gubi**

The linguistic consequences of different segmentations of the world are, of course, recorded in bilingual dictionaries. The correspondence of a SL word to two or more dictionary equivalents in the TL is called **interlanguage asymmetry**. Interlanguage asymmetry can also be found in the case of Hungarian **kéz** and **láb**. These body parts have a more detailed description in English (*arm/hand, foot/leg*), German (*Fuss/Bein*) and French (*bras/main*).

Hungarian → English:

láb (generic term in H) → **foot/leg** (specific terms in E)

Hungarian ST: Julcsa pedig összeszappanozza a **lábunkat**. (Csáth 88)

English TT: Juli soaps our **feet**. (Kessler 60)

Commentary: Hungarian **láb** → English **foot**

Hungarian ST: ... viszi a csontvázat, melynek kezei, **lábai** valami különös táncot járnak ... (Csáth 14)

English TT: ... lugging the skeleton – whose arms and **legs** danced grotesquely ... (Kessler 186)

Commentary: Hungarian **láb** → English **legs**

Hungarian → German:

láb (generic term in H) → **Fuß/Bein** (specific terms in G)

Hungarian ST: Először csak a **lábukat** mártogatták bele, azután belezekedtek térdig. (Gárdonyi 5)

German TT: Zuerst hatten sie nur die **Füße** ins Wasser getaucht, dann waren sie bis an die Knie hineingewatet. (Schüchling 5)

Commentary: Hungarian **láb** → German **Fuß**

Hungarian ST: Furcsa járása volt az öregúrnak; az egyik *lába* nem hajlott térdben, a másik nem hajlott bokában. (Gárdonyi 13)

German TT: Einen sonderbaren Gang hatte der alte Herr; ein *Bein* bog sich nicht im Knie, das andere nicht im Knöchel. (Schüchting 11)

Commentary: Hungarian *láb* → German *Bein*

The pattern of interlanguage asymmetry is almost the same in all the IE languages contrasted to Hungarian, except for Russian. The *hand/arm, foot/leg* distinction does not exist in Russian, where *ruka* ('arm/hand') and *noga* ('foot/leg') are also generic terms like Hungarian *kéz* ('arm/hand') and *láb* ('foot/leg') and both have to be specified in translating into English, French and German.

1.2. Specification of reporting verbs

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Verbs accompanying reported speech in literary works are generally semantically depleted verbs in the four Indo-European languages (*to say, sagen, dire, skazat'*), while in Hungarian they tend to be semantically rich. The authors of literary works written in IE languages generally use the central verb of the semantic field of saying, while Hungarian translators tend to choose more peripheral verbs from the same semantic field.

English: *to say* → Hungarian: *hálálkodik* ('to express one's gratitude')

Hungarian TT: – Jaj, köszönöm, nagysága! – *hálálkodott* Edna. (Borbás 11)

English ST: Oh, thank you, madam,' *said* Edna. (Christie 10)

English: *to say* → Hungarian: *tiltakozik* ('to protest')

Hungarian TT: –Te csak ne csepüld az én lábamat – *tiltakozott* az öregember. (Balabán 31)

English ST: 'Well, you mustn't abuse my legs' *said* the old man (James 9)

1.2.1. The specification of reporting verbs may take several forms in IE→Hungarian translation. In the simplest case, Hungarian translators also use reporting verbs, **but more specific** and less frequent ones, using a variety of Hungarian verbs of saying instead of the correspondents of central verbs *say, sagen, dire, skazat'*. Such variety either does not exist in IE languages, or is not set in motion in this function (in the function of verbs reporting dialogue in literary works).

In the following example, the same English reporting verb *to say* is translated into Hungarian by four different reporting verbs: *kezd* ('to begin'), *közbeszól* ('to interrupt'), *megszólal* ('to begin to speak'), *megnyilatkozik* ('to express one's ideas').

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Armstrong **said**, ‘Four of us and we don’t know which.’

Blore **said**, ‘I know.’

Vera **said**, ‘I haven’t the least doubt.’

Philip Lombard **said**, ‘I think I’ve got a pretty good idea now.’ (Christie 144)

Hungarian TT: – Négyen vagyunk, és nem tudjuk ki a... – **kezde** Armstrong.

Blore **közbeszölt** – Én tudom.

Vera is **megszólt** – Én is tökéletesen biztos vagyok benne.

Philip Lombard is **megnyilatkozott** – Úgy érzem, én is biztos vagyok benne. (Sziógyártó 145)

1.2.2. Instead of simply indicating that something has been said translators often refer to the **permanent or occasional characteristics** of the speech of individual speakers (tone, rate, emphasis) using verbs that lie even farther from the centre of the semantic field of verbs of saying: **hebeg** (‘to stammer’), **dadog** (‘to stutter’), **hadar** (‘to gabble’), **makog** (‘to falter’), **suttog** (‘to whisper’). In the choice of more specific Hungarian reporting verbs, translators are guided by the whole communicative situation in which the dialogue takes place.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: ‘Tiburon’, the waiter **said**. (Hemingway 72)

Hungarian TT: –Tiburon – **hadarta** a pincér. (Ottlik 83)

Commentary: English **said** → Hungarian **hadar** (‘to gabble’)

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: – Kacie besporjadki – **skazal** on. (Chekhov 544)

Hungarian TT: – Micsoda rendetlenség! – **dörmögte** ... (Szöllősy 844)

Commentary: Russian **skazat** → Hungarian **dörmög** (‘to murmur’)

1.2.3. In specifying IE reporting verbs, Hungarian translators frequently use verbs which, also reflect the **speaker’s state of mind and emotions**: **hüledezik** (‘to be dumbfounded’), **csodálkozik** (‘to be astonished’), **meglepődik** (‘to be surprised’). In this case the translator’s decision is influenced by the whole communicative situation described in the literary work. When choosing emotionally loaded verbs instead of simple verbs of saying, translators rely on their knowledge of the situation, and the speaker’s state of mind, their emotions towards each other, etc.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: ‘Well, I’ll be damned, was I really going ninety?’, **said** Eddie. ‘I didn’t realise it on this smooth road.’ (Kerouac 22)

Hungarian TT: – Igazán kilencvennel mentem? – *hüledezett* Eddie, – észre sem vettem ezen a sima úton. (Bartos 24)

Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *hüledezik* ('to be dumb-founded')

French → Hungarian:

French ST: – Laisse-moi!, *dit* elle, tu me chiffonnes. (Flaubert 59)

Hungarian TT: – Vigyázz! – *türelmetlenkedett* Emma. – Összegyűrod a ruhámat. (Gyergyai 64)

Commentary: French *dire* → Hungarian *türelmetlenkedik* ('to lose patience', 'to get impatient')

French ST: – Oh! j'adore la mer, *dit* M. Leon. (Flaubert 59)

Hungarian TT: – Ó, a tenger! – *rajongott* Léon úr. – Imádom az óceánt! (Gyergyai 64)

Commentary: French *dire* → Hungarian *rajong* ('to be enthusiastic about', 'adore')

French ST: – Supérieur! *dit* Chick. (Vian 17)

Hungarian TT: – Isteni! – *ujjongott* Chick, ... (Bajomi 15)

Commentary: French *dire* → Hungarian *ujjong* ('to shout with joy')

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: – Misail – *skazala* ona, – sto ti s nami delaesh? (Chekhov 512)

Hungarian TT: – Miszail – *zokogta*, – mit csinálsz velünk? (Szöllősy 829)

Commentary: Russian *skazat'* → Hungarian *zokog* ('to sob')

Russian ST: – Chto, chto, chto? – *skazal* znachitelnoe litso. (Gogol 154)

Hungarian TT: – Micsoda? – *szörnyülködött* a tekintélyes személy. (Makai 36)

Commentary: Russian *skazat'* → Hungarian *szörnyülködik* ('to be horrified')

1.2.4. Among Hungarian reporting verbs we frequently find verbs indicating **bodily movements** that **commonly accompany** the act of speaking: *bólint* ('to nod'), *legyint* ('to wave a hand to signal indifference'), *felkapja a fejét* ('to toss up one's head').

English → Hungarian:

English ST: 'Them Indians', *said* Mrs. Gardner. (Hemingway 32)

Hungarian TT: – Indiánok – *legyintett* Mrs. Gardner. (Lengyel 31)

Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *legyint* ('to wave a hand to signal indifference')

English ST: ‘Well, really’, *said* Miss Marple. (Christie 20)
Hungarian TT: – Valóban! – *bólintott* Miss Marple. (Borbás 21)
Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *bólint* (‘to nod’)

1.2.5. Finally, in order to specify reporting verbs, translators may use verbs which reflect the act of speaking only by virtue of the **situation**. Such verbs express a change in place or bodily position: *leül* (‘to sit down’), *feláll* (‘to stand up’), *be-lép a szobába* (‘to enter the room’). In the examples below, the IE verbs of general meaning are simply omitted in the translation and the phrases expressing circumstances of saying (e.g., *she said, still holding out her beautiful slim arms from her dropping breast*) will offer a reporting verb for the Hungarian translator e.g., *tárta szét karját* (‘held out her arms’).

English → Hungarian:

English ST: ‘No!’, she *said*, still *holding out* her beautiful slim arms from her dropping breasts. (Lawrence 247)
Hungarian TT: – Ne így! – *tárta szét* szép, karcsú karját keble előtt az asszony. (Falvai 306)
Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *tárja szét karját* (‘to hold out her arms’)

English ST: ‘Ay!’, *said* the man, *stretching his body* almost painfully. (Lawrence 249)
Hungarian TT: – Ajahaj – *nyújtózott* szinte fájdalmasan a férfi. (Falvai 308)
Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *nyújtózik* (‘to stretch his body’)

English ST: ‘Twenty-three!’, *said* Mrs. Bolton, *as she* carefully *separated* the columbines into single plants. (Lawrence 190)
Hungarian TT: – Huszonhárom éve! – *bontogatta* óvatosan *széjjel* a galambvirág friss gyökereit a kérdezett. (Falvai 236)
Commentary: English *to say* → Hungarian *bontogatja széjjel* (to unravel)

By specifying the reporting verb, Hungarian translators often make the relations between the characters more evident. In the next example, which is a dialogue consisting of four turns, the same German reporting verb *sagen* is repeated four times. The Hungarian translator uses four different verbs: the first one is the central Hungarian reporting verb, *mond* (‘to say’), the second and the third are less central Hungarian reporting verbs, *felel* (‘to answer’) and *hozzátesz* (‘to add’), and the fourth is a non-reporting verb in reporting function, *legyint* (‘to wave a hand to signal indifference or relief’). Through this latter specification (German *sagte* → Hungarian *legyintett*) the translator illustrates the state of mind of one of the characters. At the beginning of the dialogue Margit is jealous of another woman, but realising in the course of the dialogue that she still has Herr von Schenna’s sympathy and that Agnes, the other woman, is not a rival, makes a gesture of relief (*legyintett*) in the Hungarian translation.

German → Hungarian:

German ST: “Ja”, **sagte** Herr von Schenna nach einer Weile, “sie sieht aus wie Agnes”.

“Sie ist wunderschön”, **sagte** Margarete mit einer gepressten, seltsam erloschenen Stimme.

“Aber Fräulein von Flavon hat viel dümmere Augen” **sagte** Herr von Schenna.

“Lesen wir weiter!” **sagte** Margarete, und ihre Stimme klang dunkel, voll und warm wie vorher. (Feuchtwanger 50)

Hungarian TT: – Igen – **mondta** Jacob von Schenna hosszabb szünet után –, valóban olyan, mint Flavon Ágnes.

– Csodaszép nő – **felelte** Margit fojtott, különös hangon.

– De Flavon kisasszony szemének pillantása sokkal üresebb, ostobább – **tette hozzá** Schenna úr.

– Olvassunk tovább – **legyintett** Margit, és hangja újból olyan melegen, telin, felszabadultan csengett, mint azelőtt. (Dormándi 46)

The specification of reporting verbs in IE-H translation cannot be accounted for by IE-H interlanguage asymmetry. The Hungarian language does possess reporting verbs of a more general character: the Hungarian verb **mond** (‘to say’) stands on the same level in the generic-specific hierarchy as **to say, sagen, dire, skazat**. A quantitative analysis of type/token ratios in original Hungarian literary works and English, German, French and Russian literary works of the same genre found that in original Hungarian literary works writers use a greater variety of reporting verbs than found in literary works written in IE languages (Klaudy 1986). For this reason Hungarian readers would find it monotonous to read dialogues in which the only reporting verb is **mond** throughout the whole work. In other words, it is Hungarian literary tradition that makes translators opt for less frequent reporting verbs in the Hungarian text, and non-reporting verbs that can occasionally be used in the reporting function. Thus, it is not differences in the lexicon that are responsible for this operation, but differences in literary traditions.

1.3. Specification of inchoative verbs

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Another transfer operation fitting also in with this trend is the specification of inchoative verbs, that is, verbs expressing the **beginning** of an action. This operation is characteristic of translation from Indo-European into Hungarian.

IE languages frequently express the beginning of an action with complex verb forms which consist of a semi-auxiliary verb expressing beginning (**begin, start, commencer, beginnen, anfangen, nachinat**) and of a main verb in the form of an infinitive (**It began to rain. The wind started to blow. He started to speak**). Due to the rich morphology of the Hungarian verb system it is very easy to find Hungarian verbs which can combine the two meanings in a single verb. E.g., English

He started to speak → Hungarian *megszólalt*. This kind of meaning-integration will be discussed in the following chapters.

The operation that will be discussed in this chapter is also related to the verbs of beginning: it is the specification of the semi-auxiliary verbs *begin/start*, *commencer*, *beginnen/lanfangen* and *nachinat'*. Repeating the central verb of the semantic field of verbs of beginning (*kezd*) would seem monotonous for a Hungarian readership, therefore professional translators use more specific verbs, which are on the periphery of the semantic field of verbs of beginning: *nekilát*, *belefog*, *hozzálát* ('set/fall/turn to', 'get/settle down to'), *fakadt* ('burst out', 'broke out').

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He **began** immediately to close his cafe. (Greene 510)

Hungarian TT: Habozás nélkül záráshoz *látott*. (Sükösd 26)

Commentary: English **to begin to close** → Hungarian *záráshoz lát* ('to set to close')

English ST: He **began** to tremble violently. (Greene 518)

Hungarian ST: Szörnyű reszketés *fogta el*. (Sükösd 33)

Commentary: English **to begin to tremble** → Hungarian *elfogja a reszketés* ('to be seized with trembling')

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Mes enfants!, dit-elle, et elle **se mit à pleurer** ... (Nerval 60)

Hungarian TT: – Ó, gyermekeim! – mondta, és *sírva fakadt* ... (Brodszky 61)

Commentary: French **se mit à pleurer** → Hungarian *sírva fakad* ('to burst into tears')

French ST: Vous êtes dans vos réflexions, dit Sylvie, et elle **se mit à chanter**. (Nerval 100)

Hungarian TT: – Elmékedik? – kérdezte Sylvie, és *dalba fogott*. (Brodszky 101)

Commentary: French **se mit à chanter** ... Hungarian *dalba fogott*. ('to break out into song')

German → Hungarian:

German ST: "Du hast denen wohl die Geschichte deines Lebens erzählt, was", sagte der Junge, der ihn beim Hineingehen angerempelt hatte, "haben sie denn auch **angefangen** zu weinen?" (Kant 36)

Hungarian TT: – Alighanem elmesélted nekik az egész élettörténetedet – mondta az a fiú, aki bemenetkor annyira rátámadt Robertre. – Talán *sírva is fakadtak?* (Mátrai 35)

Commentary: German **angefangen zu weinen** → Hungarian *sírva fakad* ('to burst into tears')

Specification of the verbs of beginning is an optional transfer operation, which is carried out routinely by professional translators, but not necessarily by beginners. In each instance, the translator could have used the central Hungarian verb of beginning *kezd*, for example, *elkezdte bezárni a kávéházat* ('began to close the cafe'), *elkezdett reszketni* ('began to tremble') or *elkezdett sírni* ('began to cry'). In using a greater variety of verbs, that is, more peripheral verbs of beginning, translators follow the Hungarian literary tradition, which is observed by translators today more consciously than by the authors of original Hungarian literary works.

1.4. Specification of semantically depleted verbs

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The specification of IE verbs in IE-H translation cannot be explained by the phenomenon of interlanguage lexical asymmetry, i.e. by lack of verbs with the same general meaning in Hungarian. In IE-Hungarian translations we find very many examples for specification of verbs, and not only of verbs of saying or beginning. Specification of IE verbs with general meanings is one of the most characteristic transfer operations in the IE-Hungarian direction and it can be accounted for, at least partly, by the characteristics of the Hungarian word formation system.

The most characteristic feature of the Hungarian verb is its complexity. Here it is not morphological complexity that we are interested in (this will be discussed in the next part in connection with grammatical transfer operations), but lexical richness, which is due to the rich variety of verbal prefixes and suffixes. In Hungarian, numerous prefixes and suffixes (frequentative, reflexive, factitive or causative, etc.) can be added to verbs and in this way new words and new meanings can be created. This rich vocabulary is reflected in translations where IE verbs of general meaning (English *to be*, *to take*, *to make*, *to come*, *to go*, French *faire*, *prendre*, *avoir*, German *kommen*, *machen*, *gehen*, Russian *bit'*, *sidet'*, *stat'*, *polozit'* etc.) tend to become more specific in Hungarian translations.

English: *to be* → Hungarian: *lapul*, *fortyog*

English ST: Inside *was* a letter from Eliot. (Vonnegut 13)

Hungarian TT: Belsejében Eliot levele *lapult*. (Szilágyi 14)

Commentary: English *to be* → Hungarian *lapul* ('to lurk')

English ST: The kettle *was* on a spirit ring close to a big brown teapot. (Greene 39)

Hungarian TT: A főző spirituszállványon *fortyogott*, mellette nagy barna teáskanna. (Ungvári 51)

Commentary: English *to be* → Hungarian: *fortyog* ('to boil continuously')

German: *kommen* → Hungarian: *reátör*, *megtelepszik*, *megrohan*, *elnyom*

German ST: Da *kam*, mit der Qual und dem Hochmut der Erkenntnis, die Einsamkeit, ... (Mann 1. 60)

Hungarian TT: Ekkor a megismerés kinjával és gőgjével együtt, *reátört* a magányosság ... (Lányi 1. 61)

Commentary: German *kommen* → Hungarian *reátör* ('to rush on')

German ST: Dann *kam* der Nebel, auch er tagelang, wochenlang ... (Dürrenmatt 5)

Hungarian TT: Aztán *megtelepedett* a köd, napokra, hetekre ... (B. Fejér 5)

Commentary: German *kommen* → Hungarian *megtelepszik* ('to settle down')

German ST: Er war glücklich ins Bett gestiegen, nun *kamen* die Sorgen. (Dürrenmatt 5)

Hungarian TT: Boldogan bújt ágyba, de most *megrohanták* a gondok. (B. Fejér 5)

Commentary: German *kommen* → Hungarian *megrohan* ('to rush on')

German ST: Bis zur Rennstrecke bei Dessau fühlte er sich noch ganz munter, aber dann *kam* plötzlich die Müdigkeit. (Kant 460)

Hungarian TT: A dessauai versenyütig teljesen éber volt, de azután egyszerre *elnyomta* a fáradság. (Mátrai 36)

Commentary: German *kommen* → Hungarian *elnyom* ('to be overcome with')

French: *tomber* → Hungarian: *leroskad, felbukfencezik*

French ST: Un soir, je vous l'ai dit, un soir, comme elle rentrait d'une longue promenade à cheval, elle *tomba*, les pommettes rouges, la poitrine battante, les jambes cassées ... (Maupassant 55)

Hungarian TT: Egy este, amint mondtam, egy este, hogy hazajött egy hosszú sétalovaglásról, *leroskadt* velem szemben egy alacsony székre, kipirult orcával, ziháló mellel, elgyötört lábbal ... (Benyhe 56)

Commentary: French *tomber* → Hungarian *leroskad* ('to sink', 'to drop', 'to flop into an armchair')

French ST: Mais je *tombai* moi-même, la figure coupée par deux coups de cravache; (Maupassant 61)

Hungarian TT: De magam is *felbukfenceztem*, egy lovaglókorbács vágott kétszer az arcomba; ... (Benyhe 61)

Commentary: French *tomber* → Hungarian *felbukfencezik* ('to turn a somersault')

Russian: *sidet'* → Hungarian: *dolgozik, működik, gubbaszt*

Russian ST: Vtoroy mesyats ya *sizhu* na bivsem uchastke, znayu chto vi v gorode, i sravnitelno nedaleko ot menya. (Bulgakov 68)

Hungarian TT: Második hónapja *dolgozom* a volt körzetében, tudom,

hogy itt van ebben a városban, viszonylag nem is olyan messze tőlem. (Elbert 53)

Commentary: Russian *sidet* ('to sit') → Hungarian *dolgozik* ('to work')

Russian ST: On *sidit* v gorelovskom moem bivsem uchastke v polnom odinochestve. (Bulgakov 68)

Hungarian TT: Régi körzetemben *működik* Gorelovóban, teljes magányban. (Elbert 53)

Commentary: Russian *sidet* ('to sit') → Hungarian *működik* ('to function')

Russian ST: ... a Bomgard, kak govorila feldshernitsa, *sidit* na gluhom uchastke. (Bulgakov 70)

Hungarian TT: Bomgardról pedig azt mondja az itteni felcsernő, hogy három járással odébb egy ugyanilyen isten háta mögötti helyen *gubbaszt*. (Elbert 59)

Commentary: Russian *sidet* ('to sit') → Hungarian *gubbaszt* ('to croach')

The three different Hungarian translations of the Russian verb *sidet* ('to sit') illustrates the individual creativity of the translator. The same Russian verb has three different correspondents in the Hungarian translation: (1) *dolgozik* ('to work'), (2) *működik* ('to function'), (3) *gubbaszt* ('to croach'). None of those can be found in bilingual Russian-Hungarian dictionaries. The first two are neutral solutions with a faint reference to the profession of the protagonist, who is a doctor working in a provincial town. The third translation equivalent *gubbaszt* ('to croach') is used by the translator to demonstrate the boring and lonely life of a country doctor.

Summary comments on lexical specification

In the case of nouns, differentiation and specification of meaning can be accounted for the different segmentation of reality by the different languages. Parts of the body, kinship terms, times of the day etc. can have a more detailed vocabulary in one language and a less detailed one in another. In other cases, though segmentation may be similar, there are **frequency differences** between languages. In the case of nouns specification can often be accounted for by vocabulary differences and therefore they are more or less obligatory.

In the case of verbs, the rich morphological potential offered by the Hungarian language provide ample opportunity for specification, but this is **only an option**. IE verbs of general meaning always have, or may have, a corresponding Hungarian verb with a similarly general meaning, cf. English *to say*, German *sagen*, French *dire*, Russian *skazat'* → Hungarian: *mondja*; or English *begin*, German *beginnen*, French *commencer*, Russian *nachinat'* → Hungarian: *kezd*). Use of a semantically depleted verb in Hungarian (dictionary equivalent) would not violate any of the norms of the Hungarian language. Thus, specification of IE verbs in IE-Hungarian translation is an **optional** transfer operation. The fact that a majority of professional translators tend to specify IE verbs of saying, verbs of beginning and

semantically depleted IE verbs, shows that beside the TL norm there is a tendency to follow the **translational norms** at the same time.

Authors of original Hungarian texts of course heavily rely on the ability of the Hungarian verb to incorporate a great number of grammatical and lexical information within a single verb form. If translators want to produce a Hungarian text, where the language is not less colourful and less expressive than the original, they must utilise the potential of Hungarian verb formation. Let me remark in passing that one reason for **translationese** is exactly this inadequate utilisation of the linguistic resources of the TL. Using more specific Hungarian verbs in translation is a way to avoid translationese.

It should also be noted that handling the four IE languages as a monolithic group can be justified only from the perspective of Hungarian. The four IE languages are not on the same level of the abstract/concrete and generic/specific hierarchy, unless they are opposed to Hungarian. Let us recall Vinay and Darbelnet's comparison between French and English concerning the concrete and abstract levels of lexicon: "Generally it can be said that French words function at a higher degree of abstraction than the corresponding English words. They tend to be less cluttered with details of reality" (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 52).

Our description, however, does not concern differences in the lexicon but differences in the actual operations carried out by translators. The evidence provided by our multilingual corpus shows that Hungarian translators carry out more specifications in IE-Hungarian translation than would be expected on the basis of the given source text or bilingual English-Hungarian, French-Hungarian, German-Hungarian, Russian-Hungarian dictionaries. Thus, specification in IE-Hungarian translation is a standard language pair specific transfer operation, which is **to a certain extent** independent of either the generic or the specific nature of the lexicon of the languages under investigation.

2. Broadening of meaning (generalisation)

Lexical broadening – or, in other terms, **généralisation** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958), **generalizatsiya** (Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975), or **generalisation** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995, Klaudy 1996b) of meaning – is a standard transfer operation whereby the SL unit of a more specific meaning is replaced by a TL unit of a more general meaning.

Generalisation of meaning in translation can be accounted for differences in the conceptual mapping of the world (body parts, colours, kinship terms) reflected by the different lexical systems of languages. If the SL is characterised by a more detailed segmentation, and there is no dictionary equivalent in the TL, generalisation is unavoidable. In the case of generalisation, the form of the interlingual asymmetry is manifested as “many to one” relationship: two or more SL words have one dictionary equivalent in the TL.

Generalisation may be needed also because of differences in the word-formation systems of languages. The rich inventory of verbal prefixes and suffixes in Hungarian makes it possible to form verbs with a high degree of semantic compression. Semantically rich Hungarian verbs, which have no dictionary equivalents of similar semantic compression in IE languages, will become either more general in translation or will be translated by several words (this latter operation will be discussed in LEX 4).

Generalisation of meaning as a transfer operation can also be examined from the point of view of a universal translation strategy, namely **simplification**. Simplification is one of the supposed universal characteristics of translated texts (Baker 1993, Laviosa 1998). There are two reasons which seem to underpin the universal character of generalisation: (1) it is easier **to find** a TL correspondent with more general meaning, and (2) it is easier **to fit** a TL correspondent with more general meaning into the structure of the TL sentence.

Subtypes:

- 2.1. Generalisation of parts of the body
- 2.2. Generalisation of times of the day
- 2.3. Generalisation of realia
- 2.4. Generalisation of reporting verbs
- 2.5. Generalisation of semantically rich verbs

2.1. Generalisation of parts of the body

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Differences in the cognitive segmentation of the human body requiring **specification** in translation from L1 to L2 may require **generalisation** in the opposite direction, that is, in translation from L2 to L1. We mentioned in the previous chapter that in translating from Hungarian into IE languages translators specify the Hungarian words *száj* ('mouth/lips') and *arc* ('face/cheeks'), since in IE languages there are two corresponding terms for each. The opposite of this phenomenon may be observed in translation from IE languages into Hungarian, with translators ignoring the existing, but rarely used *arclorca* ('face/cheeks') and *száj/ajak* ('mouth/lips') distinction and translating *mouth/lips*, *bouchellèvre*, *Mund/Lippe*, *rot/gubi* equally as *száj* ('mouth') into Hungarian, as the use of the word *ajak* ('lips') is restricted. Similarly, *face/cheeks*, *Gesicht/Wange*, *visage/joue*, *litsa/shcheka* will be translated as *arc* ('face') into Hungarian, as the use of the word *orca* ('cheeks') is restricted; *foot/leg*, *Fuß/Bein*, will be translated as *láb* ('foot/leg') into Hungarian, as the use of the words *lábfej* ('foot') and *láb szár* ('leg') is restricted.

English → Hungarian:

cheek/face (specific terms in E) → *arc* (generic term in H)

English ST: She gently embraced her husband, who kissed her on the *cheek*. (Doctorow 18)

Hungarian TT: Gyöngéden megölelte férjét, az pedig *arcon* csókolta. (Göncz 17)

English ST: He kissed her *face* and tasted the salt of her tears. (Doctorow 21)

Hungarian TT: Az megcsókolta őt, s a könnye sós ízét ott érezte *arcán*. (Göncz 20)

French → Hungarian:

joue/visage (specific terms in F) → *arc* (generic term in H)

French ST: Elle ressemblait à Paul; elle avait les mêmes yeux bleus ombrés de cils noirs, les mêmes *joues* pâles. (Cocteau 21)

Hungarian TT: Igen hasonlított Paulhoz; éppen olyan kék szemű, fekete szempillákkal árnyalva, s éppen olyan sápadt *arcú*. (Gyergyai 173)

French ST: Le silence de ce *visage* monstrueux qui changeait de forme terrifiait la victime. (Cocteau 12)

Hungarian TT: E rettenetes és hallgatag *arc*, amely egyre változott, az örületig ijesztette áldozatát. (Gyergyai 166)

German → Hungarian:

Wange/Gesicht (specific terms in G) → *arc* (generic term in H)

German ST: Die feine Röte auf Eugeniens *Wangen* wich zwei Atemzüge lang der äußersten Blässe; ... (Mörke 66)

Hungarian TT: Eugénia *arcának* rózsapírja két sóhajtásnyira holtfehérre sápadt; ... (Lengyel 67)

German ST: In unwillkürlicher Beobachtung des Komponisten, seiner schlichten, beinahe steifen Körperhaltung, seines gutmütigen *Gesichts*, ... (Mörike 70)

Hungarian TT: ...nehéz is lett volna megállni, hogy ne figyeljék a zeneszerzőt, egyszerű, majdnem feszes testtartását, jószágos *arcát* ... (Lengyel 71)

Russian → Hungarian:

shcheka/litso (specific terms in R) ... *arc* (generic term in H)

Russian ST: S vlazhnih resnits yeyo lilis' slyozi *po shcheke* (A. Tolstoy 134)

Hungarian TT: Nedves szempillájáról *arcára* csorogtak a könnyek. (Wessely 35)

Russian ST: On stal smotret' yey v izmutsennoe, prekrasnoe *litso*. (A. Tolstoy 130)

Hungarian TT: A férfi elnézte az asszony meggyötört, gyönyörű *arcát*. (Wessely 131)

One could say that this is a typical example of **interlanguage asymmetry** (there are two words in the SL vs. one word in the TL). It should be noted, however, that the lexical items corresponding to the more specific items in IE languages do exist in the Hungarian language, and are recorded in all bilingual dictionaries, even if they are much more restricted in actual communication.

2.2. Generalisation of times of the day

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

There are interesting differences between languages in the way times of day are divided. Russian, for instance, has no corresponding term for Hungarian *délelőtt* (*dél* 'noon', *előtt* 'before'), while the use of the English, French and German dictionary equivalents of *délelőtt* (*forenoon*, *matiné* and *Vormittag*) is much more restricted. Thus, in both of the following two translations, the translator had to make use of broadening in translating *délelőtt*.

Hungarian *délelőtt* → English *morning*, Russian *utro* ('morning')

Hungarian ST: Valamelyik téli *délelőttön* az anatómiai intézet igazgatójának első asszisztense egy embert jelentett be ... (Csáth 10)

English TT: One winter *morning* the head assistant of the Institute of Anatomy announced someone ... (Kessler 183)

Commentary: Hungarian *délelőtt* ('forenoon') → English *morning*

Hungarian ST: Amikor véget ért a *délelőtti* vizit, ... (Örkény 1. 162)

Russian TT: *Utrenniy* obhod zakanchivalsya... (Voronkina 1. 306)

Commentary: Hungarian *délelőtt* ('forenoon') → Russian *utro* ('morning')

Similar difficulties may arise in the translation of the Hungarian word *délután* (*dél* 'noon', *után* 'after'). A dictionary equivalent exists in English and German (*afternoon*, *Nachmittag*), but not in Russian. The Russian equivalent *posle obeda* is an adverb, and cannot be used as an adjective. For this reason *szép, nyári délután* (lit.: nice summer afternoon) became *prekrasny letniy den'* (lit.: nice summer day) in Russian.

Hungarian *délután* ('afternoon') → Russian *den'* ('day')

Hungarian ST: Egy napsütéses nyári *délutánon* a fülkébe lépett a költő. (Örkény 1. 226)

Russian TT: V odin prekrasny letniy *den'* v budku voshol poet. (Voronkina 1. 321)

Parts of the day are also frequently generalised in Hungarian-German translation. The first part of the day is divided into similar units in Hungarian and German *hajnal reggel délelőtt* → *Tagesanbruchl Morgenl Vormittag*, yet the comparative analysis of Hungarian literary works and their German translations indicates that in German the general term *Morgen* is more frequently used.

Hungarian → German:

hajnaldelelőtt (specific terms in Hungarian) → German *Morgen* (generic term in German)

Hungarian ST: Aztán a nyári *hajnal* violás folyadékot csorgatott minde-nüvé ... (Kosztolányi 26)

German TT: Der sommerliche *Morgen* ergoss über alles violette Ströme ... (Klein 28)

Hungarian ST: Másnap *delelőtt* a herceg alig öltözködött föl, lármát hallott a palota lépcsőin. (Kosztolányi 12)

German TT: In den *Morgenstunden* des nächsten Tages vernahm der Prinz, kaum das er sich angekleidet hatte, auf der Treppe Lärm. (Klein 14)

Comparing two different – English and German – translations of the same Hungarian literary work, we can see that both the English and the German translator make use of generalisation.

Hungarian → German and English:

delelőtt, hajnal (specific terms in Hungarian) → *Morgen, Morning* (generic term in German and English)

Hungarian ST: Másnap *delelőtt* a herceg alig öltözködött föl, lármát hallott a palota lépcsőin. (Kosztolányi 12)

German TT: In den *Morgenstunden* des nächsten Tages vernahm der Prinz, kaum dass er sich angekleidet hatte, auf der Treppe Lärm. (Klein 14)

English TT: The prince had hardly finished dressing the next *morning*, when he heard a noise upon the staircase. (Fadiman – Szirtes 15)

Hungarian ST: Neró *hajnalig* kínlódott. (Kosztolányi 87)

German TT: Bis zum *Morgen* rang Nero mit seiner Pein. (Klein 89)

English TT: Nero wrestled with his torture till *morning* came. (Fadiman – Szirtes 78)

As we can see, the *hajnal/reggel/délelőtt* ('dawn/morning/forenoon') distinction, characteristic of the Hungarian original, disappears in the German and English translations, where translators use the generic term *morning/Morgen*.

Generalisation of parts of the day in H-IE translation is a reversible transfer operation: the generic terms *morning* and *evening* become more specific in IE-H translation. In the next example the French words *matin* ('morning') and *soir* ('evening') become *délelőtt* ('forenoon') and *délután* ('afternoon') in Hungarian:

French ST: Mais deux fois par jour, à dix heures et demie du *matin* et à quatre heures du *soir*, une émeute trouble ce silence. (Cocteau 8)

Hungarian TT: Mégis, kétszer naponta, *délelőtt* fél tizenegyor és *délután* négy óra tájt valóságos zendülés zavarta meg ezt a csendet. (Gyergyai 9)

Commentary: French *dix heures et demie du matin* ('half past ten morning') → Hungarian *délelőtt fél tizenegyor* ('half past ten forenoon'); French *quatre heures du soir* ('four o'clock evening') → Hungarian *délután négy óra* ('four o'clock afternoon')

2.3. Generalisation of realia

Predominant direction: in the case of culture specific transfer operations there is no predominant direction

Since we are going to use the term "realia" in all the remaining chapters of this book, some clarification of its meaning may be appropriate here. The term is used in two meanings. It may refer to a **thing** or concept specific to a given cultural/linguistic community, or to the **name** that we assign to that particular thing. Thus, for instance, a *gondola* itself may be a "realia", in the sense of a "light flat-bottomed boat with cabin amidships and high point at each end, worked by one oar at stern, used on Venetian canals" (*The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary* 1975: 360), or it may be the Italian word, *gondola* which stands for the boat.

The concept of **realia** can be interpreted narrowly or more liberally. One interpretation would include only items specific to a given cultural/linguistic community (clothes, money, food and beverages, etc.), while the other admits holidays, historical events, names and addresses as well. Although such a broad definition is not without its hazards, it serves our purpose better since we are interested in all situations where the translator needs information going beyond the language. For this reason, we will accept the broad definition proposed by the Bulgarian scholars Vlahov and Florin (1980:51).

We shall present Vlahov and Florin's classification illustrated with our own examples, for which the English definitions were taken from the 1975 edition of *The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary* (OID), where the source is not indicated, a definition has been provided by the present author.

I. Geographical realia

1. Geographical formations (e.g., *savannah*, 'wide treeless plain, great tract of meadowlike land esp. in tropical America' OID 756),
2. Man-made geographical entities (e.g., *polder*, 'piece of low-lying land reclaimed from sea in Netherlands' OID 653),
3. Indigenous animals and plants (e.g., *sequoia*, 'very tall Californian coniferous tree' OID 776, *eucalyptus*, 'Australian and Indonesian evergreen tree', *coyote*, 'North American prairie wolf' OID 196).

II. Ethnographical realia

1. *Realia from everyday life*
 - a) Dishes, beverages (e.g., *tortilla*, 'In Spanish America, thin flat cake of maize flour baked on flat plate of iron' OID 897, *grog*, 'English beverage made with hot water, rum, sugar and, perhaps, lemon'),
 - b) Dressing (e.g., *dolman*, 'long Turkish robe open in front' OID 249, *tartan*, 'woollen cloth with stripes of various colours crossing at right angles esp. in the distinctive pattern of a Highland clan' OID 868),
 - c) Habitat, furniture, houseware (e.g., *wigwam*, 'tent or cabin of North American Indian tribes of the region of Great Lakes and eastward, formed of bark, matting or hides stretched over frame of converging poles' OID 966),
 - d) Means of transport (e.g., *rickshaw*, 'light, two-wheeled, rental carriage, pulled by one or two men').
2. *Realia of work*
 - a) Occupations (e.g., *gaucho*, 'mounted herdsman of S. Amer. pampas' OID 345),
 - b) Tools (e.g., *lasso*, 'rope, line of untanned hide etc. with running noose esp. for catching cattle' OID 475),
 - c) Workplace (e.g., *ranch*, 'cattle breeding establishment in US, Canada, etc.' OID 700).
3. *Art and culture*
 - a) Music and dance (e.g., *tarantella*, 'Rapid, whirling dance of S. Italian peasants' OID 867),
 - b) Musical instruments (e.g., *banjo*, 'musical instruments having 4, 5, 6, or 7 strings, head and neck like guitar, and body like tambourine' OID 58),
 - c) Theatre (e.g., *columbine*, 'loud-mouthed, vivacious and tricky servant girl. One of the characters in the Commedia dell' Arte'),
 - d) Holidays and games (e.g., *Chanukah*, 'Jewish religious feast in memory of the victory of the Maccabees and of the liberation of Jerusalem'),

e) Customs, rituals and their participants (e.g., *tamada*, 'Master of ceremonies at a friendly gathering in Georgia').

4. *Ethnic realia*

- a) Ethnonyms (e.g., *Basques*, 'ancient people of unknown origin, living in the Northwest part of the Pyrenees'),
- b) Nicknames (e.g., *Fritz*, 'Russian nickname of German soldiers in World War II', *Yankee*, '1. native or inhabitant of New England or of Northern State of US generally; 2. applied by non Americans to any inhabitant of US OID 980), *Gringo*, '(contempt.) among Spanish-Americans a foreigner, esp. an Englishman or an American of US (OID 369),
- c) Name related to residence (e.g., *nutmegger*, 'resident of Connecticut'; *down Easter*, 'resident of Maine'; *baystater*, 'resident of Massachusetts').

5. *Measurement units and coinage*

- a) Measurement units (e.g., *pud*, 'Russian unit of weight = 16.38 grams')
- b) Coinage (e.g., *tugrik*, 'Mongolian monetary unit'; *centime*, 'French small change'; *dime*, 'ten cent coin in the United States'),
- c) Popular nicknames (e.g., *buck*, 'dollar in US slang').

III. Social and political realia

1. *Administration and organisation*

- a) Administrative units (e.g., *canton*, 'Independent unit forming a part of the Swiss Federation'),
- b) Settlements (e.g., *pueblo*, 'Spanish American town or village esp. communal village or settlement of Indians in Arizona, New Mexico and adjacent parts of Mexico and Texas' OID 682),
- c) Part of a city (e.g., *piazza*, 'an Italian square', *kremlin*, 'fortified enclosure or citadel within Russian town or city' OID 467).

2. *Political bodies*

- a) Governing bodies (e.g., *Reichstag*, 'supreme legislature of the former German Empire and of the Republic' OID 712),
- b) Rulers (e.g., *Shah*, 'title of the sovereign ruler of Iran' OID 781, *Negus*, 'supreme ruler of Ethiopia' OID 566).

3. *Political life*

- a) Political activity and its participants (e.g., *tory*, 'member or supporter of the English Conservative Party'),
- b) Social organisations and their participants (e.g., *carbonari*, (pl) 'members of the secret Italian organisation, fighting for the unification of Italy at the beginning of the 19th century'),
- c) Social movements and their participants (e.g., *hippy*, 'person rejecting conventional standards and organised society in favour of unconstrained living' OID 399),

- d) Rank, titles and addresses (e.g., *earl*, ‘nobleman ranking in British peerage between marquis and viscount’ OID 264); *Excellency*, ‘title of ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, governors and their wives, and some other high officers’ OID 290),
- e) Institutions of learning (e.g., *college*, ‘various educational institutions from high-school to the university in England and the United States’),
- f) Classes, social strata, castes (e.g., *pariah* ‘member of the lowest and most oppressed caste in India’),
- g) Political symbols (e.g., *Union Jack*, ‘popular name of the British imperial flag’).

4. *Military realia*

- a) Military units (e.g., *cohort*, ‘a small unit of the Roman army, one tenth of a legion’),
- b) Arms (e.g. *yataghan*, ‘short sword of Muslim countries with slight reverse curve’ OID 980),
- c) Uniform (e.g., *dolman*, ‘hussar’s uniform jacket worn like cape with sleeves hanging loose’ OID 249),
- d) Military ranks and assignments (e.g., *cuirassier*, ‘armed horse soldier’).

We listed this “inventory” in such detail and have given at least one example for each category, because in the following we are going to refer frequently to problems of translating realia, without discussing the concept of realia again in each instance. If the ST realia has no function in the text, i.e. it makes no difference what a given character eats, drinks or wears, then it can be either generalised or omitted, while if for some reason it has special significance, translators generally give explanatory additions (explicitation) or provide a descriptive translation.

Vlakhov and Florin’s inventory is extremely detailed, but the list could be further expanded on the basis of additional translation text analyses. They do not include historical events or religious rites as realia even though their translation requires considerable amounts of world knowledge, in addition to linguistic competence, as we shall see in the chapters below.

Returning to the question of generalisation, it is useful to note that in certain cases a detailed description or precise definition of realia may be incomprehensible for the TL audience, or would convey information that is irrelevant in the given communicative situation. If the particular realia has no function in the text, i.e. it makes no difference what the characters ate, drank or wore, then an exact definition of the dishes, beverages or apparel, unknown in the culture of the TL, would only divert the attention of the reader. In such cases translators tend to replace specific terms by generic ones. The ordinary Hungarian table wine *szemelt rizling* (‘riesling of selected grapes’) becomes *wine* or *white wine* in English and *Wein* or *Weisswein* in German translation. The ordinary Hungarian red wine *kadarka* (‘red wine made of kadarka-grapes’) becomes *wine* or *red wine* in English and *Wein* or *Rotwein*, in German translation, Hungarian folkdances e.g., *csürdöngölő* (‘barn-stamper’) or *löttyögtető* (‘shake-about’) become *dance* or *folk dance* in English and *Tanz* or *Volkstanz* in German translation.

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: A kurucok is betörtek, és a dúsgazdag Végh Tamás Vica nevű hajadon lányát ragadták el egy lakodalomból, mikor ifjabb Nagy Mihállyal a *löttyөгtötöt* járta; ... (Mikszáth 14)

German TT: ... da waren auch die Kurutzen auf den Trick bekommen. Bei einer Hochzeit drehte sich die Vica, die Tochter des steinreichen Tamás Végh, gerade mit Mihály Nagy, dem Jüngeren, *im Tanze*, ... (Székács 14)

Commentary: The Hungarian folk dance *löttyөгtötö* (lit.: shake-about) totally unknown even to most Hungarians today became *Tanze* ('dance') in the German translation.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Frank watched her shred cabbage on the meat slicer for *coleslaw*. (Malamud 55)

Hungarian TT: Frank figyelte, hogy metéli a *salátának* való káposztát a felvágottmetélőn. (Balassa 62)

Commentary: *coleslaw* is a typical American cabbage salad, consisting of cabbage, onions, celery, carrots, radish and other vegetables mixed with mayonnaise. As coleslaw is unknown for Hungarian people, and in this case the exact type of salad is not important from the point of view of the plot, it was translated into Hungarian by the generic term *saláta* ('salad').

Bring me a bock – says a customer in a bar in a short story by Graham Greene. It is an important feature of this order that, in spite of riots in the street, the customer refuses to go home, behaves as though everything were all right and orders his usual drink. In this instance, the translator did not use the correspondent of **bock** in Országh's *English-Hungarian Dictionary*, *baksör* (EHD: 203), since the expression used by the customer is designed to strike the reader as completely ordinary and routine. This is why the translator translated the English specific term **bock** by the Hungarian generic term *sör* ('beer'): Hozzon egy korsó *sört*" (Sükösd 27).

The following example is yet another illustration for the use of generic terms in the translation of beverages:

English → Hungarian:

English ST: ... he had preferred himself a glass of *stout* and some oysters ... (Greene 472)

Hungarian TT: ... jómaga szívesebben fogyasztott volna egy pohár *sört* és néhány osztrigát ... Szobotka 293)

Commentary: *stout*, a 'heavy dark type of beer prepared with well roasted barley or malt and sometimes caramelised sugar' (OID 836), unknown in Hungary, became *sör* ('beer') in the Hungarian translation.

English ST: A slice of cold pie, a glass of **port**, a cup of tea ... (Dahl 128)

Hungarian TT: Egy szelet hideg húspástétom, egy pohár **bor**, egy csésze tea, ... (Borbás 129)

Commentary: **port**, a ‘heavy, sweet, fortified wine’ (OID 657), unknown in Hungary, becomes **bor** (‘wine’)

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: – Davayte narzanu – poprosil Berlioz. (Bulgakov 10)

Hungarian TT: – **Ásványvizet** kérek – mondta Berlioz. (Szöllősy 8)

Commentary: **narzan** a mineral water from the Caucasus becomes **ásványvíz** (‘mineral water’) in the Hungarian TT.

Units of measurement and monetary units are typically linked to a culture. Their translation frequently requires conversion (for further examples see the chapter on total transformation LEX 9). When precise measurements are not required, the translator may use general terms.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Azt üzente Cseténé, hogy hozzon egy **kiló** kenyeret és **húsz deka** felvágottat. (Örkény 1. 55)

English TT: That’s why she asked Mrs Csete to tell Kopp to take home **a loaf of** bread and **some** cold cuts. (Sollosy 50)

Commentary: **kiló** (‘one kilogram’), the usual weight of a loaf, becomes **a loaf of**, while **húsz deka** (‘twenty decagrams, or 6 ounces’), the usual quantity of cold cuts (bought by the decagram in Hungary) for a family dinner, becomes **some** in the English translation.

Body size in Hungarian is not usually given with the same precision as in English. If a character is described as a young man of 6 feet and 2 inches in an English novel, instead of a literal translation or conversion of feet and inches into metric units, we will find **középtermétűnél magasabb fiatalember** (‘a young man higher than average’). The same generalisation takes place when translating from English into Russian: **molodoy chelovek vishe srednevo rosta** (‘a young man higher than average’).

2.4. Generalisation of reporting verbs

So far we have been primarily discussing the generalisation of **nouns**. The meaning of **verbs** is also frequently broadened in H-IE translation. In chapters LEX 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, it was demonstrated that translations into Hungarian are generally characterised by the specification of IE verbs with general meanings. The opposite tendency can be observed in the H-IE direction: Hungarian verbs become more abstract and more general when translated into IE languages. The rich inventory of reporting verbs in Hungarian, for instance, is not reflected at all in H-IE trans-

lations. Instead of the wide variety of Hungarian reporting verbs translators use the same semantically depleted reporting verbs (*to say, sagen, dire, skazat'*) in IE translations.

Hungarian ST: Menj csak el kisfiam tojásnak – *nógatott* néha – , hiszen a tojás a születés és az elmúlás egyszerre. (Örkény 4. 44.)

French TT: – Un oeuf, *disait elle* parfois, pourquoi ne deviendrais-tu pas un oeuf? (Tardos 2. 45.)

Commentary: The Hungarian reporting verb with complex meaning: *nógatott* ('urge', 'encourage') is replaced by the central reporting verb in French *disait*.

2.5. Generalisation of semantically rich verbs

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The generalisation of semantically rich Hungarian verbs is one of the most typical transfer operations in H-IE translation. As we have already mentioned, this operation can be accounted for the rich variety of Hungarian prefixes and suffixes, which makes possible to condense many different shades and nuances of meaning into the same single Hungarian verb (iterative, durative, causative, frequentative etc.). Hungarian literary tradition greatly favours the fullest possible use of these stylistic resources of the language. The retention of this richness is not always possible, and not always necessary, either, in IE languages. Translators either use analytic solutions, that is, they use more words in the TL (this operation will be discussed in the next chapters), or they decide to choose IE verbs with general meanings:

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST:... *végigsiklottak* ujjai a bordáin. (Csáth 185)

English TT: ... his fingers *run over* its ribs. (Kessler 185)

Commentary: *végigsiklottak* ('slide along to the very end') becomes *run over* in English translation.

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Még sötétség *terjengett* mindenütt. (Kosztolányi 25)

German TT: Noch *lag* über allem Dunkelheit ... (Klein 27)

Commentary: *terjengett* ('spread slowly over') becomes *lag* ('lay') in the German translation.

The four IE languages, English, French, German, and Russian are not at the same level of the abstract/concrete hierarchy. We have noted earlier that Vinay and Darbelnet consider French more abstract than English. In their book (1958, 1995) we can find a number of illustrations of the generic nature of French and the specific nature of English, e.g. French *coup* as opposed to English *cut, thrust, shot, kick, clap, gust, crack, stroke*, or French *est* in opposition to English *hangs, stands, lies* for indicating positions of objects (1995: 53).

Or if we take into consideration the system of prefixes in German and Russian, we find that many meanings expressed by prefixes in Hungarian could be retained in translations from Hungarian into Russian and German. Nevertheless, a tendency or preference for generalisation of verbs is clearly detectable also in Hungarian-Russian and Hungarian-German translation. In the following examples the meanings of the Hungarian prefixes *meg-* and *be-*, are retained in the translation by the Russian prefixes *za-*, *do-*, while the verbs themselves become more general.

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: ... *megpendült* a szomszéd ház udvarán egy zongora-
verkli. (Molnár 3)

Russian TT: ... в соседнем доме *zaigrala* шарманка ... (Rossiyanov 5)

Commentary: By the use of the Russian inchoative prefix *za-* the inchoative meaning of the Hungarian verb can be retained in the translation, but instead of the specific verb *pendül* which refers to the sound made e.g. by string instruments, we find *igrat'* ('to play'), a general verb in Russian.

Hungarian ST: ... a friss tavaszi szellő szárnyán *berepült* a muzsika a
tanterembe. (Molnár 3)

Russian TT: ... с dunoveniem vesennevo veterka в класс *doneslas'* muzi-
ka. (Rossiyanov 5)

Commentary: *berepül* ('fly into') → *doneslas'* ('come into')

The evidence provided by our multilingual corpora shows that Hungarian translators make more use of generalisation in Hungarian-IE translation than required by the source text or than could be expected on the basis of bilingual Hungarian-English, Hungarian-French, Hungarian-German, Hungarian-Russian dictionaries. Thus, generalisation in Hungarian-IE translation is an overall translation strategy, independent to some extent from the generic or specific nature of the lexicon of the languages under investigation.

The universal character of generalisation can be demonstrated by presenting similar solutions by two independent translators, one working in the Hungarian-English, and the other in the Hungarian-German direction.

Hungarian → English and German:

Hungarian ST: Egymás után *hörpintette* fel a serlegeket. (Kosztolányi 26)

English TT: ... *emptying* one goblet after another. (Fadiman-Szirtes 26)

German TT: *Leerte* hintereinander die Becher. (Klein 28)

Commentary: Hungarian: *hörpint* ('take a swig') becomes *to empty* in English, and *leeren* ('to empty') in German.

Summary comments on lexical generalisation

In the case of nouns, generalisation of meanings (broadening of meanings or generalising translation) can be accounted for by the differences in the lexical systems, that is, by differences in the lexical reflection of reality. In the case of verbs, a relative lack of morphological and word-formation options in IE languages makes generalising translation a must.

The above causes are related to lexical differences between languages, therefore, they are language specific causes. However, generalising translation may also have **translation specific** causes. It may be inherent in the nature of translation: translators might be tempted to follow the line of least resistance, and if they cannot find a precise equivalent in the TL, they will select a word with a more general meaning, which is easier to fit into the total structure of the TL sentence.

We may ask, therefore, whether broadening of meaning should not be regarded as a universal translation strategy, independent of subject matter, language pair or direction of translation? This would be in line with the hypothesis that **simplification** is one of the universal strategies of translation (Baker 1993, Laviosa 1998). Analysis of our multilingual corpus shows, though, that for Hungarian translators generalising translation is **not a universally valid** translation strategy. As was illustrated in chapter LEX 1, in translating from IE languages into Hungarian the verbs became more specific because Hungarian translators take special care to use the rich inventory of verbal prefixes and suffixes provided by the lexical system of the Hungarian language. In this case, they apply language pair specific translation strategies rather than universal strategies.

Generalising translation is used mainly when Hungarian is translated into IE languages and generally in cases where semantically rich Hungarian verbs have either no equivalent in the TL or can be translated only analytically, as will be shown in the next chapter of this part.

3. Contraction of meanings

Lexical contraction – or, in other terms, **concentration** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, 1995), **integration** (Klaudy 1995), **accumulation** or **condensation** of meanings – is a standard transfer operation whereby translators draw together the meaning of several words, and thus SL units consisting from two or more words will be replaced by a TL unit consisting of one word.

Contraction of meanings in translation can be explained by the different segmentation of reality e.g., kinship relations, by the different word formation possibilities (e.g., long compound words are common in German) and by the synthetic or analytic nature of the lexical systems of different languages.

According to the traditional classification of language typology, Hungarian belongs to the **agglutinative** type of languages, where words tend to be made up of several syllables. Typically each word has a base (or root stem) and a number of affixes. Any grammatical category has its own affix: *fiú* ('boy'), *fiú-k* ('boys'), *fi-aink* ('our boys'), *fi-aink-nak* ('to our boys'), *szeret* (to love), *szeret-ek* ('I love'), *szeret-l-ek* ('I love you'). Agglutinative languages like Hungarian or Finnish may allow extremely long words: "... the longest Finnish word consists of 103 letters, the longest Hungarian word consists of 83 letters" (Rot 1994).

When translating from an **isolating**, monosyllabic language like English into an **agglutinative** language like Hungarian, many obligatory contractions take place, which are not only obligatory operations but are automatic as well. During the process of translation from IE into Hungarian, for instance, the contraction of IE pronouns and auxiliary verbs with the main verb is an obligatory and automatic transfer operation, which is necessary to create grammatically correct Hungarian sentences. Morphological contraction in IE-H translation means that functional elements with **grammatical meaning** are incorporated into the main verb (e.g., *May I have it?* → *Elvehetem?*). As this operation is automatic, we are not going to deal with it in detail.

Something that is not obligatory and automatic is the contraction of different **lexical meanings**, distributed over several words in IE languages, e.g., English: *to say softly* → Hungarian: *suttog*; English: *You are making me nervous* → Hungarian: *Idegesítesz*; German: *Ich mache mich schön* → Hungarian: *Szépítkezem*. The Hungarian **word formation** system with its rich inventory of verbal prefixes and suffixes makes it possible to condensate many nuances of meaning into a single Hungarian verb, but it is only a possibility, which may and may not be used by translators. Analytic IE lexical structures, for example English: *to have a look*, German: *Platz nehmen*, Russian: *stal dogadivatsya* can always be translated also analytically into Hungarian: *pillantást vet* 'have a look', *helyet foglal* 'take a seat', *kezdi megsejteni* 'begin to have a feeling'.

Contraction of meanings in translation always presupposes some kind of decision-making on the part of translators for two reasons: (1) contraction of mean-

ings is rarely suggested by bilingual dictionaries, (2) contraction of meanings is an optional transfer operation.

This type of lexical correspondence (the meanings of several SL words are amalgamated into one word in the TL) can rarely be found in bilingual dictionaries. For example, if we try to find the English-Hungarian translation correspondence *started sipping* → *belekortyolt* in an English-Hungarian Dictionary (EHD 1977), it turns out that it cannot be found either under the entry *to start* or *to sip*. Checking the same correspondence in all the four IE-H academic dictionaries (*English-Hungarian Dictionary* 1977, *French-Hungarian Dictionary* 1973, *German-Hungarian Dictionary* 1974, *Russian-Hungarian Dictionary* 1969), it becomes clear that none of these dictionaries will **suggest that translators should or could use the verb *belekortyol***, for the simple reason that none of these dictionaries contain this Hungarian verb.

Contraction of meanings is a good test of translators' creativity. Hungarian translators in their everyday practice carry out **more contractions** than offered by the bilingual dictionaries. The condensation of different meanings into a single Hungarian verb, that is, utilisation of the word formation potential of Hungarian is not an automatic transfer operation, but requires the operation of a certain kind of routine transfer skill on the part of translators, as we shall see in the following.

Examination of contraction as a transfer operation from the point of view of universal translation strategies (Baker 1993, Laviosa 1998) shows that contraction is not a universal translation strategy. It takes place first of all in IE-H translation. As contraction of meaning results in a lower number of words in translation, translators often hesitate to choose the more implicit solutions. Failure to carry out possible contractions in translation can be regarded as an **indirect proof** of the universal character of explicitation (cf. the "asymmetry hypothesis", Klaudy 1999b: 15, 2001).

Subtypes:

- 3.1. Contraction of kinship terms
- 3.2. Contraction motivated by word formation potential
- 3.3. Integration of inchoative verbs into the main verb
- 3.4. Integration of adverbs of manner into reporting verbs
- 3.5. Merging change of state verbs with adjectives
- 3.6. Merging semantically poor verbs with nouns

3.1. Contraction of kinship terms

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

For the expression of certain kinship relations one language may have a collective term while another may not, e.g., Hungarian *testvér* is a collective term for English *brother and sister*, French *frère et soeur*, German *Brüder und Schwester*, Russian *brat i sestra*. Similarly, for Hungarian *nagyszülők*, or English *grand-parents* there is no collective term in Russian, one can refer to them only analytically: *babushka i dedushka*. In other cases, it is Hungarian where a more detailed description can be found, and IE languages are characterised by a unified approach which does not distinguish siblings on the basis of relative age: Hungarian *öccs*

(‘younger brother’) and *fivér* (‘elder brother’) can be translated with one collective term into IE languages *brother*, *frère*, *Brüder*, *brat* and similarly Hungarian *húg* (‘younger sister’) and *nővér* (‘elder sister’) can be translated with one collective term into IE languages *sister*, *soeur*, *Schwester*, *sestra*. If there is no collective term in the SL but it exists in the TL, then translators use contraction.

English → Hungarian:

brother/sister (specific terms in E) → *testvérek* (collective term in H)

English ST: Of course they wasn’t *brother and sister*, ... (Hemingway 62)

Hungarian TT: Persze nem voltak *testvérek*, ... (Szász 63)

English ST: Then his sister was his manager, and they was always being written up in the papers all about *brothers and sisters* and how she loved her brother ... (Hemingway 62)

Hungarian TT: Aztán a nővére volt a menedzsere, s mindig kiírták őket az újságokban, hogy *testvérek*, és hogyan szereti a lány a fivérét ... (Szász 63)

French → Hungarian:

frère et soeur (specific terms in F) → *testvérek* (collective term in H)

French ST: Il connaissait le style passionnel *du frère et de la soeur* ... (Cocteau 22)

Hungarian TT: Ismerte *a két testvér* szenvedélyes beszédmodját ... (Gyergyai 174)

French ST: Peu à peu la façon dont je regardais *le frère et la soeur* évoluait. (Tournier 21)

Hungarian TT: Lassanként kezdtem másként látni *a két testvért*. (Szabolcs 20)

3.2. Contraction motivated by word formation potential

Predominant direction: from Hungarian → into German

Although word combination is one of the most frequent forms of expanding vocabulary and creating new words in all the five languages under investigation, it is especially frequently used in German (e.g. *Kriegsfolgenbereinigungsgesetz* ‘war consequences clearing act’). In certain registers (scientific, political or administrative) all languages tend to produce excessively long, sometimes monstrous words, but in German long words are a general characteristic of the lexical system. That is why our corpus of literary works contains a large number of contractions in Hungarian → German translation: Hungarian noun phrases consisting of adjective plus noun become compounds in the German translation.

Hungarian ST → German TT:

Erőszakos alak! S amellet érzékeny. (Palotai 15)

Er ist ein *Gewaltmensch!* Aber empfindlich ist er auch. (Dira 12)

Commentary: Hungarian *erőszakos alak* ('agressive person') → German *Gewaltmensch*.

Színészi pózba vágta magát. (Mikszáth 25)

Jetz warf er sich *in Schauspielerpose*. (Schüching–Engl 294)

Commentary: Hungarian *színészi póz* ('theatrical pose') → German *Schauspielerpose*.

Egy *gyermekkori stikli* volt. (Mikszáth 26)

Es war ein *Jugendstreich*. (Schüching–Engl 294)

Commentary: Hungarian *gyermekkori stikli* ('youthful escapades') → German *Jugendstreich*.

On the basis of its potential for compounding, the German language can certainly be opposed not only to Hungarian but to English, French and Russian as well (cf. *Donaudampfschiffkapitän* in Hervey et al. 1992); in this book, however, we always concentrate on Hungarian as one of the language pairs to be compared.

3.3. Integration of inchoative verbs into the main verb

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

As mentioned earlier (LEX 1.3), IE verbs of beginning (*start, beginnen, commencer, nachinat'*) in auxiliary function (*begin to rain, start to speak*, etc.) often become **more specific**, more concrete in IE→Hungarian translation. Another operation that is connected with verbs of beginning is the **integration** of these verbs into the main verb *began to speak* → *megszólalt*. In this case, the inchoative meaning expressed by the auxiliary verb is integrated into the meaning of the main verb. One of the main characteristics of the Hungarian lexical system is the existence of a rich storehouse of prefixes and suffixes, which makes it possible to integrate the inchoative meaning into the meaning of the main verb (*sipping, zu schluchzen, apparaître, dogadyvat'sya*), resulting in a synthetic Hungarian verb containing inchoative prefixes: *bele-, fel-, meg-* (*belekortyolt, felzokogott, feltüntek, megsejtette*).

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Billy *started sipping* his tea. (Dahl 72)

Hungarian TT: Billy *belekortyolt* a teába. (Borbás 73)

Commentary: English *started sipping* → Hungarian *bele+kortyolt* (inchoativ prefix + sipped)

German → Hungarian:

German ST: ... im Nebenzimmer rechts **begann** die Schwester **zu schluchzen**. (Kafka 102)

Hungarian TT: ... a jobb oldali szobában húga **felzokogott**. (Györffy 103)

Commentary: German **begann ...zu schluchzen** ('began to cry') → Hungarian **felzokogott** (inchoativ prefix + sobbed)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: ... et des étoiles aussi **commençaient apparaître** à l'horizon obscurci, ... (Maupassant 26)

Hungarian TT: ... és az elsötétedett látóhatáron már **feltűntek** a csillagok is ... (Illés 136)

Commentary: French **commençaient apparaître** ('began to appear') → Hungarian **feltűntek** (inchoativ prefix + appeared)

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: По видимому с середины зими Dimov **stal dogadyvat'sya**, chto yevo obmanivayut. (Chekhov 141)

Hungarian TT: Úgy a tél dereka felé Dimov, úgy látszik, **megsejtette**, hogy felesége megcsalja. (Szöllősy 305)

Commentary: Russian **stal dogadyvat'sya** ('began to have a feeling') → Hungarian **megsejtette** (inchoativ prefix + had a feeling)

3.4. Integration of adverbs of manner into reporting verbs

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

In the chapter on specification (LEX 1), it was mentioned that IE verbs of saying (*say, sagen, dire, skazat'*) in literary works often become more specific or more concrete in IE→Hungarian translation.

Another way of concretisation is the **merging** of adverbs of manner and verbs of saying (*said encouragingly* → *biztatta*). One of the most characteristic features of the Hungarian lexical system is that with the help of a rich inventory of prefixes and suffixes Hungarian verbs offer very favourable possibilities for the condensation of several meanings into one single verb. Meanings that are expressed analytically in IE languages, that is, distributed between adverbs and verbs, can be expressed synthetically in Hungarian.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: 'Before this day is done', Mr. Boggis **said softly**, I shall have the pleasure of sitting down upon that lovely seat.' (Dahl 136)

Hungarian TT: – Még mielőtt leáldozik a nap – **suttogta** Mr. Boggis –, erre a szépséges székre lesz szerencsém letelepedni. (Borbás 137)

Commentary: English *said softly* → Hungarian *suttogta* ('whispered')
English ST: 'Yes Edna?' *said* Miss Marple *encouragingly*. (Christie 6)
Hungarian TT: – Nos, Edna – *biztatta* Miss Marple. (Borbás 7)
 Commentary: English *said encouragingly* → Hungarian *biztatta*
 ('encouraged her')

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Vous!, *fit* elle *avec étonnement*. (Flaubert 101)
Hungarian TT: – Hogy ön! – *csodálkozott* Emma. (Gyergyai 175)
 Commentary: French *fit avec étonnement* → Hungarian *csodálkozott*
 ('wondered')

French ST: J'ai soif, *dît* Chloé *dans un souffle*. (Vian 113)
Hungarian TT: – Szomjas vagyok – *rebegette* Chloé. (Bajomi 105)
 Commentary: French *dît dans un souffle* → Hungarian *rebegette* ('mumbled')

German → Hungarian:

German ST: "Was willst du mit einer Familie", *rief er empört aus*.
 (Dürrenmatt 34)
Hungarian TT: – Mire neked család – *méltatlankodott*. (D. Fejér 39)
 Commentary: German *rief ... empört aus* → Hungarian *méltatlankodott*
 ('was indignant')

German ST: "Gib sie mir", *sagte er laut*. (von der Grün 14)
Hungarian TT: – Add ide! – *förmedt* rám ... (Bognár 22)
 Commentary: German *sagte er laut* ('said loudly') → Hungarian *förmedt rá*
 ('bawled out')

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: – Ну, "Nasu marku" – *zlobno otvetil* Bezdornnij. (Bulga-
 kov 16)
Hungarian TT: – Hát, Márkát – *vetette oda* Hontalan. (Szöllősy 16)
 Commentary: Russian *zlobno otvetil* ('replied angrily') → Hungarian
odavet ('threw out a remark')

This operation is not obligatory as the analytic solution *mondta lágyan* (lit.: said softly), *mondta biztatóan* (lit.: said encouragingly), *mondta hangosan* (lit.: said loudly), *mondta mérgesen* (lit.: said angrily), etc. would be equally correct in Hungarian. This operation is a new argument for the existence of a special norm followed by translators. Translators who decide to choose the synthetic solution consciously or instinctively take advantage of the special lexical possibilities of the Hungarian language.

3.5. Merging change of state verbs with adjectives

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

In IE languages, the changes in the physical or mental states of things or persons are usually expressed analytically by verbal phrases, consisting of a “verb of becoming” (e.g. *turn*) expressing the mere fact that something is changing, and of an adjective expressing the specific content or direction of the change (e.g. *turn sentimental*). In Hungarian, where the word formation system makes it very easy to form verbs from adjectives, these two meanings can be contracted and expressed synthetically by one verb (*turn sentimental* → *elérzékenyül*).

English → Hungarian:

English ST: And if it *makes me smaller*, I can creep under the door. (Carroll 16)

Hungarian TT: Ha pedig *eltörpülök* tőle, akkor kimászhatok alul az ajtórésen. (Kosztolányi 13)

Commentary: English *makes me smaller* → Hungarian *el+törpülök* (prefix+dwarfed by)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: L'enfant *reprenait* un visage *ombrageux*. (Cocteau 35)

Hungarian TT: A lány arca *elborult*. (Gyergyai 185)

Commentary: French *reprenait ombrageux* → Hungarian *el+borult* (prefix+darkened)

German → Hungarian:

German ST: “Dies frühzeitige Aufstehen,” dachte er, “*macht* einen ganz *blödsinnig*”. (Kafka 82)

Hungarian TT: – Ez a korai felkelés – gondolta, — egészen *megbolondít*. (Györffy 83)

Commentary: German: *macht blödsinnig* → Hungarian: *meg+bolondít*. (prefix+drives mad)

German ST: Sein geschorener Backenbart *war weiß geworden*, ... (Mann 1. 130)

Hungarian TT: Nyírott pofaszakállá *megfehéredett* ... (Lányi 1. 131)

Commentary: German: *war weiß geworden* → Hungarian: *meg+fehéredett* (prefix+became white)

3.6. Merging semantically depleted verbs with nouns

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

This type of meaning integration is probably the most frequent one in IE-H translation: IE verbs of general meaning (*take, tun, prendre, pochustvovat'*) are

amalgamated with nouns of specific meaning (*sip*, *Blick*, *café*, *robost'*) resulting in a synthetic Hungarian verb form (*kortyintott*, *bepillantsak*, *kávéztunk*, *megszzeppent*). The great variety of synthetic verb forms is a unique possibility of Hungarian, which does not mean, at the same time that here are no analytic forms. In the sentences below, the translators could have used analytic IE forms parallel to the IE constructions, but they chose to use the synthetic forms, characteristic of Hungarian.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Franny nodded, and *took a sip* of her milk. (Salinger 27)

Hungarian TT: Franny bólintott, és *kortyintott* a tejből. (Elbert 28)

Commentary: English *took a sip* → Hungarian *korty+intott* (sip + verbal suffix)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Il revint le soir à la même heure que la veille. Nous *prenions notre café*. (Vercors 25)

Hungarian TT: Este megint csak abban az órában érkezett meg, mint előző nap. Éppen *kávéztunk*. (Rubin 38)

Commentary: French *prenions notre café* → Hungarian *kávéztunk* (coffee + verbal suffix)

German → Hungarian:

German ST: ... da doch ein Sinn und ein Verlangen in mir wäre, auch *ein Blick* in dies und jenes *zu tun*, ... (Möricke 16)

Hungarian TT: ...pedig bennem megvolna a vágy, hogy *bepillantsak* ebbe-abba, ... (Lengyel 17)

Commentary: German *ein Blick ... zu tun* → Hungarian *be+pillantsak* (prefix + look + verbal suffix)

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: Akakij Akakievich uzhe zablagovremenno *pochuvstvoval nadlezhashchuyu robost'*. (Gogol 153)

Hungarian TT: Akakij Akakijevics már előre kellőképpen *megszzeppent*. (Makai 35)

Commentary: Russian *pochuvstvoval ...robost'* → Hungarian *meg+szzeppent* (inchoativ prefix + was frightened)

Summary comments on lexical contraction

The contraction of meanings as a transfer operation is very close to the specification of meanings, discussed in the first chapter (LEX 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5). Disappearance of IE verbs of general meaning will necessarily make the Hungarian text

more specific. Contraction and specification of meaning primarily characterise translation into Hungarian. They are among the most frequently used transfer operations, and sometimes they are used more than once in the same sentence, as shown below:

English ST: ... and it **was a shock** last week when one of the brood not only detected me in the act of observation but **returned that knowing signal**, as if he **shared my knowledge** of what the years would **make** of him. (Greene 124)

Hungarian TT: ... és a múlt héten jócskán **megdöbentem**, mikor a fészek-aljából az egyik nemcsak rajtakapott megfigyelés közben, de még **vissza is kacsintott**, mintha ő **éppoly jól tudná**, mit **tartogat** számára a jövő. (Borbás 235)

English	→	Hungarian
was a shock	→	megdöbben (contraction);
returned ... a knowing signal	→	visszakacsintott (contraction):
shared my knowledge	→	tudná (contraction);
make	→	tartogat (specification)
years	→	jövő ('future') (specification)

The instances of contracting meanings, which we have shown in this chapter are almost all optional transfer operations. In translating from IE languages into Hungarian, incorporation of inchoative meaning into the main verb, the merging of adverbs of manner with reporting verbs, and semantically depleted verbs with nouns and change of state verbs with adjectives are not obligatory. Even without applying these operations translators could produce lexically and grammatically correct Hungarian sentences. These operations simply take full advantage of the synthetic nature of Hungarian, which manifests itself in its lexical system.

These operations cannot be called automatic, and inexperienced translators do not use them. Experienced translators, however, often follow the synthetic principle, and perhaps even more frequently than the authors of literary works originally written in Hungarian. Contraction of meanings in translating from Indo-European languages into Hungarian is evidence of the existence of a special **translational norm**, which is, perhaps, more conservative than the norms of general or literary Hungarian.

As contraction results in a lower number of words in the TL text, it can be treated as a kind of broad translation strategy, i.e. **implication**. Implication is never obligatory: it is rather a possibility, provided by the TL. Finding the appropriate synthetic forms in the TL is not always easy: it requires a rich vocabulary on the part of translators. Inexperienced translators often choose the analytic solution because it does not require a long search in the dictionary to find an equivalent. Translators who fail to take advantage of the possibilities of contraction offered by Hungarian may produce more explicit translations, but this kind of **explicitness** is not always desirable, because it leads to **simplification** of vocabulary in the TL text.

4. Distribution of meaning

Lexical distribution – or, in other terms, **dilution** (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, 1995), **segmentation** (Klaudy 1995) or **division** of meanings – is a standard transfer operation whereby the complex lexical meaning of a SL word is distributed over several words in the TL.

Distribution of meaning in translation can be explained by the different segmentation of reality, e.g., kinship relations, by the different word-formation possibilities (e.g., long compound words are common in German), and by the synthetic or analytic nature of the lexical systems of different languages.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, due to their rich **morphology** and **word-forming potential**, Hungarian verbs can incorporate more meanings (**synthesis**) than IE verbs, which are characterised by an **analytical** structure. E.g., Hungarian: *Becsomagoljam?* (synthetic form) – English: *Shall I wrap it up?* (analytic form). Hungarian: *Vilma elmosolyodott* (synthetic form) French: *Vilma eut un sourire* (analytic form). The meaning components of Hungarian verbs with a synthetic morphological structure are redistributed into several words in the process of translation into IE languages. Reference to the person, time, object and nature of the activity are all separated in the process of translation into IE (in the form of pronouns, auxiliary verbs, etc.). *English ST*: – Segítség! *Megöl!* (Örkény 190) *Hungarian TT*: “Help! *He is going to kill me.*” (Sollosy 119). The distribution of **grammatical meaning** the H-IE translation is **obligatory**, which is necessary to produce grammatically correct TL sentences, therefore we shall not give a detailed account of that transfer operation.

The distribution of **lexical meaning** is more interesting for translation research. The synthetic nature of the Hungarian word-formation system makes it possible to amalgamate many different shades and nuances of meaning in one word with the help of a large number of prefixes and suffixes. To distribute the meaning of semantically rich Hungarian verbs in H-IE translation is an **almost obligatory** transfer operation because translators translating from H into IE often cannot find IE verbs of a similar semantic complexity. Or, what is more interesting, if they find an equivalent in the bilingual dictionary, they cannot be sure that it will be a translational equivalent as well (because of frequency differences).

This type of lexical correspondence (the meaning of a SL word distributed over several TL words) is adequately recorded in bilingual dictionaries, because often there is no other way to find an equivalent for a synthetic Hungarian verb (cf. *ki-kocsizik* → *go for a drive* (HED 1977. II.1074) than to distribute its meaning over several IE words.

Distribution of meaning as a transfer operation can also be studied from the point of view of a supposed universal translation strategy: i.e. a higher **explicitation** (Baker 1993, Klaudy 1993, Laviosa 1998). As the distribution of meaning results in the increasing of the number of words in translation, the TL text will,

undoubtedly, be more explicit. However, this kind of explicitation (resulting from the distribution of SL meaning) may violate the coherence of the TL text.

Subtypes:

- 4.1. Distribution of meaning in kinship terms
- 4.2. Distribution of meaning in complex nouns
- 4.3. Distribution of meaning in paraphrasing translation
- 4.4. Distribution of meaning in inchoative verbs
- 4.5. Separation of adverbs of manner
- 4.6. Distribution of meaning in reporting verbs
- 4.7. Distribution of meaning in change of state verbs
- 4.8. Distribution of meaning in semantically rich verbs

4.1. Distribution of meaning in kinship terms

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

Distribution of meaning in translation of kinship terms, as mentioned earlier, is motivated by the different degree of segmentation of reality in this semantic area. Kinship terms may have a more detailed classification in one language and a less detailed one in the other. Hungarian, for instance, has a collective term for *nagy-szülők* ('grandparents') while Russian does not, cf. *babushka i dedushka* 'grandmother and grandfather'. Hungarian has a collective term for *testvérek* ('brother and sister') while English, German, French and Russian do not. The meaning of the Hungarian word *testvérek* can only be rendered by two words in IE languages: *brother and sister, Brüder und Schwester, frère et soeur, brat i sestra*.

Hungarian → English:

testvérek (collective term in H) → *brothers/sisters* (specific terms in E)

Hungarian ST: Azután elment, mert már jöttek a varázsló rokonai és testvérei, s azokkal ő nem volt ismerős. (Csáth 64)

English TT: Then she went away, because the brothers and sisters and aunts and uncles and cousins of the magician were gathering, and she didn't know any of them. (Kessler 204)

Hungarian → French:

testvérek (collective term in H) → *frère/soeur* (specific terms in F)

Hungarian ST: Testvéreim nincsenek. Rokonom csak egy van, egy gazdag gyáros ... (Kosztolányi 93)

French TT: Je n'ai plus ni frère, ni soeur. Mon seul parent est un riche fabricant ... (Komoly 92)

The collective/specific character of a kinship term is always a relative concept. The terms *brother and sister, Brüder und Schwester, frère et soeur, brat i ses-*

tra are specific in relation to Hungarian *testvérek*, but they are collective terms in relation to Hungarian *öcs* ('younger brother'), *fivér* ('elder brother'), *húg* ('younger sister') and *nővér* ('elder sister'). In this case, translating from Hungarian into IE languages will require descriptive translation, which can be regarded as a special case of meaning distribution: *öccse* → *sein jüngerer Bruder*, *húga* → *seine kleine Schwester*.

Hungarian → German:

öcs/húg (specific terms in H) → *jüngerer Bruder/kleine Schwester* (collective terms in G with specification of relative age)

Hungarian ST: Édesanyja reggel hétkor benyitott az udvarra néző szerény lakás hosszúkás szobájába, melyben három gyermeke aludt: ő, *az öccse meg a húga*. (Kosztolányi 24)

German TT: Um sieben Uhr in der Frühe öffnete seine Mutter die Tür zum länglichen Zimmer ihrer bescheidenen Wohnung mit Hofblick, in welchem ihre drei Kinder schliefen: er, *sein jüngerer Bruder und seine kleine Schwester*. (Koriáth 132)

Distribution of kinship terms may seem to be a typical example of interlingual asymmetry (Gak in Zlateva 1993), because neither Hungarian *testvérek*, nor Hungarian *öcs/fivér*, *húg/nővér* have a single-word dictionary equivalent in IE languages. Sometimes, however, we find cases of seemingly **unmotivated distribution**: the Hungarian word *rokonok* for example does have a single-word dictionary equivalent in English *relatives*, yet the translator carried out the operation of distribution of meaning: *rokonok* ('relatives') → *aunts, uncles, and cousins*.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Azután elment, mert már jöttek a varázsló *rokonai* és testvérei, s azokkal ő nem volt ismerős. (Csáth 64)

English TT: Then she went away, because the brothers and sisters and *aunts and uncles and cousins* of the magician were gathering, and she didn't know any of them. (Kessler 204)

One explanation for the occurrence of seemingly unmotivated transfer operations can be found in the **principle of analogy**. In the process of translating, translators always have their previous solutions in their mind. As Levy states, every move "is influenced by the knowledge of previous decisions and by the situation which resulted from them" (cited by Wilss 1998: 57). Since the translator in the above example was forced to divide the meaning of the Hungarian word *testvérek*, into *brothers and sisters* in the English translation, he continued to use the same operation in translating the next word: *rokonok* → *aunts, uncles, and cousins*, although he could have found a single-word English equivalent in *relatives*.

4.2. Distribution of meaning in complex nouns

Predominant direction: **from German → into Hungarian**

It has been mentioned earlier (LEX 3.2) that the preference for word combinations in German may produce very long words which can be translated into Hungarian only by several words: e.g. *Kriegsfolgenbereinigungsgesetz* → *a második világháború anyagi következményeinek rendezéséről szóló törvény* ('war consequences clearing act'). This operation is needed not only in certain registers (scientific, political or administrative), where all languages tend to produce excessively long words, but also in the everyday practice of German → Hungarian literary translation.

German → Hungarian:

German ST: Hexerei und Kartenlesen, Amulettgetrage, böser Blick, Benschwörungen, Vollmondhokuspokus und was sie sonst noch alles treiben ... (Süskind 19)

Hungarian TT: ... a boszorkányság, kártyavetés, amulettviselés, szemmel verés, igézés, teliholdkor történő varázslások és hasonlók ellen ... (Farkas 15) ('wizardry by full moon')

German ST: Eisenbahndämpfe, der Schleim der Auspuffgase, Straßentaub ... (Böll 887)

Hungarian TT: A vasút felől felszálló gőz, a kipufogó gázok lepedéke, az utcai por ... (Dorombly 6) ('steam rising from the railway')

German ST: ... das lange adamsapfelige Bergfilmprofil; ... (Böll 36)

Hungarian TT: ... a hegyvidéki filmek jellegzetes férfigurája, hosszú, ádámcsutkás profiljával; ... (Rayman 70) ('a typical male character of movies about life in the mountains')

German ST: Sie stiegen Arm in Arm über den Graben an der Straße und sofort tiefer in die Tannendunkelheit hinein, ... (Mörrike 10)

Hungarian TT: Karonfogva ugrották át az útmenti árkot, és léptek be a fenyves homályába, ... (Lengyel 11) ('the twilight of the fir forest')

Distribution of complex nouns takes place, of course, not only in German-Hungarian translation, but also when translating from any language into any other language, but Hungarian translators undoubtedly carry out more distributions in the German-Hungarian translation than in English-Hungarian, French-Hungarian or Russian-Hungarian translation.

4.3. Distribution of meaning in paraphrasing translation

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

The next form of distribution is paraphrasing translation, when in the absence of a precise TL term translators render the meaning of the SL term with a noun of general meaning and a concretising attribute: Hungarian *kocsonya* → English *meat in aspic*; Hungarian *sterc* → English *baked potatoes*; Hungarian *kondér* → English *great kettle*.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Nem annyira, mint a *kocsonya*, erről az uramat lehetne faggatni, ... (Esterházy 53)

English TT: Not as much as *meat in aspic*, though, you should ask my husband about it, ... (Sollosy 42).

Hungarian ST: Amikor azután a nagynénje egy este a *sterc* fölött célozgatni kezdett, hogy ha nem nősül, ... (Németh 300)

English TT: One evening, over the *baked potatoes*, his aunt began nagging him: if he was not going get married ... (Gulyás 6)

Hungarian ST: A koca rőfögve dörgölözött a lányhoz, aki csakhamar a mosópincébe sietett, tüzet gyújtott a *kondér* alá. (Csáth 6)

English TT: The sow grunted and nuzzled her. The girl left her and scuffled down to the cellar where she lit a fire under the *great kettle*. (Kessler 116)

Paraphrasing is especially often used in the translation of so-called “cultural words”, otherwise referred to as “realia”. As mentioned in LEX 2.4, if the precise rendering of the realia is not important, translators use generalising translation. It does occur, however, that the realia must be translated accurately. Since these words have no equivalents in the TL, translators frequently use a paraphrasing translation, i.e. attempt to render the meaning of the realia with a descriptive Adjective + Noun combination.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: ..., his immaculate suit, stiff collar and *Homburg hat* making a strange contrast to the nets, bags and boxes full of testtubes with which he was surrounded. (Durrell 109)

Hungarian TT: ... Makulátlan öltönye, kemény gallérja és *széles karimájú puhakalapja* különös ellentétben állt a hálókkaal, zacskókkal, kémcsövekkel telt dobozokkal, melyekkel körülrakta magát. (Sárközi 114)

Commentary: English *Homburg hat* → in paraphrasing Hungarian translation *széles karimájú puhakalap* (lit.: broad rimmed felt hat)

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Nagy díszben jelentek meg ökelmeik, *panyókásan*, kardosan. (Mikszáth 42)

German TT: Die Herren erscheinen in großem Stadt, *mit umgehängtem Dolman* und Galadegen. (Székács 48)

Commentary: Hungarian *panyókásan* → in paraphrasing German translation *mit umgehängtem Dolman* (lit.: with dolman worn as a cape with the sleeves hanging loose).

Hungarian → German and French:

Hungarian ST: Az első padokban szinte magától értetődően az “*úrügyermek*”-ek helyezkedtek el. (Kosztolányi 28)

German TT: Die ersten Bänke hatten wie selbstverständlich *die Kinder aus “vornehmen Hause”* beschlagnahmt, ... (Koriath 136)

French TT: Sur les premiers bancs – la chose allait quasi de soi – avaient pris place *les enfants de bonne famille*, ... (Koriath 136)

Commentary: Hungarian *úrügyerek* → in paraphrasing German translation *die Kinder aus “vornehmen Hause”*, in paraphrasing French translation: *les enfants de bonne famille* (lit.: children from better families).

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: V uglu dopivala kakaya-to kompaniya, i v centre yeyo suetil-sya znakomiy konfernans’e v *tyubeteyke* i s bokalom Abrau v ruke. (Bulgakov 63)

Hungarian TT: Csak a sarokban iszogatott még egy kisebb kompánia, s a közepén a közismert konferanszié üldögélt *tatár saphában*, kezében egy pohár Abrau. (Szöllősy 97)

Commentary: Russian *v tyubeteyke* → in paraphrasing Hungarian translation *tatár saphában* (lit.: in a tatars’ hat)

4.4. Distribution of meaning in inchoative verbs

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The next type of distribution to be discussed is the separation of inchoative meanings from Hungarian verbs in translation. This operation is typical of the H-IE direction. The complex meaning of Hungarian inchoative verbs (e.g., *elpityeredett*) is rendered by two separate verbs in IE languages: one expressing the beginning of the action (*start, beginnen*), and another expressing the action itself (*snivelling, zu flennen*). The general character of this operation is shown in the following examples, where distribution is made both by the English and the German translator in the same Hungarian sentences.

Hungarian ST: Erre aztán Rozsákné is felkelt, felöltözött és **elpityeredett**. (Mikszáth 23)

English TT: This was enough to make Mrs. Rozsák get up too, put on her clothes and **start snivelling**. (Sturgess 27)

German TT: Da stand nun auch Frau Rozsák auf, zog sich an und **begann zu flennen**. (Schüching–Engl 291)

In Russian translation, distribution does not take place, as the inchoative prefix **za-** makes it possible to form a similarly synthetic verb form: **elpityeredett** → **zaplakala** (**za** = prefix with inchoative meaning + **plakat** ‘to cry’).

Russian TT: Pri etih slovah u kuharki srazu propal son, ona podnyalas’, odelas’ i **zaplakala**. (Leybutin 29).

4.5. Separation of adverbs of manner

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian** → **into IE**

Just as in translating from IE languages into Hungarian, adverbs of manner are often incorporated into the verb in Hungarian, in translating from Hungarian into IE languages adverbs of manner will be **separated** from the IE verb. The complex meaning of the Hungarian verb including not only the action but also the way or method of doing it (**beront**, **belibbent**, **elcipelt**, **bevillamosozik**) can only be rendered by two separate words in IE translation: an adverb for expressing the manner, style or way of the action (**hurriedly**, **hereingetanzelt**, **de force**, **tramvayem**), and a verb for expressing the action itself (**return**, **kommen**, **traîner**, **doehat**’).

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: ... **berontott** az asszisztens. (Csáth 12)

English TT: ... the assistant **returned hurriedly**. (Kessler 184)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **berontott** (‘rushed in’) is distributed between the English verb **returned** and the adverb **hurriedly**.

Hungarian → French:

Hungarian ST: **Elcipelt** egy budai kocsmába. (Kosztolányi 132)

French TT: Il **m’entraîna de force** dans un cabaret de Buda. (Komoly 130)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **elcipelt** (‘drag away’) is distributed between the French verb **m’entraîna** and the adverb **de force**.

Hungarian ST: Fekete szemüveges koldus **kuporgott** az aszfalton. (Kosztolányi 63)

French TT: Un mendiant à lunettes noires **se tenait accroupi** sur l'asphalte. (Komoly 62)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **kuporgott** ('crouched') is distributed between the French verb **se tenait** and the adverb **accroupi**.

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Thalamus, az udvari borbély, **belibbent**. (Kosztolányi 90)

German TT: Thalamus, der Hofbarbier, **kam hereingetänzelt**. (Klein 91)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **belibbent** ('sailed into') is distributed between the German verb **kam** and the adverb **hereingetänzelt**.

Hungarian ST: ... mikor felpattant az ajtó, s **becsörtettek** a Csuda uram huszárai. (Mikszáth 14)

German TT: ... als die Tür aufsprang und die Husaren des Hauptmanns Csuda **polternd** in den Saal **eindrängen**. (Székács 14)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **becsörtettek** ('came in rattling their swords') is distributed between the German verb **eindrängen** and the adverb **polternd**.

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: Az lesz a legokosabb, ha **bevillamosozik** a belvárosba. (Örkény 1. 56)

Russian TT: Luche vsevo **tramvajem doyehat'** do tsentra. (Voronkina 1. 284)

Commentary: The complex meaning of the synthetic Hungarian verb **bevillamosozik** ('take a tram and go somewhere') is distributed between the Russian verb **doyehat'** ('go to') and the adverb **tramvajem** ('by a tram').

4.6. Distribution of meaning in reporting verbs

A similar distribution of meaning takes place when translating **reporting** verbs from Hungarian into IE languages. Hungarian reporting verbs of complex meaning **felhördül** 'to exclaim in protest', **hajtogat** 'to say a thing over and over again', **kötekedik** 'to pick a quarrel' or other verbs occasionally serving as reporting verbs (**sír** 'to cry', **csodálkozik** 'to be astonished', **mosolyog** 'to smile') are **divided** into a verb with general meaning and an adverb of manner expressing the way of saying: **mondta szünet nélkül** 'said again and again' **mondta csodálkozva** 'said with astonishment', **mondta mosolyogva** 'said smiling'.

Hungarian ' English, German:

Hungarian ST: – Eltitkolta-e? – **vigyorgott** a káplán gonoszul. (Mikszáth 35)

English TT: ‘Has he?’ **said** the chaplain **with a nasty grin**. (Sturgess 42)

German TT: ‘Hat er das wirklich?’ **sagte** der Kaplan **und grinste** böseartig. (Schüching–Engl 307)

Commentary: The similar solutions provided by the English and the German translators indicate the systemic nature of distribution in H-IE translation.

Hungarian ST: – Hát ez mi? – **csodálkozott** Gergely. (Gárdonyi 103)

English TT: ‘Why, whatever’s that?’ **asked** Gergő in **surprise**. (Cushing 85)

German TT: ‘Was ist denn das?’ **fragte** Gergő **erstaunt**. (Schüching 81)

Commentary: The similar solutions provided by of the English and the German translators indicate the systemic nature of distribution in the H-IE translation.

Hungarian ST: – Üsse kő – **legyintett** a férfi. (Örkény 1. 239)

English TT: ‘Never mind,’ the man **said with an exasperated wave of the hand**. (Sollosy 60)

Hungarian →French:

Hungarian ST: – Ugyan **ne bolondozzon** már. (Krúdy 104)

French TT: Voyons, **ne dites pas de bêtises!** (Gachot 208)

Hungarian ST: – Betonozva? – **hökkent meg** a tisztviselő. – Szokatlan, kérem. (Örkény 2. 97)

French TT: L’employé **manifeste une légère surprise** – Des murs en ciment armé ... (Tardos 1. 99)

4.7. Distribution of meaning in change of state verbs

Sometimes it is impossible to render **changes in state** with a single IE verb: *el-vörösödik* (‘turn red’), *elkékül* (‘turn blue’) *elérzékenyül* (‘turn sentimental’). Hungarian verbs indicating a change of state are also frequently distributed in translation into a verb of general meaning and an adjective describing the state.

Hungarian ST: Egészen **belevörösödtem** a próbálkozásba, hogy a gyanús közmondást kiegészítsem. (Karinthy 273)

English TT: My struggles to complete the shady-looking proverb actually **made me quite red** in the face. (Barker 12)

Hungarian ST: ... és ő maga is kötelességszerűen **elérzékenyült**. (Csáth 13)
English TT: ... and so **turned** dutifully **sentimental** himself. (Kessler 186)

Hungarian ST: Egy hónap alatt **elgyomosodtak** a parkok, zab nőtt a gyermekjátékszóterek homokozóiban. (Örkény 4. 16)
French TT: Au bout d'un mois, les jardin **furent envahis d'herbes folles** et les squares pour enfants d'avoine sauvage. (Tardos 2. 17)

4.8. Distribution of meaning in semantically rich verbs

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

As was illustrated in LEX 3, the differences in the word-formation systems of H and IE languages are responsible for one of the standard transfer operations, the contraction of meaning in the IE-Hungarian direction. The question is: can the same process be identified in the opposite direction? When Hungarian works are translated into IE languages, do we see the distribution of the meanings of the Hungarian verbs? On the evidence of our data provided by a multilingual comparative analysis, distribution of the meaning of verbs is one of the most common transfer operations in translating from Hungarian into English, French, German and Russian. Semantically rich Hungarian verbs are very often rendered by IE **verbs** of general meaning (English: **take, make, do** French **faire, prendre, avoir**, German: **machen, kommen, tun**, Russian: **prinimat', proizvodit', vzyat'**) and one or two **nouns** of specific meaning.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Mikor a gróf felébredt, **kikocsizott**, ha ugyan Estella megengedte. (Mikszáth 16)

English TT: When the count awoke he **went out for a drive in his coach**, if Estella allowed him to. (Sturgess 18)

Hungarian ST: A vacsora után együtt **borozgatott** a lengyelével, ... (Mikszáth 17)

English TT: After dinner **he used to settle down to drink** with his Polish house-guest, ... (Sturgess 19)

Hungarian → French:

Hungarian ST: Muszáj legalább néhány könyvet **végigszótározni**. (Babits 6)

French TT: On est obligé de **lire** nombre d'ouvrages, **dictionnaire en main**. (Leully-Szende 15)

Hungarian ST: Ők is **cihelődtek**. (Kosztolányi 55)

French TT: Elles aussi **rassemblaient leurs affaires**. (Komoly 55)

Hungarian ST: Délelőtt tizenegykor **fürödni** készült. (Kosztolányi 204)
French TT: A onze heures du matin, il se préparait à **prendre son bain**.
 (Komoly 184)

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Ott az osztály végén parasztygyermek **tanyáztak**.
 (Kosztolányi 28)

German TT: Hier, am Ende der Klasse, hatten die Bauernjungs ihr **Lager aufgeschlagen**. (Koriath 136)

Hungarian ST: De azért szívesen **leült** volna közéjük. (Kosztolányi 29)

German TT: Desungeachtet hätte er gern bei ihnen **Platz genommen**.
 (Koriath 136)

Hungarian ST: **Elindítottam** a magnót. (Örkény 1. 150)

German TT: Ich **setzte** das Magno **in Gang**. (Thies 1. 40)

Hungarian ST: – Fél napot dolgozom, fél napot **strandolok**. (Örkény 1. 241)

German TT: “Den halben Tag arbeite ich, den anderen halben Tag **gehe ich baden**.” (Thies 1.91)

Hungarian ST: A tér egészen **kihalt**. (Kosztolányi 5)

German TT: Der Platz **lag** da wie **ausgestorben**. (Klein 7)

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: Nagy csöndben voltak, egyikük sem **pisszent**. (Molnár 37)

Russian TT: Vsyo eto delalos' v glubokom molchanii: nikto ne **izdal ni zvuka**. (Rossiyanov 27)

Commentary: Hungarian: **pisszen** ('to hiss') → **izdat' zvuk** ('to emit a sound')

Hungarian ST: A többi fiúk, akik nem tartoztak a Pál-utcaiak közé, rettetesen **irigyelték** őket, mikor Boka intésére valamennyien **szalutáltak** ... (Molnár 61)

Russian TT: Ostal'niye, ne prinadlezhashchiye k ih chislu, **preispolnilis'** zhguchey **zavisti** pri vide tovo, kak vse oni v otvet razom **otdali chest'**... (Rossiyanov 44)

Commentary: Hungarian **irigyel** ('to envy') → Russian **preispolnit'sya zavisti** ('to be filled with envy'), Hungarian **szalutál** ('to salute') → Russian **otdat' chest'** ('give a salute')

The verbs **kihocsizott** (lit.: went out for a drive in his coach), **borozgatott** (lit.: he used to settle down to drink) beautifully illustrate the remarkable ability of the Hungarian language to create words which result in a significant compression of

meanings. The meanings of several words are condensed into a single Hungarian word and these meanings should, or rather must be distributed by the translators translating from Hungarian into IE languages.

The systemic character of the distribution of semantically rich Hungarian verbs can be illustrated by the following examples, where the same Hungarian verb *panaszkodik* is equally divided into two words in both the English and the German translations:

Hungarian ST: Panaszkodni is szeretett volna, de csak egy ízben kísérelte meg. (Kosztolányi 212)

English TT: He would have liked to tell his troubles, but never tried to do so after the first attempt. (Fadiman–Szirtes 180)

German TT: Er hätte ihr auch gern sein Leid geklagt, doch versuchte er es nur einmal. (Klein 215)

Summary comments on lexical distribution

The transfer operation of **distribution** of meaning is akin to the operation of generalisation of meanings. If we replace a concrete verb with a more general verb and a noun, the expression loses some of its terseness.

At the end of LEX 1, in connection with the broadening of meanings we raised the question of whether this is a **universal translation strategy** that takes place in every translation, regardless of the direction of translation. If the translator broadens and generalises the meaning of a word, it fits more easily into the pattern of the target language text.

The same question can be raised in connection with the distribution of meaning. Distribution, i.e. translating one word by several words, might be more **convenient** for the translator than having to search for the **one** word which has the same meaning as, or a meaning very close to, the source-language original. It is also possible that it is not done for convenience but in an attempt to provide the most **accurate** translation that translators tend to use more words than they find in the original text (cf. the explication hypothesis).

The question is whether generalisation and distribution of meaning can be regarded as universal translation strategies which are generally characteristic of all translation endeavours and are independent of the nature of the text, the language pair or the direction of the translation.

As mentioned above, one of the reasons may be that the translator works “from furnished material”, or to use a psycholinguistic term, writes following an “externally provided programme”. Translators must put into words thoughts they did not develop, and the writer who did develop them used a different thought process when following the path from the emergence of thought to linguistic structure. In other words, the translator always has to move along a pre-set course from thought to language, and this is always more difficult than to follow a course of his own choice. This more difficult route is reflected in the fact that translated texts contain more words than originals.

Disregarding the fact that broadening and distribution of meaning are characteristic of all translations, our analysis bears witness to the fact that these opera-

tions are principally characteristic of translation from Hungarian into IE languages.

What could be the reason for this phenomenon? As we have already mentioned, Hungarian linguists consider the so-called “**synthetic**” form of expression a general characteristic of the Hungarian language (Bárczi 1975, Dezső 1982b). Synthesis gives the language terseness, while analysis results in a looser language structure. The Hungarian system of verbs is characterised by the fact that the person who performs the act, the number of persons and the time and mode of action are all expressed synthetically, i.e. with the use of affixes and suffixes on the verb itself: *Megnézhetem?* (cf. the analytic English form *May I have a look at it?*). Objective conjugation and the possessive personal suffix are also synthetic: *látlak, kocsid* (cf. the analytic English forms *I see you, your car*).

This does not mean, however, that the whole of the Hungarian language is synthetic, just as analyticity is not a universal characteristic of IE languages. As we will show in the chapter on grammatical transfer operations, IE languages use synthetic participial structures, while Hungarian is characterised by an analytic subordinate clause structure. If, on the other hand, we limit our studies to lexical operations, then, as far as manifestations studied so far are concerned, Hungarian is characterised by a synthetic form of expression, while IE languages are characterised by an analytic form of expression. This is the reason why in IE-Hungarian translation, **narrowing and contraction of meaning** will be the most characteristic transfer operation, while Hungarian-IE translation will be characterised by **broadening and distribution of meaning**.

As noted before, there is an interesting **operational asymmetry** between the **obligatory** nature of broadening and distribution and the **optional** nature of narrowing and contraction (cf. the asymmetry hypothesis, Klaudy 1999b, 2001). Narrowing and contraction of meaning are **not automatic** transfer operations and require conscious decision-making on the part of translators.

5. Omission of meaning

Lexical omission is a standard transfer operation whereby meaningful lexical elements of the SL text are dropped. The term omission (cf. **opushchenie** in Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975) is different from Vinay and Darbelnet's term **économie** (1958) and **economy** (1995), which means "the relatively smaller quantity of expression forms required in one language for conveying the same content which is expressed by more words in another language" (1995: 342). In the case of **omissions**, we cannot speak about the "same content", because, as a result of omission, certain meanings are lost in the TL text without being incorporated into other meanings (see **lexical contraction** – LEX 3).

The reason for lexical **omissions** is the difference in **background knowledge** in SL and TL readers. Brand names, toponyms and historical periods, which are very well known in the culture of the SL, may mean nothing to TL readers. In such a situation the translator may use a variety of approaches, such as generalisation, paraphrase, search for analogies, etc. Since the reason for lexical omission is usually not due to linguistic differences, we will not talk about a characteristic direction, except for the last subtype. Omission of meaning as a transfer operation may be observed in both directions.

Lexical omission is an optional transfer operation, and as such requires decision-making on the part of translators. Being professional cultural mediators, translators have to assess the significance of a given SL realia (brand name, toponym, etc.) for the TL audience. If a SL brand name, street name or address form is totally unknown to the TL readers, and the context does not reveal its meaning, they have to decide whether to explain it (in an explicit or implicit way) or drop it. If the given realia contains no significant information for the TL readers, it may be omitted.

Subtypes:

- 5.1. Omission of brand names
- 5.2. Omission of toponyms
- 5.3. Omission of toponyms and ethnonyms used in attributive function
- 5.4. Omission of institutional names
- 5.5. Omission of forms of address
- 5.6. Omission of references to SL
- 5.7. Omission of names of parts of the body

5.1. Omission of brand names

Brand names for foods, beverages, clothing or furniture may have significant implications in the SL text. They may indicate inexpensiveness, or, conversely, its rarity, value or its social prestige. This meaning is frequently lost on the TL reader, even if the brand name is left unchanged in the translation. The use of a brand name instead of the generic name of a particular item of food or beverage can be misleading, since knowledge of brand names varies from culture to culture.

Two *Maltesers*. Half pound *Earl Grey*. Cheese – *Wensleydale?* or *Double Gloucester?* *Yardley* pre-shave lotion. (Greene 9)

Suddenly, even her lipstick seemed a shade or two lighter, as though she had just blotted it with a sheet of *Kleenex* (Salinger 20)

Of the six English and American brand names in the above examples, Hungarian readers are only familiar with *Earl Grey* and *Yardley*. They know that the former is a tea-brand and the latter a brand of cosmetics. *Malteser* means nothing to them and they would not know either that *Wensleydale* and *Double Gloucester* are cheeses, if this were not explained by the author.

The American brand name *Kleenex*, found in the second example is just now becoming familiar to the Hungarian public as a type of disposable paper handkerchief. In translating brand names, the translator, as shown in the translations below, uses either omission, explanatory addition or generalisation. In this chapter, we will show examples of omitting brand names, frequently accompanied by generalising translation (comp: *Wensleydale* → *angol sajt* ('English cheese') *Double Gloucester* → *ömlesztett sajt* ('processed cheese'), *Kleenex* → *lemosópapír* ('washing paper').

English ST: Two *Maltesers*. Half pound *Earl Grey*. Cheese – *Wensleydale?* or *Double Gloucester?* *Yardley* pre-shave lotion. (Greene 9)

Hungarian TT: Két csomag Máltai cukorka, negyed kiló Earl Grey tea. Sajtok – *angol sajt?* *ömlesztett sajt?* *Yardley* arcvíz a villanyborotvához. (Ungvári 119)

Commentary: The English brand names *Maltesers*, *Wensleydale* and *Double Gloucester* are omitted from the Hungarian translation.

English ST: Suddenly, even her lipstick seemed a shade or two lighter, as though she had just blotted it with a sheet of *Kleenex*. (Salinger 20)

Hungarian TT: Hirtelen a rúzsa is egy árnyalattal vagy kettővel is halványabbnak látszik, mintha letörölte volna egy *lemosópapírral*. (Elbert 20)

Commentary: The American brand name *Kleenex* is omitted from the Hungarian translation.

This operation is, in effect, a form of generalisation: by omitting the brand name the expression loses precision. Yet, we consider it to be an independent operation. In the case of generalisation, we replace a word which has a specific meaning with one that has a more general meaning: *stout* is translated as *sör* ('beer'), while in

the present case some specific terms have been **completely omitted** from the translation (*Wensleydale, Double Gloucester, Kleenex*).

When the brand name fulfils a specific **function** in the text, it cannot be omitted or replaced using generalisation. Mary McCarthy's novel, *The Group*, takes place in America during the 1930s, and brand names, the symbols of consumption, play an important role in the life-styles of the characters. In the two examples below, the translator preserves them, with the exception of *Teacher's Highland Cream*, which is the only brand name for which the original text gives no explanation (a whisky).

English ST: Yet every time she looked at Dottie, sitting in their living room ... sipping her *Clover Club cocktail* out of the *Russel Wright cup* ... (McCarthy 58)

Hungarian TT: Mégis valahányszor Dottie-re pillantott, amint ott ült a nappaliban ... *Clover Club koktélt* hörpölgetett a *Russel Wright pohárból* ... (Dezsényi 65)

English ST: ... he was a secret believer in name brands, like *Arrow shirts* and *Firestone tires and Teacher's Highland Cream and Gillette razors*. (McCarthy 266)

Hungarian TT: ... titokban hitt a nagy márkákban: az *Arrow ingekben, Firestone autógumikban és Gillette borotvákban*. (Dezsényi 307)

In general, the **brand names**, which create problems for the translator are not those that **symbolise wealth and elegance**, since in these cases the text usually gives an indication as to the function of the brand name, even if this brand name is not familiar in the TL culture. In the next example, also taken from *The Group* by Mary McCarthy, the context makes it clear that the brand names *Fortuny* and *Schiaparelli* symbolise the wealth and elegance one of the main characters always longed for.

English ST: Then the others remembered that Kay had always longed for a *Fortuny gown*, which she never in her wildest moments could have afforded. (McCarthy 376)

Hungarian TT: Akkor a többieknek is eszébe jutott, hogy Kay mindig is vágyott egy *Fortuny-ruhára*, de legmerészebb pillanataiban sem engedhette meg magának. (Dezsényi 437)

English ST: It was a *Schiaparelli suit* she was wearing; Kay had asked that straight on – she guessed it was a *Schiaparelli*. : “Schiap makes all Elinor's clothes,” the Baroness had remarked ... (McCarthy 390)

Hungarian TT: *Schiaparelli-kosztüm* volt rajta; ezt Kay mindjárt megkérdezte – sejtette, hogy Schiaparelli. – Elinor minden ruhája *Schiaptól* van – jegyezte meg a bárónő ... (Dezsényi 453)

Omission and generalisation are important mostly for those brand names or company names which are used in everyday parlance, are known to everybody in the

SL culture, and are indeed used as **common names**, but are unknown in the TL culture.

English ST: ... as he had never worked with **Carter Paterson** and was unused to such exertions ... (Durrell 62)

Hungarian TT: ... Soha nem dolgozott a **bútorszállító szakmában**, nem szokott efféle erőmutaványokhoz ... (Sárközi 64)

Commentary: The English trade name, which is the name of the company **Carter Paterson**, was left out from the Hungarian translation and instead we find the general name of the activity carried on by the company: **bútorszállító szakma** ('furniture removal business').

5.2. Omission of toponyms

In describing the scene of an action, the author of an original work may rightly assume that the readers are familiar with the location: e.g. Hungarian readers generally know that **Sportuszoda** ('Sport Swimming Pool') is on **Margit-sziget** ('Margaret Island'), that crossing **Margit híd** ('Margaret Bridge') they come to **Nagykörút** ('Grand Boulevard'), and that the **Ferenciek Temploma** ('Franciscan Church') is in **Belváros** ('Inner City'), etc.

SL readers know not only the location of toponyms, but their connotative meanings as well. The names of London's districts, such as Chelsea or Belgravia suggest the elegance of the environment to an English reader, but do not suggest anything to a Hungarian reader. The translator, who knows that the TL reader may not be familiar with these districts, either omits the district or street name, or adds an explanatory comment. In this chapter, we shall illustrate such cases of omission.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He was alone in the great **Belgravia house** with Baines and Mrs. Baines. (Greene 457)

Hungarian TT: ... így egyedül maradt a **nagy házban** Baines-szel és a feleségével. (Szobotka 280)

Commentary: the name of **Belgravia**, a reference to the characters' social status, is omitted and replaced by the much weaker innuendo of **nagy ház** ('great house')

Hungarian → French:

Hungarian ST: Zsonglőr-mutatványait vette elő, mindjárt első intrádára elnyelte a Vilma kisasszony kesztyűit, majd **újveretű körmöci aranyakat** szedegetett elő a hajából ... (Mikszáth 16)

French TT: Il faisait montre de ses talents de jongleur et de prestidigitateur. Tout d'abord il avala les gants de mademoiselle Vilma, puis il retira **des pièces d'or toutes neuves** des cheveux de la jeune fille ... (Körössy 21)

Commentary: **Körmöc** (a gold mining town in medieval Hungary, was also the site of a mint), a reference to the quality of the gold pieces, is omitted.

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: A **Ferenceseknél** szállt le. (Örkény 1. 56)

Russian TT: On soshol **v tsentre** ... (Voronkina 1. 284)

Commentary: The reference to the downtown church of the Franciscans (**Ferencesek**) in Budapest is omitted in the translation and replaced by **v tsentre** (in the centre).

5.3. Omission of toponyms and ethnonyms used in attributive function

The names of **countries, cities or nations** used as attributes, are frequently omitted from translations. **Párizsi felvágott** (lit.: Parisian salami, 'large-sized salami' or 'Bologna'), **angol szalonna** (lit.: English bacon, 'smoked, meaty bacon') or **berliner kendő** (lit.: Berliner shawl, 'large-size shawl') are meaningful and identifiable items only for the Hungarian reader.

Toponyms and ethnonyms used in attributive function reflect the history of contacts between nations, image and self-image as well as value judgements (see **Dutch courage, Dutch music, Dutch gold** in English all with negative connotations). Such expressions vary according to language pairs: when somebody leaves a party without saying 'Good bye', Hungarians say **angolosan távozik** (lit.: to take English leave), while the same concept is expressed in English as **to take French leave**. In this case the translator is lucky because the expression does exist in both languages, so he/she only has to replace one nationality name (English) by another (French). More often such SL toponyms and ethnonyms used in attributive function are missing in the TL, or are used in a different sense or with different connotations. Thus, translators very often have to omit them from the target text.

English ST: Do that again, you **Welsh ruffian**, and I'll pull your ears off. (Osborne 12)

Hungarian TT: Te falusi bugris! Vigyázz, mert kitépem mind a két füledet. (Ottlik 13)

Commentary: **Welsh ruffian** is replaced by **falusi bugris** ('country boor'), as the only collocation of **Welsh** in Hungarian is with bardic poetry.

French ST: ... parmi lesquelles éclataient deux petits souliers de droguet blanc avec des boucles incrustées de diamants **d'Irlande**. (Nerval 16)

Hungarian TT: ... és ezer apróság között egy pár fehér selyemtopán gyémántos csatja tündökölt. (Brodsky 17)

Commentary: The French attribute **d'Irlande** means 'cheapness', which

it does not carry in Hungarian, so it is omitted in the translation without any compensation for the loss of meaning.

Hungarian ST: Éppen a szemek különös színe tette a lányt érdekessé. Mintha két *besztercei szilva* villogna, csillogna a rőt pillák alatt. (Mikszáth 13)

German TT: Gerade die eigentümliche Form und Farbe der Augen machten das Mädchen interessant. Wie zwei *reife Pflaumen* schimmerten und schillerten diese Augen unter den rötlichen Wimpern. (Schüchling–Engl 279)

Commentary: *besztercei szilva* (lit: Beszterce plum, after a town in Northern Hungary) is notably dark (blue) in colour, to which the reference in the text is made, while the translator replaces it by a notion of soft ripeness, omitting all reference to colour.

Hungarian ST: Aztán széthasított egy újságlapot, összecsavarta, s úgyahogy bedugaszolt vele egy piszkos *parádivizes üveget*. (Örkény 1. 207)

German TT: Zerriss dann eine Zeitung, knüllte sie zusammen und verstopfte so eine schmutzige *Brunnenwasserflasche*. (Thies 1. 65)

Commentary: *parádivizes üveg* ('bottle for mineral water from Parád') is replaced by *Brunnenwasserflasche* ('spring water bottle'). Parád is a town in northern Hungary, known for its mineral spring.

The translators' task is made even more difficult in cases where the attributive form of toponyms and ethnonyms represent a concept **without the attributed noun**. To Hungarian SL readers *tokaji* means obviously 'wine from Tokaj, a wine growing region in Hungary', *zalai* means 'cold cuts from Zala, a county in western Hungary' and *pálpusztai* means 'cheese from Pálpusztá, a village in western Hungary'.

English ST: Next to it was an untouched *Scotch and soda*. (Vonnegut 13)

Hungarian TT: Mellette érintetlen *szódás whisky*. (Szilágyi 106)

Commentary: *Scotch* means 'Scotch whisky' in English, but not in Hungary, so *Scotch* is omitted from the Hungarian translation, where we find *szódás whisky* ('whisky with soda') instead.

Hungarian ST: Ott legalább folyton eszik az ember. Kemény tojást, savanyú cukrot, sonkás zsemlet, *nápolyit*. (Palotai 17)

German TT: Dort kann der Mensch wenigstens zu immerzu essen. Harte Eier, saure Drops, Schinkenbrötchen, *Waffeln*. (Dira 13)

Commentary: Hungarian *nápolyi* (lit.: Neapolitan wafers with meaning 'creamy wafers') is omitted from the German translation, and we find the generic term *Waffeln* ('wafers') instead.

5.4. Omission of institutional names

Proper names designating establishments like restaurants, bars, clubs, hotels and swimming pools are also frequently omitted in the process of translation. The reasons for such omissions may be various: either translators do not feel it important to broaden the TL reader's horizon, or do not want to give explanatory, additional information (e.g., *York bar*), or they think that the name of a swimming pool or a garage is an unnecessary detail, which has no importance from the point of view of the plot (e.g., *Lukács uszoda*, *Récsey garázs*)

English ST: ... he had preferred himself a glass of stout and some oysters at the *York bar*... (Greene 472)

Hungarian TT: ... jómaga szívesebben fogyasztott volna egy pohár sört, néhány osztrigát egy *kocsmában*. (Szobotka 293)

Commentary: *York bar* is replaced by *kocsm* ('public bar', 'cheap inn').

Hungarian ST: A *Lukács uszodában* ismerkedtünk meg. (Palotai 14)

German TT: Wir haben uns im *Schwimmbad* kennengelernt. (Dira 11)

Commentary: *Lukács uszoda* (lit.: 'St Luke's swimming pool', a well known, old public bath and pool in Budapest) is replaced by *Schwimmbad* ('swimming pool').

The names of establishments, restaurants, bars, etc. are often accompanied by place names: moreover, place names often substitute for the name of the establishment, e.g., *Ferihegy* means 'airport', *Lipótmező* means 'lunatic asylum', *Markó utca* means 'prison'. In such cases, the place name is frequently omitted from the translation and the specific or the generic name of the establishment appears instead in the TL text.

English ST: 'Yes, Pokey, where should we go?', agreed the bridegroom. Pokey considered. 'Go to the *Coney Island*', she said. (McCarthy 33)

Hungarian TT: – Na, Pokey, hová menjünk? – csatlakozott Harald. Pokey tűnődött. – Menjetek a *Vidám Parkba* – mondta. (Dezsényi 36)

Commentary: *Coney Island* (the site of New York's amusement park) is replaced by *Vidám Park* ('a park for merrymaking')

Hungarian ST: S ha az abnormis emberek volnának többségben, akkor talán a rendes eszűeké volna a *Lipótmező*. (Mikszáth 18)

German TT: Und wenn die Abnormen in der Überzahl wären, würden vielleicht Menschen mit normalem Verstand die *Irrenhäuser* füllen. (Schüching–Engl 284)

Commentary: *Lipótmező* (the site of an old asylum in Budapest) is replaced by *Irrenhaus* ('lunatic asylum').

Abbreviations of names are also frequently omitted in translation. The SL abbreviations which are not international are very often unknown to TL readers. The use of the full name would obviously lead to an unnecessary lengthening of the text, and even so an explanatory translation would be necessary. Such an

explanation would shift the emphasis to irrelevant details. Moreover, abbreviations may be **obsolete** even in the SL environment, referring to a bygone age (e.g. **KIK**). Thus abbreviations are often left out and generic terms are used instead in the translated text.

Hungarian ST: A házban nem szeret senki. A **KIK** nem hajlandó rendbehozatni a plafont, mely beázik. (Örkény 1. 31)

English TT: The tenants do not like me. The **landlord** refuses to fix my leaky tap. (Sollosy 23)

Commentary: **KIK** (abbreviation of Kerületi Ingatlankezelő Vállalat, lit.: District Real Estate Managing Company, owned by the local councils) is replaced by **landlord**, thereby changing the original to a concept familiar to the TL reader.

Hungarian ST: Harminckét gyönyörű foga volt az egr **SZTK-ból**, vadonátúj. (Örkény 1. 150)

German TT: Zweiunddreißig herrliche Zähne, von der Egrer **Krankenversicherung**, funkelnagelneu. (Thies 1. 40)

Commentary: **SZTK** (abbreviation of the Szakszervezeti Társadalombiztosítási Központ, lit.: 'Trade Unions' Social Insurance Centre', the Hungarian version of the 'National Health Service', now under a new name, though people still refer to it by its old name) is replaced by **Krankenversicherung** (lit.: 'sickness insurance', the German generic term for 'health insurance').

Hungarian ST: Bodrogi főorvos, a sebészeti osztály vezetője lemondta tervezett jugoszláviai **IBUSZ-utazását** ... (Örkény 1. 214)

German TT: Chefarzt Bodrogi, der Leiter der chirurgischen Abteilung, sagte seine Jugoslawien-Reise **beim Reisebüro** ab ... (Thies 1. 72)

Commentary: **IBUSZ** (abbreviation of Idegenforgalmi és Belföldi Utazási és Szervezési Iroda, lit.: 'Organising bureau for foreign and inland travel', the oldest Hungarian travel agency) is replaced by **Reisebüro** (lit.: 'travel bureau', the German generic term for 'travel agency').

5.5. Omission of forms of address

Forms of addresses and **forms of courtesy** are frequently omitted from translations, as they are highly characteristic of a culture and also representative of an age, therefore very nearly untranslatable meaningfully. It would be particularly difficult to render in translation the complex relationship between the characters in Hungarian literature on the basis of translating the different forms of address, such as: **tekintetes** (lit.: respectful), **nagyságos** (lit.: great-ful), **méltóságos** (lit.: worth-ful), **nagyméltóságú** (lit.: of great dignity) **kegyelmes** (lit.: grace-ful), ranks: **báró** (lit.: baron), **gróf** (lit.: count), **lovag** (lit.: knight), **herceg** (lit.: prince), **főherceg** (lit.: high prince), and forms of courtesy, such as: **alázatosan kérem** (lit.: I humbly request), **esedezem** (lit.: I beseech), **méltóztassék** (lit.: be pleased to, deign to), **szolgálatjára** (lit.: at your service), and so on.

Hungarian ST: – Szóval **esedezem**, igazgató úr, **méltóztassék** megnézetni, megvan-e az apám csontváza talán ... (Csáth 11)

English TT: ‘**I beg you, sir**, have somebody look for it and find out if my father’s skeleton still exists ...’ (Kessler 184)

Commentary: **esedezem** (lit.: beseech) is replaced by **I beg you**, while **méltóztassék** (lit.: be pleased) is omitted.

Hungarian ST: – Tessék **méltóságos úr**, köszönöm a szívességét, bocsánatot kérek, hogy alkalmatlankodtam. (Csáth 12)

English TT: ‘Here you are, **sir**. And I thank you for your consideration. Pardon me for disturbing you.’ (Kessler 185)

Commentary: **méltóságos** (lit.: worth-ful), a title of mere courtesy and not of actual rank at the time of writing is omitted.

In the translations the address forms **kegyelmed** (lit.: your grace), **kegyed** (lit.: short for **kegyelmed**) are also omitted. In Hungarian society, until the beginning of the 16th century, **kegyelmed** was an expression of social distinction and was a respectful address. From the second half of the 16th century it became an address used among the nobility to indicate an equality of rank. The abridged form, **kelmed** and **kend**, appeared at the beginning of the 19th century, became a popular and occasionally discourteous form of address, and later completely disappeared from the language.

Hungarian ST: – Nyargaljon végig **kegyelmed** és közölje a hadakkal a parancsot, hogy legyenek veszteg egy darabig ... (Mikszáth 89)

English TT: ‘Ride along the lines at full speed and convey my command to the men. They may rest for a while ...’ (Sturgess 112)

German TT: “Reiten Sie geschwind den Zug entlang und teilen Sie den Truppen den Befehl mit, sie sollen sich eine Weile ruhig verhalten, ... (Schüching–Engl 380)

Hungarian ST: – Adják át **kendtek** a város polgármesterének, sehol se pihenne. (Mikszáth 48)

English TT: ‘Take this to Beszterce and hand it to the burgomaster, without stopping anywhere on the road.’ (Sturgess 58)

German TT: “Übergebt das dem Bürgermeister der Stadt Beszterce, los, nirgends Rast machen!” (Schüching–Engl 325)

Prizes, honours and medals and the distinctions attached to them are among the most personal affairs in all cultures. **Kossuth-díj** (lit: Kossuth Prize), the highest state prize for excellence in the arts and sciences, means little to an English reader and was presumably omitted from the following translation for that reason.

Hungarian ST: Megcsókolta Zsolozsmait – egy **Kossuth-díjas kritikus!** – az orra hegyén, aztán visszament a kirakatba. (Örkény 1.210)

English TT: And with that she kissed Zsolozsmai on the tip of his nose and strolled back to her store window. (Sollosy 49)

Commentary: The Hungarian *Kossuth-díjas kritikus* (lit: Kossuth Prize winner critic) is left out from the English translation.

The **title of married women** is another culture-bound phenomenon. Hungarian women can retain either their maiden names, use their married names or a combination of the two: married name + maiden name. The translation of the combined maiden name and married name e.g., *Kászonyné Kakas Hanna* may cause problems in translations, as the translator has to use either the married name (see below in the *English TT*) or the maiden name (see below in the German and Russian *TT*), and one of the two will be left out from the target text.

In the one-minute short stories by István Örkény, where every name represents a compressed biography, the name *Kászonyné Kakas Hanna* is eminently characteristic of the serious, established, energetic, scholarly woman from the capital, who kindly condescends to listen to the wrinkled, old peasant woman talking about goose blood. This shade of meaning, suggested by the form of the Hungarian name, is lost in translation.

Hungarian ST: *Kászonyné Kakas Hanna* barátságosan rámosolygott, és élébe tartotta a mikrofont. (Örkény 1. 150)

English TT: With a friendly smile, *Mrs. Kászony* held out the microphone. (András T., Erickson 63)

German TT: *Frau Hanna Kakas* lächelte sie freundlich an und hielt ihr das Mikrofon hin. (Thies 1. 40)

Russian TT: *Hanna Kaszon'* privetlivo ulibnulas' starusonke i podnesla mikrofont. (Voronkina 2.151)

Commentary: The reference to the sociocultural background of the person, suggested by the name *Kászonyné Kakas Hanna* is lost in all the three IE translations.

5.6. Omission of references to SL

Translators frequently omit **SL references** that would be incomprehensible to the TL reader. In Frigyes Karinthy's novel *Utazás a koponyám körül* (*A Journey Round My Skull*) the writer tries to solve a crossword puzzle, in which the solutions are non-existing Hungarian proverbs. The text of the novel contains very wittily and authentic-sounding, though non-existing Hungarian popular sayings: "*Ha csalé balra, jobbra bakafánt*" and "*Asszony sírás repcepogácsa*". The translator, very naturally, does not undertake their translation.

Hungarian ST: Kitűnő, jóízű népi mondások ezek, csak éppen az a bajuk, hogy nem léteznek a valóságban...Ilyen közmondásai vannak: *Ha csalé balra, jobbra bakafánt*" vagy "*Asszony sírás repcepogácsa*". Most tessék elképzelni, milyen nehéz egy keresztretjvényben rekonstruálni egy ilyen ismeretlen közmondást a hiányzó betűkkel. (Karinthy 272)

English TT: These are racy proverbs of the finest colloquial flavour. Their only drawback is the fact that they have no existence in reality. (...) The

reader will sympathise with anyone who attempts to reconstruct an unknown proverb from the missing letters in a cross-word puzzle. (Barker 11)

In the following example, the ST contains a reference to differences between German and Austrian usage (*wie es die Reichsdeutschen nennen*, (lit.: as the Germans of the German Reich say). The horse radish is *Kren* in German and *Meerrettich* in Austrian usage, the side-dish is *Garnierung* in Austrian and *Beilage* in German usage. These differences are omitted in the Hungarian translation.

German ST: Was aber die Beilagen, wie es die Reichsdeutschen nennen, betrifft, so wünsche ich ein anderes Mal den Kren, genannt Meerrettich, etwas trockener. (Roth 28)

Hungarian TT: Ami pedig a köritést illeti, legközelebb a tormát valamivel szárazabbra kívánom. (Boldizsár 32)

Commentary: Kren and Meerrettich mean both ‘horse radish’, the first in German, the second in Austrian usage; the Hungarian text has simply torma (‘horse radish’) instead.

5.7. Omission of names of parts of the body

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The cases of omission hitherto discussed were **independent** of language pair and of the direction of translation. In the previous subtypes, we dealt with omissions due to linguistic reasons. Their reasons, though, were not systemic differences, but the impossibility of rendering the linguistic references of one language in another language. The final subtype will deal with omissions for which we must seek the reason in the differences between the two linguistic systems.

Omissions and insertions, which may be justified linguistically, can be due to the appearance of **redundancies**, which vary from language to language. Linguistic redundancy means that we describe real events and their participants in more than the minimally required number of words, which means that languages do not always adhere to strict rules of “economy”. In describing manifestations of reality, every language latches on to something different, considers different things important and considers different things to be negligible.

One such redundancy in Indo-European languages is using the plural of nouns in combination with numerals, while a redundancy in Hungarian is the indication of possession with both the possessor and the item possessed. These two instances represent **grammatical redundancies** and will be discussed in the next part of this book (GR 4, 5).

In the following, we shall discuss a case of **lexical redundancy**. Verbs have mandatory or optional complements in every language. The complements, mandatory only in the SL, naturally have to be omitted in the translation. In the case of activities involving a part of the body: *int* (‘to wave with the hand’), *megszorít* (‘to press with the hand’) *megsimogat* (‘to caress with the hand’), English requires that the part of the body be mentioned, whereas Hungarian generally does not.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He sat by the candle in the middle of the room, *tapping with his hands* on the edge of the table. (Wilder 116)

Hungarian TT: Ült a gyertya mellett a szoba közepében, és *dobolt* az asztal peremén. (Kosztolányi 117)

Commentary: *tapping with his hand* is replaced by *dobolt* ('was drumming').

French → Hungarian:

French ST: La marquise *battit des mains*. (Maupassant 202)

Hungarian TT: A márkí felesége *tapsolt*. (Tóth 203)

Commentary: *battit des mains* ('clapped her hands') is replaced by *tapsolt* ('applauded').

German → Hungarian:

German ST: Madame Buddenbrook wandte sich an ihre Schwiegertochter, *drückte mit einer Hand* ihren Arm ... und sagte: Immer der nämliche, mon vieux, Betsy ? ... (Mann 3. 8)

Hungarian TT: Madame Buddenbrook a menyéhez fordult, *megszoritotta* a karját, és ... mondta: – Mon vieux csak a régi marad, ugye, Betsy? ... (Lányi 3. 7)

Commentary: *drückte mit einer Hand* (lit.: pressed with one hand) is replaced by *megszoritotta* ('pressed', in objective conjugation, comprising the object as well).

German ST: Der jüngere Hausherr hatte, als der allgemeine Aufbruch begann, *mit der Hand* nach seiner linken Brustseite *gegriffen*, ... (Mann 3. 16)

Hungarian TT: A fiatalabbik házigazda, mikor mindenki mozgolódni kezdett, a bal felső zsebéhez *nyúlt*, ... (Lányi 3. 14)

Commentary: *mit der Hand ... gegriffen* (lit.: with the hand ... reached ...) is replaced by *nyúlt* ('reached') with *to* indicated on the noun.

The verb phrases *int a kezével* (lit.: to wave with the hand), *bólintott a fejével* (lit.: to nod with the head), *nézett a szemével* (lit.: to look with the eyes) are formally possible but unusual collocations in Hungarian and are traps for novice translators. Omission is obviously not a consideration when the particular part of the body is more precisely defined: *jobb kezével* (lit.: with the right hand), *fájós lábával* (lit.: with the leg, which was aching), etc.

Summary comments on lexical omission

The **omission** of meanings, or their addition to be discussed in the next section (LEX 6), is a standard transfer operation, which is independent of language pair and of direction of translation. It is not motivated by the differences between the lexical systems of individual languages, but by the differences between the background knowledge of readers of the SL text and those of the TL text.

We could consider omission of realia unfamiliar to readers of the TL or their generalising translation, which is often associated with it, to be a conscious **translation strategy**. Since unfamiliar realia mean nothing to TL readers, their omission does not cause any loss. Yet, this operation must be used with the greatest **caution**, since the references to realia in the TL may be important for several reasons:

- (1) the **poetic function** of SL realia (brand names, food, beverage, household goods or geographical names, etc.) may play an important role in the description of characters and situations.
- (2) the **atmosphere-creating function** of realia less familiar to the TL reader is to create 'local colour' (cf. *sheriff, coyote, grizzly, prairie, savannah, mustang in Wild West novels*).
- (3) the **informative function** of SL realia is to inform us about the way of life of a SL community, their customs and habits.
- (4) the **culture-transmitting function** of SL realia is to bring the SL and TL communities closer to each other and overcome communication difficulties between the two cultures.

The only language pair specific omission discussed in this section was the elimination of lexical redundancy (cf. *intett* 'waved' instead of *intett a kezével* 'waved with the hand'), which is one of those operations that translators teach to each other as a trick of the trade and adhere to more rigidly than average TL speakers. In other words, this is one of the manifestations of the existence of **language pair specific translational norms**.

6. Addition of meaning

Lexical addition is a standard transfer operation whereby new meaningful elements, which cannot be found in the SL text, appear in the TL text. The increase in the number of words in the TL text is also characteristic of another standard transfer operation, **distribution of meaning** (LEX 4), although there is a conceptual difference between the two operations. While in the case of **distribution** there is no extra information in the TL text, and the same amount of information is divided into its elements, in the case of **addition** there will always be new elements in the TL text. The term **addition** (cf. **dobavlenie** in Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975) is different from Vinay and Darbelnet's term **amplification** (1958, 1995), which means "The translation technique, whereby a target language unit requires more words than the SL to express the same idea" (1995: 339). In the case of **addition**, discussed in this section, we cannot speak of the "same idea", because as the result of addition **new meanings** will appear in the TL text.

The reason for **adding** meanings is the same as for omitting them, namely differences in the **background knowledge** of the SL and TL readers. Brand names, toponyms, or historic periods, which are common knowledge in the SL culture, may mean nothing to the TL reader. In such cases, translators have several options, such as generalisation, paraphrase, omission, analogy, etc. If the given brand name, street name, etc. represents important information in the context of a particular textual environment, and they do not wish to omit it, they may use an explanatory addition. Since the reasons for such lexical addition are usually not differences in linguistic systems, we will not talk about directions, except for the last subtype.

Lexical additions are not obligatory transfer operations. They require decision-making on the part of translators. They have to assess the significance of a given SL realia for the TL audience. If they decide that the given SL brand names, street names or address forms contain significant information for the TL readers, they will apply various techniques of adding **extra information** to help the TL audience to understand the unknown item. The method of adding extra information also requires decision-making: depending on the genre of the translated texts they may use footnotes and endnotes (in scientific texts) or explanatory additions (in literary texts).

Examination of lexical addition as a transfer operation from the point of view of universal translation strategies (Baker 1993, Laviosa 1998) found that additions are typical manifestations of the universal translation strategy **explicitation**.

Subtypes:

- 6.1. Addition in the case of brand names
- 6.2. Addition in the case of toponyms
- 6.3. Addition in the case of institutional names
- 6.4. Addition in the case of historical realia
- 6.5. Addition of names of parts of the body.

6.1. Addition in the case of brand names

Brand names of foods, beverages or furniture in the original work may carry various meanings in their context. They may indicate that the items in question are commonly used commodities, that they are cheap or, conversely, represent high value and elegance by their rarity, in other words, they refer to **social prestige**. This meaning is frequently lost for the TL reader, even if the brand name is included in the translation. If the brand name is used instead of the proper name of a particular item of food or beverage, etc., it may be misleading, since knowledge of the brand name may vary from culture to culture. In translating brand names, the translator may use omission, explanatory addition or generalisation, as shown in the examples below.

Let us return to an earlier example (see section LEX 5), where the translator either omitted such items or gave explanations for them:

English ST: Two **Maltasers**, Half pound **Earl Grey**. Cheese – Wensleydale or Double Gloucester? **Yardley** pre-shave lotion. (Greene 9)

Hungarian TT: Két csomag **Máltai cukorka**, negyed kiló **Earl Grey tea**. Sajtok – angol sajt? ömlesztett sajt? **Yardley arcvíz villanyborotvához**. (Ungvári 119)

Commentary: **Malteser** is explained by adding **cukorka** ('drops'), **Earl Grey** by **tea** ('tea') and **Yardley pre-shave lotion** by adding **arcvíz villanyborotvához** ('face-wash for electric shavers').

German ST: Der neue **Twanner** schien Bärlach nicht gutgetan zu haben ... (Dürrenmatt 14)

Hungarian TT: A **twanni újbor** aligha tett jól Bärlachnak ... (Ungvári 161)

Commentary: **Twanner** is explained by adding **újbor** (lit.: young wine).

Hungarian ST: Finom **vágújhelyi** van a Jágovics pincéjében. (Mikszáth 90)

Russian TT: В погребе у Яговича yeast'zamechatelnie **vaguyheyskiye vina**. (Leybutin 104)

Commentary: The Hungarian SL word **vágújhelyi** (lit.: from the township of Vágújhely) refers only to the origin of some unidentified food or drink, while the word **pince** ('cellar') conjures up the concept of wine. The translator felt it necessary to add **vino** ('wine') to the Russian TL text.

6.2. Addition in the case of toponyms

Explanatory additions are commonly used for **geographical names**, since the geographical name, by itself, does not give sufficient information for the TL reader, who would not know whether the name indicates a village, a town or perhaps a county.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He was the son of a proprietor of a certain well-known cotton mill *in Massachusetts*. (James 107)

Hungarian TT: Caspar Goodwood atyja ismert pamutfonógyár tulajdonosa volt *Massachusetts államban*. (Balabán 164)

Commentary: *Massachusettes* is explained by adding *állam* ('state').

English ST: ... suffering from various complaints which, in the opinion of *St. Mary Mead*, were largely imaginary. (Christie 12)

Hungarian TT: ... különféle bántalmakban szenvedett, amelyeknek *St. Mary Mead falu* közvéleménye szerint nagy része képzelt betegség volt. (Borbás 13)

Commentary: *St. Mary Mead* is explained by adding *falu* ('village').

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Elle a dit qu'on croyait que c'était un fou qui avait fait le coup, encore un fou de la *Seine-et-Oise* (Duras 15)

Hungarian TT: A lány azt mondta, hogy úgy gondolják, egy őrült követte el a dolgot, megint egy *Seine-et-Oise megyei* őrült. (Farkas 11)

Commentary: *Seine-et-Oise* is explained by adding *megye* ('county').

French ST: Ça continue comme ça jusqu'à la *Goutte d'Or* et après c'est les quartiers français qui commencent. (Ajar 13)

Hungarian TT: És ez így megy egészen a *Goutte d'Or tégig*, azután már a francia negyedek kezdődnek. (Bognár 10)

Commentary: *Goutte d'Or* is explained by adding *tér* ('place/square').

French ST: Quelquefois on ne distinguait que leurs jambes noires dans une literie du *Palais Royal* ... (Cocteau 126)

Hungarian TT: Olykor egyéb sem látszott belőlük, mint a fekete lábuk egy *Palais-Royal negyedi* ágyneműsbolt teljes készletének közepette ... (Pór 127)

Commentary: *Palais Royal* is explained by adding *negyed* ('district').

German → Hungarian:

German ST: ... die Straße von Lamboing (eines der *Tessenbergdörfer*) ... (Dürrenmatt 5)

Hungarian TT: ... a Lamboingból (az egyik *Tessenberg vidéki faluból*) vezető út ... (Ungvári 161)

Commentary: *Tessenbergdörfer* is explained by adding *vidéki* ('region of Tessenberg').

German ST: ... in einem Haus an der *Aare* ... (Dürrenmatt 19)

Hungarian TT: ... egy *Aare-parti* házacsakában ... (Ungvári 229)

Commentary: *Aare* is explained by adding *parti* ('on the bank of').

Hungarian → French:

Hungarian ST: De bezzeg nagy öröm dagasztja a helybeli mézárós keblét, kinek **Kiskőrösön** gyermeke született Szilveszter szent éjszakáján. (Karinthy 47)

French TT: Mais, assurément, le boucher **du village de Kiskőrös** a le coeur débordant de joie, car un enfant vient du lui naître en cette sainte nuit. (Gal 53)

Commentary: **Kiskőrös** is explained by adding **village** ('village').

Hungarian ST: Ez a viharvert kis csapat hajnali három felé a **ferencvárosi** házak közé vetődött. (Kosztolányi 84)

French TT: Cette petite troupe battue par les tempêtes échoua sur les trois heures du matin vers certaines maisons du **quartier Ferencváros**. (Komoly 83)

Commentary: **Ferencváros** is explained by adding **quartier** ('district').

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: U nas **na Baykale** bila svoya vorona. (Rasputin 462)

Hungarian TT: Volt a **Bajkál-tónál** egy saját hollónk. (Harsányi 149)

Commentary: **Baykal** is explained by adding **tó** ('lake')

Russian ST: ... ya pereutomilsya. Pozhaluy, pora brosit' vsyo k chertu i v **Kislovodsk**. Bulgakov 12)

Hungarian TT: ... Úgy látszik kimerült vagyok, jó lenne mindent itt hagyni, ördög vigye ... és elutazni **kúrára Kislovodszkba**. ... (Szöllősy 8)

Commentary: **Kislovodsk** is explained by adding **kúrára** (lit.: for a course of treatment), inferring that Kislovodsk is a spa.

The toponym by itself does not give any information about the size of the settlement, and frequently does not reveal even whether it refers to a lake, a river, a mountain, a park or a district.

On the first page of Dezső Kosztolányi's novel *Édes Anna*, translated into English under the title: *Anna Édes*, the following Hungarian geographical names appear: **Duna, Várhegy, Vérmező, Krisztina, Szentháromság tér** and **Vár**. If the translator retains the Hungarian geographical names, the English reader will only recognize **Duna** as a river, and **Szentháromság tér** will be explained by the addition of **Square**, but **Krisztina, Vár** and **Vérmező** will be totally obscure and the reader will have no idea as to what these terms mean, and will not be able to imagine the scene where the action takes place, while mentioning the name **Vár** (Castle) will immediately conjure up for Hungarian readers the image of **Castle Hill** with the **Royal Palace** on top and with **Vérmező** below it. The English translator of *Édes Anna*, György Szirtes, used various additions to increase the English reader's understanding of the place in question, instead of omitting any of the Hungarian names.

Hungarian ST: Legalább **Krisztinában** ezt beszéltek. (Kosztolányi 7)

English TT: Such at least were the rumors in the **Krisztina area**. (Szirtes 1)

Hungarian ST: ... és ott egy öreges úr, régi **krisztinai** polgár...meg is találta... (Kosztolányi 7)

English TT: ... where it was found by an elderly long-established resident of the **Krisztina area** ... (Szirtes 1)

Commentary: **Krisztina** is the shortened form of the toponym **Krisztinaváros** (lit.: Krisztina-town), a district of the Buda part of Budapest referred to mainly by the shortened form.

In a more complex form of addition, the translator does not simply explain the meaning of a geographical name – whether it is a village or a mountain –, but also broadens the reader's background knowledge by the **addition of other details as extra information**. In the example below, the translator added that there was a (Royal) **palace** on top of **Várhegy**.

Hungarian ST: Délután – úgy öt óra felé – A Hungária-szállóban székelő szovjetház körül felrebbent egy repülőgép, átrepült a Dunán, a **Várhegyen**, s merész kanyarodással a **Vérmező** felé tartott. (Kosztolányi 7)

English TT: In the afternoon – at about five o'clock – an airplane rose over the Soviet headquarters in the Hotel Hungaria, crossed the Danube, and, passing the **palace on top of the Várhegy**, banked steeply toward the **Vérmező gardens**. (Szirtes 1)

Commentary: **Várhegy** ('Castle Hill') is the place of the Royal Palace in Budapest, **Vérmező** (lit.: Blood-field) is a huge public park under the Castle Hill. It was a place of public executions until the 18th century.

In a special case of explanatory translation the original geographical name is both **retained and translated**. The translation can be incorporated into the geographical name (**Vérmező** becomes **Vérmező gardens**) or the explanation may be a reduplication of the name (**who worked in the Fortress, or Vár district**). It is interesting that in the case of **Szentháromság tér** the translator retained the entire Hungarian expression and added the translation as a separate component of the sentence (**square dedicated to the Holy Trinity**).

Hungarian ST: ... és ott egy öreges, régi krisztinai polgár, adóhivatalnok a **Várban**, a **Szentháromság téren**...meg is találta. (Kosztolányi 7)

English TT: ... where it was found by an elderly long-established resident of the Krisztina area, an excise clerk who worked in the **Fortress, or Vár district**, in **Szentháromság tér**, **the square dedicated to the Holy Trinity** ... (Szirtes 1)

Commentary: The geographical name **Szentháromság tér** is retained and translated at the same time: **the square dedicated to the Holy Trinity**.

The translator may also arbitrarily add the name of a place at the beginning of a text, which would have never occurred to the writer, having in mind only SL readers. Frigyes Karinthy's work, *Utazás a koponyám körül* (Journey Around My Skull),

begins with a precise indication of time and place, but the translator, with the English reader in mind, added “in Budapest” to the original place name *az Egyetem téri Centrál kávéház*.

Hungarian ST: Ez év márciusában – tizedike felé lehetett – egy délután az *Egyetem téri Centrál Kávéházban* uzsonnáztam, ablak melletti törzsasztalomnál ... (Karinthy 271)

English TT: One afternoon – it must have been about March 10th – I was having tea at the *Cafe Central on the Egyetem tér in Budapest*. (Barker 9)

Additions are often used in the translations of **travel books**. If toponyms are retained in their SL form, they often need explanation, and if they are translated into the TL, translators generally tend to preserve the original name as well. In such cases two different solutions are possible. After the translated geographical name, the original name appears in parentheses in the TT, or the original name appears in the TT with the translated name in parentheses. While translators of literary texts tend to use a more delicate, less obvious form of addition, in the case of travel literature explicatory additions need not be hidden or camouflaged in the text.

Comparison of the translation of one of the standard Budapest travel books into four different languages reveals very interesting differences in the field of necessary additions. The title of the original: *Budapest – madártávlatból. Történelmi séta* (lit.: Budapest from a bird’s eye view – A historical walk.) The travel book was translated into English (*Budapest – A City Set in Time*), French (*Budapest – Promenade dans le temps*), German (*Budapest – Die Stadt im Spiegel der Zeit*), and Russian (*Budapest – Progulka v glub’ vekov*) by four different translators. The four translators used different methods to explain Hungarian toponyms to their readers. While the French translator simply translated the toponyms, the English translator felt it necessary to add the Hungarian name of the toponyms as well.

Hungarian ST: ... Balra tekintve, kissé távolabb, de még jócskán a város határain belül a ligetes, szállodás *Margit-sziget* látszik. (Bart 2)

English TT: ... To our left, almost out of view but still well within the city limits, is the green expanse of *Margaret Island (Margit-sziget)* with its parks, swimming pools and hotels. (Gorman 4)

French TT: Sur notre gauche, un peu plus loin mais encore largement dans les limites de la ville, apparait la verdoyante *Ile Marguerite* avec ses hôtels de luxe ... (Chehádé 3)

Hungarian ST: ... középpütt a *Lánchíd*, az első, s máig a legszebb (Bart 3)

English TT: In the Centre is *Lánchíd or Chain Bridge*, the first and to this day the most beautiful bridge in the city. (Gorman 3)

French TT: ... le *Pont de Chaînes*, tandis que, juste au-dessous de nous, le plus jeune et le plus gracieux ... (Chehádé 3)

Commentary: The English translator in both cases added also the original name (*Margit-sziget, Lánchíd*) to the translated names *Margaret Island, Chain Bridge*.

Comparative analysis of the translation of travel books into different target languages may give interesting insights also into the translation of historical realia (see later in this section, LEX 6).

6.3. Addition in the case of institutional names

Additions are frequently required in translating the **names of institutions**. Translators are more familiar with the culture of the TL than the majority of the TL readers by virtue of their occupation, know that in London, **St. Pancras** is a railroad station, **Bentley** a restaurant and **Fortnum's** a high-class foodstore. An explanatory addition will assist TL readers and will increase their understanding of the SL culture.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Well – I'll bet **Fortnum's** must be doing a roaring line in sacrificial cocks. (Osborne 182)

Hungarian TT: No, a **Fortnum áruház** biztosan bombaüzletet csinál az áldozati kakasokkal. (Ottlik 183)

Commentary: **áruház** ('department store') is added in the translation.

English ST: Even today, when I went to the booking office at **St. Pancras...** (Osborne 218)

Hungarian TT: Még ma is, amikor jegyet váltottam a **St. Pancras pályaudvaron**... (Ottlik 219)

Commentary: **pályaudvar** ('railway station') is added in the translation.

English ST: There were eight Japanese gentlemen having a fish dinner at **Bentley's**. (Greene 118)

Hungarian TT: Nyolc japán úr vacsorázik a londoni **Bentley étteremben**. (Borbás 207)

Commentary: **étterem** ('restaurant') is added in the translation.

English ST: ... he had cheated Charles James Fox out of 50,000 **at Crockford's**. (Wilde 239)

Hungarian TT: ... ötvenezer font sterlinget nyert csalárd módon **Crockford kártyabarlangjában** Charles James Foxtól. (Timár 148)

Commentary: **kártyabarlang** ('gambling den') is added in the translation.

French → Hungarian:

French ST: ... il s'agissait de faire venir leurs fils élevés chez les Jésuites et chez les **Dominicains**. (Maupassant 140)

Hungarian TT: ... le akarták hozatni a jezsuitáknál és a **Domonkos-rendieknél** nevelkedő gyermekeiket. (Benyhe 141)

Commentary: **rend** ('religious order') is added in the translation.

French ST: – A une heure donc, derrière le **Luxembourg** (Dumas 46)
Hungarian TT: – Legyen egy órákor a **Luxembourg palota** mögött.
(Csatlós 45)

Commentary: **palota** ('palace') is added in the translation.

Translators are generally aware of the TL reader's level of knowledge about the SL culture. One can take it for granted that **Scotland Yard** is not unknown to the Hungarian reader, but it is unusual to refer to it in Hungarian simply as the **Yard**. Thus, in this instance, there is no need for an explanatory addition, but the full name should be restored by adding the missing word.

English ST: We'll send these up to the **Yard** and see what they have to say.
(Christie 34)

Hungarian TT: Ezt felküldjük a **Scotland Yardra**, és majd meglátjuk mit szólnak hozzá. (Borbás 35)

The same is done in translations of Hungarian works into foreign languages. The Hungarian reader knows that **Bucsinszky**, **Central and New York** are cafés or, at least, that these were names of famous cafés at the turn of the century. Similarly, **Nemzeti** ('national') is obviously a theatre, **Kútvölgyi** and **Lipótmező** are hospitals and **Royal** is a hotel, but this must be explained to a non-Hungarian reader.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Utána a **Bucsinszkyben** gyorsan "lekenek" egy kroit, tizenegyre már a kiadónál vagyok. (Karinthy 276)

English TT: This business settled I dashed off a short article in the **Café Bucsinszky**, and by 11 o'clock I was in my publisher's office. (Barker 17)

Hungarian ST: S ha az abnormis emberek volnának többségben, akkor talán a rendes eszűeké volna a **Lipótmező**. (Mikszáth 18)

English TT: ...but if abnormal people were in the majority, perhaps the **Lipótmező asylum** would be full of normal ones. (Sturgess 20)

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: – Anyám itt Pesten halt meg, a **Kútvölgyiben** ... (Szabó 8)

German TT: – Auch Mama ist hier in Pest gestorben, im **Kutvölgyer Krankenhaus** ... (Thies 161)

Hungarian ST: ... és az emberek üveg mögül bámulnak az utcára, kis csokrokat vesznek a **Nemzeti** előtt ... (Szabó 95)

German TT: ... und die Menschen durch die Scheiben auf die Straße starren und kleine Sträuße vor dem **Nationaltheater** kaufen ... (Thies 89)

Hungarian ST: – A **Royal** vendégeit nevezed te népnek? (Palotai 32)
German TT: “Die Gäste im **Hotel Royal** nennst du das Volk?” (Dira 24)

Once the necessary information is given, the background knowledge of the TL reader is enhanced (he or she has been informed that **Royal** is a hotel) and the translator does not feel it necessary to repeat the addition when the name is mentioned again.

Hungarian ST: – Külföldi szivarok szállnak meg a **Royalban**, dohánnyal a szívük fölött. (Palotai 33)
German TT: **Im Royal** steigen alte Kracher ab, mit Zaster über dem Herzen. (Dira 24)
Commentary: At the second mention of the name **Royal**, addition is no longer necessary.

The decision-making process in translation can be illustrated by the next example. There are two realia in the French original: **Bastille**, which is familiar to Hungarian readers and **For-l’Evêque**, which is unfamiliar. The translator applies addition (‘prison’) only in the second case:

French ST: – Quatre l’ont emmené je ne sais où, à la **Bastille** ou au **For-l’Evêque**. (Dumas 125)
Hungarian TT: – Négyen vele mentek a **Bastille-ba**, vagy a **For-l’ Eveque-börtönbe** ... (Csatlós 119)
Commentary: In the case of **Bastille**, there is no explanatory addition, the other name **For-l’ Eveque** is complemented with the word **börtön** (‘prison’).

6.4. Addition in the case of historical realia

In the translation of historical realia (events, personalities, historical garments, armory, etc.), the amount of necessary omissions and additions depends on the direction of translation. While many of the events of English, French, German and Russian history are well known in Hungary, the events of Hungarian history often require explanatory additions in English, French, German and Russian translations. Hungarian historical realia like **kakastollas csendőr** (lit.: sickle-feathered gendarme) **hétszilvafás nemes** (lit.: petty gentry of an estate with seven plum-trees), **EMKE** (lit.: Hungarian Cultural Association in Transylvania) are either omitted or explained in the translation.

Hungarian → French/German:

Hungarian ST: Félt a kendős öregasszonyoktól, a **kakastollas csend-öröktől**. (Kosztolányi 21)
French TT: Il avait peur des vieilles femmes à fichu, **et des gendarmes avec leurs plumes de coq au shako**. (Komoly 21)

German TT: Er fürchtete sich vor alten Frauen im Umschlagtüchern, vor **Gendarmen in federgeschmuckten Tschako**. (Koriath 132)

Commentary: *kakastollas csendőr* is translated into French as *gendarmes avec leurs plumes de coq au shako* (lit.: gendarmes in shakos with plumes of cocks) and into German as *Gendarmen im federgeschmuckten Tschako* (lit.: gendarmes in plumed shakos).

Hungarian ST: Mikor a komposzesszorátusi gyűlésen azzal érvelt ellene a **hétszilvafás** Piry Gábor ... (Mikszáth 265)

Russian TT: Kogda na dvorjanskom sobranii **melkopomestniy dvoryanin** Gabor Piri zayavil ... (Gromov 140)

Commentary: **hétszilvafás** (lit.: with seven plum-trees) is explained in Russian as **melkopomesztniy dvoryanyin** (lit.: smallholding nobleman).

Hungarian ST: Nemrég találkoztam vele itt Budapesten, mint egy deputáció vezetőjével, mely az **EMKE** érdekében járt itt. (Mikszáth 5)

Russian TT: Nedavno ya videlsya s nim v Budapeste, kogda on priyezhal vo glave kakoy to delegatsii po delam **kulturnovo obshchestva transsilvanskih vengrov**. (Salimon 5)

Commentary: The abbreviation **EMKE** is explained in the Russian translation by spelling out the full name: **kulturnovo obshchestva transsilvanskih vengrov** ('Hungarian Cultural Association in Transylvania').

In translating *historical events*, the addition of a *date* is frequently necessary, so that the TL reader knows when the event took place.

Hungarian ST: **Az orosz áttörés** után csapódtunk egymáshoz, ... (Örkény 1. 102)

English TT: We were thrown together by the **Russian offensive of 1944**.... (Sollosy 76)

Hungarian ST: Elpusztult a Lánchíd. (Lengyel 554)

English TT: **In the Second World War** the Chain Bridge was demolished. (Házi 12)

Interesting historical additions can be found in the translations of travel books. Travel book authors have a foreign language audience in mind, so they arrange their ideas in a way that is different from what they would use if the book was written for SL readers. They need to have a clear perception of what events, persons and places require a more detailed explanation for foreign readers. Moreover, additions and explanation made by travel book authors are further developed by the translators, who are professional mediators between the two cultures and have their **own hypotheses** on the extent of knowledge of TL readers about the SL culture. For example, they know what a name like *Elisabeth* means for English, French, German or Russian readers. The original Hungarian **Habsburg császárné** (lit.: Habsburg Empress, which in itself would be an unnecessary addition for Hungarian readers) is translated into English, French and German without

any further explanation (Habsburg Empress, imperatrice d' Autriche, Habsburg-Kaiserin) while the Russian translator felt it necessary to add *suprugi imeperatora Frantsa Yosifa* (lit.: the wife of the Emperor Francis Joseph).

Hungarian ST: ... alattunk pedig, ... az Erzsébet-híd, mely a régi Európa legszebb asszonyának, a szép Habsburg császárnének a nevét viseli. (Bart 3)
Russian TT: ... most Erzhebet ... nazvanniy v chest' znamenitoy krasavitsi Yelizaveti, *suprugi imeperatora Frantsa Yosifa*. (Voronkina 3)

The *Szent Jobb* (lit.: Holy Right) is the mummified right hand of the first Hungarian King, Stephen I. The Hungarian original has *szent király* ('holy/saint king'), which is a clear reference to Stephen I for a Hungarian audience, but not necessarily for English readers. The English translator felt it necessary to add the name of the King (*King Stephen*), while the French translator was satisfied with the *premier roi* ('the first king').

Hungarian ST: Nemkülönben kalandos története van a magyar katolikus egyház legbecsebb ereklyéjének, a ma a Bazilika egyik oldalkápolnájában őrzött Szent Jobbnak – *a szent király mumifikálódott jobb keze* ... (Bart 16)

English TT: The most highly revered relic of the Hungarian Catholic Church, the Holy Right – *the clenched right hand of King Stephen preserved through the centuries* – has a no less spectacular history. (Gorman 15)

French TT: Mais l'histoire de la relique la plus prestigieuse de l'Église catholique hongroise est non moins riche en aventures. Il s'agit de la Sainte Dextre – *la main droite momifiée du premier roi* ... (Chehádé 15)

Additions may be necessary when place names have changed in the course of history, and the same towns have different names in different language communities. The town of *Pozsony* (today in Slovakia and called *Bratislava*) used to be the capital city of Hungary for centuries. While in the English translation both the Hungarian and the Slovak names are preserved, the German translation adds the traditional German name of the same town (*Pressburg*) as well.

Hungarian ST: ... a török elől elmenekült országgyűlés pedig egészen 1848-ig *Pozsonyban* (*ma: Bratislava*) ülésezett. (Bart 6)

English TT: ... and the Parliament, which had fled from the Turks, set up its seat in *Pozsony* (*today's Bratislava*), where it remained until 1848. (Gorman 6)

German TT: ... der von den Türken geflohene Landtag hielt seine Versammlungen noch bis zum Jahre 1848 in *Preßburg* (*ung. Pozsony, heute Bratislava*). (Dira 8)

6.5. Addition of names of the parts of the body

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The only lexical addition which is not triggered by cultural differences but linguistic ones is the addition of names of parts of the body in H-IE translation. Verbs have characteristic complements in every language. In the case of activity involving certain parts of the body *int*, *bólint* ('to nod'), *megszorít* ('to press'), *megsimogat* ('to stroke') in Hungarian it is not essential to mention the part of the body involved, unlike in IE languages. Thus, the Hungarian model is *megsimogatja* (to stroke) and not *megsimogatja a kezével* ('stroke with his/her hands'), *bólint* ('to nod') and not *bólint a fejével* ('to nod his/her head'), *megrúg* ('to kick') and not *megrúg a lábával*. ('to kick with his/her leg'). The complements required only by the TL must naturally appear in the translation.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: Nem szerette a feltűnést, az autóbuszon mindig az ablak felé **fordult**. (Örkény 1. 238)

English TT: She hated calling attention to herself so much that even on the bus she'd sit **with her head turned** to the window. (Sollosy 59)

Commentary: The Hungarian verb **fordult** ('turned') is extended in the English translation with the name of the relevant part of the body: **turned ... with her head**

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Turzó becsús **fölemel** egyet, és diktálja: – Háborúba való ördögpofo. (Gárdonyi 268)

German TT: Der Oberschätzer Turzó **nahm eine in die Hand** und diktierte: "Im Krieg verwendbare Teufelsfratzen." (Weissling 263)

Commentary: The Hungarian verb **fölemel** ('he takes up') is extended in the German translation with the name of the relevant part of the body: **nahm eine in die Hand** ('he took ... in his hand')

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: Nem térdepelt már, hanem a gróf nyakát **tartotta** átnyalábolva. (Mikszáth 36)

Russian TT: ... no teper' uzhe ne stala na koleni, a **obhvatila** Pongratsa **rukami** za sheyu ... (Leibutin 45)

Commentary: The Hungarian verb **tartotta** ('she held') is extended in Russian translation with the name of the relevant part of the body: **obhvatila rukami** ('she held ... with her hands')

Hungarian → English and Russian:

Hungarian ST: – Üsse kő – *legyintett* a férfi. (Örkény 1. 239)

English TT: ‘Never mind,’ the man *said with an exasperated wave of the hand.* (Sollosy 60)

Russian TT: – Propadi on propadom, – *mahnul rukoy* muzhchina. (Voronkina 1. 325)

Commentary: The Hungarian verb *legyintett* (‘to move a hand to signal indifference’) is extended in English and Russian translation with the name of the relevant part of the body: English: *hand*, Russian: *ruka*

Summary comments on lexical addition

Addition of meaning is a standard transfer operation which is independent of the language pair and of the direction of the translation. It is generally not due to differences in the systems of individual languages, but to differences in **background information** possessed by SL and TL readers.

If SL realia, unknown to the TL reader, must be preserved for some reason – **poetic function, atmosphere-creating function, informative function or culture-transmitting function** – translators usually use addition by which they indicate the particular meaning of a piece of realia. In travel books or scientific texts, explanatory additions may be indicated by typographical devices (parentheses, footnotes or glossaries). In literary works, translators often try to broaden the reader’s background knowledge rather less obtrusively.

We may raise the question whether such lexical additions should be seen as universal translation strategies. Lexical additions generally result in a more explicit TL text. According to the **explicitation hypothesis**, only those types of additions can be considered explicitations that are not dictated by systemic differences, but arise **from the nature** of translation. On the basis of this approach, the majority of the above lexical additions will certainly fall into this category. The additions which serve to expand the background knowledge of the reader are manifestations of one of the most general principles of translation, that of taking into consideration the TL reader and **cooperating** with him/her.

7. Exchange of meanings

Exchange of meanings is a standard transfer operation whereby a meaning in the SL text is replaced by another meaning in the TL text, which is seemingly different from the SL meaning but is logically related (e.g., an expression of reason may be replaced by an expression of consequences in TL). Exchange of meaning in our understanding differs from **chassé-croisé** or **interchange**, terms used by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958, 1995). According to their definition, interchange is “A translation technique by which two lexical items permute and change grammatical category. Interchange is a special case of **transposition**” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 344); as we can see, this refers to a change in the grammatical category of lexical items, which will be discussed in the next part of this book.

Exchange of meaning, as we use it, also differs from another term used by Vinay and Darbelnet, namely **modulation** (1958, 1995), defined as “A translation method consisting of changing the point of view, an evocation, and often a category of thought” (1995: 346). Modulation, as used by them, is a very broad term, comprising different kinds of lexical and grammatical operations, e.g., abstract and concrete, cause and effect, means and result, part for a whole, etc. (1995: 89).

The operation of **exchanging** meanings is a more radical departure from the original text than the operations described previously. The translator not only broadens or narrows the source-language meaning but endeavours to render the meaning of the source-language sentence using completely different means.

English ST: He had not heard *her coming*. (Greene 557)

Hungarian TT: Nem hallotta, hogy *Mabel ott van a közelben*. (Osztovits 311)

Commentary: The process of *coming* is replaced by the result in the Hungarian translation. (lit.: He did not know that *she was in the proximity*).

The meaning is only seemingly new, since the new TL term is **logically related** to the source-language meaning. Retsker (1974) refers to this operation as **logical expansion**. Retsker defines the essence of logical expansion as follows: “The essence of logical expansion is that instead of a dictionary correspondence, we use a contextual correspondence logically related to it. The object of the action can be replaced by a characteristic of the object, a characteristic feature can be replaced by the object or by the process. If the meaning of verbs is exchanged, the precise system of the exchange operations can be demonstrated and a reciprocal relationship can be shown between the process (action or condition) and its causes and consequences. Accordingly, and on the basis of the permutation theory, if there are three possible elements, the linking of any two will result in one of the following six possibilities:

1. Exchange of process with the cause of the process.
2. Exchange of process with the consequence of the process.
3. Exchange of cause with the process.
4. Exchange of cause with the consequence.
5. Exchange of consequence with the cause.
6. Exchange of consequence with the process.”

(Retsker 1974 : 223–224.)

What makes such expansion of meaning possible? When the authors of original works describe a situation, they can do this in many ways. They can select the time of the event, its location, precedents, content and the characters. They can adopt any of these as their starting point and are free to choose how to continue. The translator, naturally, does not enjoy this freedom, since the description chosen by the author becomes an inseparable part of the original work, yet there are a number of choices open to him. The translator can exchange the process with the consequence of the process (*He did not hear him come* → *He did not know that he was in the proximity*), the site of the action with the action (*In your arms I do not fear death* → *if you embrace me, I do not fear death*), the accessories of an action for the action (*He heard the sounds of the table being set in the next room* → *he heard from the next room that they were setting the table*), the action for one of its accessories (*He never heard him speak loudly* → *He never heard him raise his voice*), etc. The translator can change the starting point of the action (*I should have received the letter long ago* → *the letter should have arrived long ago*) or can change the dynamic approach for a static one (*They had to leave in two hours* → *they only had two hours left*) or the static approach for a dynamic one (*it did not shorten the waiting time* → *it did shorten the slow passing of the time*).

There is, though, a much more compelling reason for such exchange of meanings in translation. Identical situations and identical actions are not only described in different ways by different languages, but are also **seen from different angles**. For instance, ways of describing characters in literary works – their faces, stature and clothing – are strikingly different in various languages. It is the task of the translator to make the target language reader see the character the same way as the source language reader. The translator has many choices in describing the clothing of the characters: the character may *wear a grey cloak over her white dress* or she may *wear a white dress under her grey cloak* or, perhaps, *her white dress can be seen under her grey cloak* or *her grey cloak can cover a white dress*). Or, in describing the face of the characters: the character may have *bright black eyes shining from her white face* or she may have *bright black eyes and a white face* or even, perhaps, she may have *a white face with bright black eyes*.

It is important, however, that these exchanges do not represent a complete departure from the original text. The logical relationship must be preserved. It is for this reason that this operation is known as logical **extension** of meaning.

Retsker (1974) considers the logical relationship between concepts as the basis for all lexical transfer operations. According to him, the broadening and narrowing of meanings is based on the logical category of **subordination**, while exchange of meanings is based on the logical category of **intersection**. There is a subordina-

tive relationship when the extension of one concept is part of the extension of another concept. There is an intersection between concepts when only part of the extension of one concept forms part of another concept, and a part of the second concept, in turn forms part of the first concept. This has been illustrated in the following example:

English ST: I could only hope that *I wouldn't live so long.* (Greene 127)
Hungarian TT: Szívemből remélem, hogy *nem érem meg ezt a napot.*
 (Borbás 228)

Just because somebody *lives for a long time*, it does not guarantee that he will *live to see a certain day*, and just because somebody *lives to see a certain day* does not guarantee that *he will live for a long time*. Thus the extent of the concept *those living for a long time* and the extent of the concept *those who see a certain day* overlap only to a limited degree. The extensions of these concepts intersect only, and it is this **intersectional** logical relationship which makes the logical extension operation available to translators.

As the exchange of meanings is a general transfer operation, independent of language pair and of direction of translation, we will not indicate characteristic directions, except for the last subtype.

Subtypes:

- 7.1. Exchange of action for result
- 7.2. Exchange of result for action
- 7.3. Exchange of action for object
- 7.4. Exchange of object for action
- 7.5. Exchange of action for place
- 7.6. Exchange of place for action
- 7.7. Exchange of action for actor
- 7.8. Exchange of actor for action
- 7.9. Exchange of state for action
- 7.10. Exchange of cause for action
- 7.11. Exchange of sound for action
- 7.12. Dynamic vs. static and static vs. dynamic exchange

7.1. Exchange of action for result

English → Hungarian:

English ST: The Indian summer was nearly over, the *clocks had all been altered*, and you could feel the approach of winter concealed in the smallest wind. (Green 73)

Hungarian TT: A vénasszonyok nyara már csaknem véget ért, *visszaállt a téli időszámítás*, s a legenyhébb szél rezzenéseiben is már érezhető volt a készülő tél lehelete. (Ungvári 119)

Commentary: “action” in English (*clocks had all been altered*) is replaced by “result” in Hungarian (*téli időszámítás* ‘winter time’).

English ST: ... as soon **as they married**; and that will be New Year's day. (E. Brontë 337)

Hungarian TT: ... mihelyt **meglesz az esküvő**, újév napján. (Sőtér 333)

Commentary: "action" in English (**as they married**) is replaced by "result" in Hungarian (**meglesz az esküvő** 'after the wedding').

English ST: ... He didn't want anybody to hear **what he was going to say now**. (Greene 125)

Hungarian TT: Nem akarta, hogy bárki is meghallja a **következőket**: ... (Borbás 236)

Commentary: "action" in English (**what he was going to say**) is replaced by "result" in Hungarian (**következőket** 'the followings').

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Fegyvereik nem voltak, de az egyik fiú már korábban **belépett** a Magyar Önkéntes Honvédelmi Szövetségbe ... (Moldova 33)

German TT: Waffen besaßen sie nicht, aber einer von ihnen **war** früher **Mitglied** im "Freiwilligenverband zur Landesverteidigung" gewesen ... (Kolbe 32)

Commentary: "action" in Hungarian (**belépett** 'joined') is replaced by "result" in German (**war ... Mitglied** 'was the member').

Hungarian ST: A rajtaütés tervét könnyen **meghatározták** ... (Moldova 30)

German TT: Der Plan für den Überfall **war** schnell **fertig** ... (Kolbe 32)

Commentary: "action" in Hungarian (**meghatározták** 'decided') is replaced by "result" in German (**war fertig** 'was ready').

7.2. Exchange of result for action

English → Hungarian:

English ST: I hate it when they are **absolutely all gin**. (Salinger 16)

Hungarian TT: Utálom, amikor **telerakják ginnel**. (Elbert 15)

Commentary: "result" in English (**absolutely all gin**) is replaced by "action" in Hungarian (**telerakják ginnel** 'fill up with gin').

French → Hungarian:

French ST: La route était **déserte**, ... (Nerval 98)

Hungarian TT: **Senki sem járt** az úton ... (Brodszky 99)

Commentary: "result" in French (**déserte** 'The street was abandoned') is replaced by "action" in Hungarian (**Senki sem járt** 'There was nobody in the street').

German → Hungarian:

German ST: Als ich das nächste Mal *bei ihm war*, zehn oder elf Tage später ... (Mann 440)

Hungarian TT: Mikor legközelebb, tíz-tizenegy nappal azután *elmentem hozzá* ... (Szöllősy 535)

Commentary: “result” in German (*bei ihm war* ‘I was with him’), is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*elmentem hozzá* ‘I went to him’).

7.3. Exchange of action for object

English ST: ... he carried his body with him like *something he hated*. (Greene 412)

Hungarian TT: ... úgy cipelte magával a testét mint valami *undorító tárgyat*. (Borbás 226)

Commentary: “action” in English (*something he hated*) is replaced by “object” in Hungarian (*undorító tárgyat* ‘disgusting thing’).

7.4. Exchange of object for action

English ST: It was as if he had discovered my *secret interest*. (Greene 125)

Hungarian TT: Rajtakapott, amint *titkos szenvedélyemnek hódolok*. (Borbás 236)

Commentary: “object” in English (*secret interest*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*titkos szenvedélyemnek hódolok* ‘I follow a secret passion’).

7.5. Exchange of action for place

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: ... gőzvonat volt, a Baross utcán közlekedett, *ahol laktunk*. (Karinthy 273)

English TT: It was drawn by a steam engine and ran along the Baross utca, *where my home was*. (Barker 12)

Commentary: “action” in Hungarian (*ahol laktunk* ‘where we lived’) is replaced by “place” in English (*where my home was*).

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Vue de près, la femme réelle révoltait notre ingénuité; il fallait qu’elle apparût reine ou déesse, et *surtout n’en pas approcher*. (Nerval 14)

Hungarian TT: A valóságos nő közlelről felháborította ártatlanságunkat; királynőnek vagy istennőnek kívántuk látni, *de csak messziről*. (Brodszky 15)

Commentary: “action” in French (*surtout n’en pas approcher* ‘did not want to approach her’) is replaced by “place” in Hungarian (*de csak messziről* ‘from a certain distance’).

7.6. Exchange of place for action

English ST: – I am not afraid of death, Lucius – *in your arms*. (Greene 417)

Hungarian TT: – *Ha te ölelsz*, Lucius, nem félek a haláltól. (Borbás 230)

Commentary: “place” in English (*in your arms*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*Ha te ölelsz*. ‘if you embrace me’).

7.7. Exchange of action for actor

English ST: ... and the bedclothes had been neatly turned back on one side, all ready for *someone to get in*. (Dahl 64)

Hungarian TT: ... és a paplan takarosán felhajtott sarokkal várja *az új vendéget*. (Borbás 65)

Commentary: “action” in English (*someone to get in*) is replaced by “actor” in Hungarian (*az új vendéget* ‘waiting for the new guest’).

7.8. Exchange of actor for action

English ST: *You* sound so crazy. (Vonnegut 79)

Hungarian TT: Annyira örülten hangzik, *amit mond*. (Szilágyi 72)

Commentary: “actor” in English (*You*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*amit mond* ‘what you are saying’).

7.9. Exchange of state for action

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Yet weeks went by and the store *stayed empty*. (Malamud 14)

Hungarian TT: Teltek, múltak a hetek, és az üzlet csak *nem talált bérlőre*. (Balassa 13)

Commentary: “state” in English (*stayed empty*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*nem talált bérlőre* ‘did not find tenant’).

English ST: ... but surely Tobaccos are about *as low as possible*. (Green 126)

Hungarian TT: ... de annyi biztos, hogy a dohánynemű már *nem mehet lejjebb*. (Borbás 237)

Commentary: “state” in English (*as low as possible*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*nem mehet lejjebb* ‘cannot go lower’).

English ST: “You are *insane*” she said. (Vonnegut 137)

Hungarian TT: – Te *megháborodtál*, – mondta Sophie. (Borbás 136)

Commentary: “state” in English (*insane*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*megháborodtál* ‘you went mad’, ‘you became insane’).

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Harmadéves történelem-filozófia *hallgató vagyok* ... (Örkény 1. 240)

German TT: *Ich studiere* das dritte Jahr Geschichte und Philosophie ... (Thies 1. 91)

Commentary: “state” in Hungarian (*hallgató vagyok* ‘I am a student’) is replaced by “action” in German (*Ich studiere* ‘I study’).

7.10. Exchange of cause for action

English ST: He couldn’t get his story out *for laughter*. (Greene 127)

Hungarian TT: Egyszerűen egy szót sem bírt kinyögni, *annyira kacagott*. (Borbás 237)

Commentary: “cause” in English *for laughter* is replaced by “action” in Hungarian: (*annyira kacagott* ‘laughed so much’).

7.11. Exchange of sound for action

English ST: Behind him were the lights of the hall and the *sound of a servant laying* the table for dinner. (Greene 555)

Hungarian TT: Mögöttük kivilágított hall, egy szolgáló vacsorához *terített*. (Osztovits 313)

Commentary: “sound” in English (*sound of a servant laying*) is replaced by “action” in Hungarian (*terített* ‘she layed the table for dinner’).

7.12. Dynamic vs. static and static vs. dynamic exchanges

All the exchanges described above can be categorised as either static or dynamic exchanges. When we exchange “action” for the “result”, “cause”, “place” or “object” of the action, etc. we choose a **static** approach over a **dynamic** one.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He didn't want anybody to hear *what he was going to say now*. (Greene 125)

Hungarian TT: Nem akarta, hogy bárki is meghallja *a következőket*. (Borbás 236)

Commentary: “dynamic approach” in English (*what he was going to say now*) is replaced by “static approach” in Hungarian (*a következőket* ‘the followings’).

When we exchange the “result”, “object”, “cause” or “site” of an action for the “action” itself we do the opposite and move from a **static** approach to a **dynamic** one.

English ST: He couldn't get his story out *for laughter*. (Green 127)

Hungarian TT: Egyszerűen egyetlen szót sem bírt kinyögni, *annyira kacagott*. (Borbás 237)

Commentary: “static approach” in English (*for laughter*) is replaced by “dynamic approach” in Hungarian (*annyira kacagott* ‘he laughed so much’).

The **dynamic vs. static** and **static vs. dynamic** exchanges are continuously carried out in translation, regardless of language pair and direction. Every language offers us the option of describing the same phenomenon or situation in a more static or more dynamic fashion.

However, examining our corpus, some preferences can be detected between the different directions. As our parallel corpora testify, there are substantially more **static** → **dynamic** exchanges in IE-Hungarian translations and substantially more **dynamic** → **static** exchanges in Hungarian-IE translations. The reason for this is that switching from a static approach to a dynamic one (a lexical transfer operation) often involves **noun** → **verb** replacement (a grammatical transfer operation), which is characteristic of IE-Hungarian translations. This will be discussed in the chapter on grammatical replacements (GR 7) in connection with “verbalisation”.

Static vs dynamic exchange

Predominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

English ST: It was the *beginning* of a chapter of catastrophe. (Christie 26)

Hungarian TT: És ezzel *kezdődött* a katasztrófák sorozata. (Borbás 27)

Commentary: “static approach” in English (*beginning*) is replaced by “dynamic approach” in Hungarian (*ezzel kezdődött* ‘it began with this’).

English ST: Alix *was in despair*. (Christie 130)

Hungarian TT: Alix *kétségbeesett*. (Borbás 131)

Commentary: “static approach” in English (*was in despair*) is replaced by “dynamic approach” in Hungarian (*kétségbeesett* ‘he despaired’).

French ST: – Voilà, **la visite** d'un admirateur! (Exupéry 42)

Hungarian TT: – **Meglátogat** egy csodálóm. (Rónay 46)

Commentary: “static approach” in French (**la visite**) is replaced by “dynamic approach” in Hungarian (**meglátogat** ‘to visit’).

Dynamic vs static exchange

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian** → **into IE**

The exchange of the dynamic approach for the static one (a lexical transfer operation) often involves **verb** → **noun** replacement (a grammatical transfer operation), characteristic of Hungarian-IE translations. This will be discussed in the chapter on grammatical replacements (GR 7), in connection with “nominalisation”.

Hungarian ST: – Fölösleges – mondta a bíró. – Én csak mint magánember **érdeklődöm** ... (Örkény 1. 198)

English TT: ‘That won’t be necessary,’ the judge explained. ‘**My interest** is purely personal’. (Sollosy 65)

Commentary: “dynamic approach” in Hungarian (**érdeklődöm** ‘I inquire’) is replaced by “static approach” in English (**My interest**).

As we can see, **static** → **dynamic** and **dynamic** → **static** exchanges are intertwined with grammatical replacements, since the exchange of meanings frequently goes together with the replacement of grammatical forms. We will return to these questions in the chapter on grammatical replacements (GR 7).

Summary comments on exchange of meanings

Exchange of meanings is a standard transfer operation, **independent** of language pairs or of the direction of translation. This is neatly illustrated by the next example, where the translator, translating from English into Hungarian, used two exchanges in opposing directions within a single sentence. In translating the first half of the English sentence, she exchanged the “action” **he spoke** for the “result of the action” (**beszédét** ‘her speech’). In translating the second half of the sentence, she exchanged the “result of the action” **lack of French** for the “action” itself (**nem beszél** ‘does not speak’):

English ST: He admired the way in which **she spoke** English, and apologized for his own **lack of French**. (Greene 154)

Hungarian TT: A férfi megcsodálta as asszony angol **beszédét**, mentegetőzőtt, **amiért nem beszél franciául**. (Borbás 116)

Exchange of meanings is a genuine example of optional operations, since the target-language sentence could be constructed without an exchange of meanings, but this operation will result in a translation that is more idiomatic and more in conformity with the perspectives typically adopted by the target language. It is a

translation specific operation. In their search for a more idiomatic TL expression, translators are guided by the principle of following target-language standards.

The ability to perform exchanges of meanings is an important component of every translator's competence. For monolingual individuals or language learners the adoption of a different perspective presents one of the greatest problems (they are unable to go beyond the perspectives of their own native tongues), while shifting perspectives belongs to the daily routine of professional translators. This ability – the ability to readily change points of view and approaches – is the backbone of translators' professional competence. Translators are called professional language mediators precisely because they are able to move from mind to language and from language to mind along two different strategic pathways at the same time.

8. Antonymous translation

Antonymous translation is a standard lexical transfer operation whereby meanings in the SL text are replaced by opposite meanings in the TL text. **Antonymous** translation is an extreme form of exchange of meanings. In the previous section, exchange of meaning was referred to as logical **extension**, since the “new”, target-language meaning is always in some logical relation with the source-language meaning. Here the logical relation is antonymity itself.

Hungarian ST: ... édesanyám azzal fogadott, hogy az apám már *nem él*.
(Csáth 10) (‘doesn’t live’)

English TT: My mother met me ... with the news that my father had *died*.
(Kessler 18)

If we relate this operation to a formal logical category, as we have done with earlier operations, the basis for antonymous translations is the formal logical category of **contradiction**. The relationship of contradiction exists between concepts that are formed by means of a negation. A person *lives* or *does not live*. That he/she lives can also be expressed by saying that he/she *does not not live* and vice versa. Naturally, in the practice of translation we rarely encounter the logical relationship behind antonymous translation in such pure form.

Subtypes:

- 8.1. Negative-positive inversion
- 8.2. Positive-negative inversion
- 8.3. Conversive translation
- 8.4. Antonymous translation in situative utterances
- 8.5. Antonymous translation in dialogues

8.1. Negative-positive inversion

The inversion of a SL negative statement into a TL positive statement is a standard transfer operation characteristic of all directions of translation. In Vinay and Darbelnet’s book, cases of antonymous translation (though they do not use this term) are to be found in the chapter on grammatical modulations (1995: 252). We shall discuss it as a lexical transfer operation, even if inversion of a negative statement into a positive one will very often affect the structure of the entire sentence. One reason for including them in the category of lexical operations is that bilingual dictionaries record numerous examples for antonymous translations at the word-level:

English → Hungarian:

non-acceptance → *visszautasítás*; *non-appealable* → *jogerős*; *non-attendance* → *távolmaradás*; *non-conductor* → *szigetelő*; *non-stop* → *folyamatos*; *non-wasting* → *tartós*, etc. (EHD 1254).

French → Hungarian:

non-assistance → *cserbenhagyás*; *nonchallamment* → *kényelmesen*; *non combattant* → *békés*; *non-fini* → *félkész*; *non-majeur* → *kiskorú*; *non-noble* → *közrendű*; *nonpareil* → *párját ritkító*; *non-résistance* → *passzív engedelmesség*, etc. (FHD 1297-1299).

German → Hungarian:

unablässig → *folytonos*; *unbenommen* → *szabad*; *unbesetzt* → *szabad, üres*; *unbesorgt* → *nyugodt*; *unbewachsen* → *kopár*; *Uneinigkeit* → *viszály*; *unerheblich* → *csekély*; *unerlaubt* → *tilos*; *unfein* → *durva, nyers*; *ungekürzt* → *teljes terjedelmű*; *ungemein* → *rendkívüli*; *ungerade* → *görbe, ferde*; *ungewaschen* → *piszkos*; *ungleichartig* → *különnemű*; *unrasiert* → *borostás*, etc. (GHD 630-646).

Russian → Hungarian:

nebedniy → *tehetős, jómódú*; *nebivaliy* → *rendkívüli*; *nevidanniy* → *csodálatos*; *nevozvratimo* → *örökre*; *nevozmütimost'* → *nyugalom*; *nedaleko* → *közel*; *neziblemny* → *állhatatos*; *neizbezhny* → *szükséges*; *neizmenny* → *állandó*, etc. (RHD I. 925-943).

The other reason for including negative-positive inversion among lexical operations is that negative-positive inversion often affects **only one word** of the sentence.

Hungarian ST: És éppenséggel *nem harapós* népség. (Gárdonyi 21)

German TT: Und sie waren ein *friedfertiges* Volk. (Weissling 21)

Commentary: Negative approach in Hungarian (*nem harapós* 'not biting people') is replaced by positive approach in German (*friedfertiges* 'friendly').

If the word translated by inversion fulfils a predicative function, then, naturally, the entire sentence will be rearranged around it.

Hungarian ST: Másnap délután, amikor átjött hozzánk, titokban megkért, *hogy ne szóljak senkinek* ... (Csáth 183)

English TT: She came to see us the next afternoon and asked me *to keep it a secret* ... (Kessler 93)

Commentary: Negative statement in Hungarian (*ne szóljak senkinek*

‘do not tell anybody’) is replaced by positive statement in English (*to keep it a secret*).

Of course, translators in their everyday practice make negative-positive inversions one would expect on the basis of bilingual dictionaries. Let us see some illustrative examples from our corpus:

English → Hungarian:

English ST: He began to read it immediately *with his mouth not quite closed*. (Salinger 10)

Hungarian TT: Mindjárt olvasni is kezdte, *kissé eltátott szájjal*. (Elbert 7)

Commentary: Negative approach in English (*not quite closed*) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*kissé eltátott* ‘slightly opened’).

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Autant qu’elle détesta sa belle-fille, elle *ne transigeait pas sur les principes*. (Mauriac 14)

Hungarian TT: Ha gyűlöli is a menyét az öregasszony, azért *a szabályokhoz ragaszkodik*. (Pór 14)

Commentary: Negative approach in French (*ne transigeait pas sur les principes* ‘she does not deviate from rules’) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*a szabályokhoz ragaszkodik* ‘she sticks to rules’).

German → Hungarian:

German ST: ... und eigentlich *fehlt mir nichts* ... (Frank 4)

Hungarian TT: ... Nem, látszólag *mindenem megvan* ... (Solti 9)

Commentary: Negative approach in German (*fehlt mir nichts* ‘I do not lack anything’) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*mindenem megvan* ‘I have all I need’).

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: ... zagovoril proshedshiy s inostrannim aktsentom, no *ne koverkaya slova*. (Bulgakov 11)

Hungarian TT: – kezdte a jövevény idegenszerű kiejtéssel, de *korrekt szóhasználattal*. (Szöllősy 12)

Commentary: Negative approach in Russian (*ne koverkaya slova* ‘not distorting the words’) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*korrekt szóhasználattal* ‘with correct usage’).

As mentioned above, negative-positive inversion is a bidirectional, non language specific transfer operation, independent of language pair and direction of translation. Our corpus, nevertheless, revealed two cases, where negative-positive inver-

sion seemed to be a more or less systemic transfer operation: (1) restriction may be expressed by negating positive statements, and (2) emphasis may be expressed by negating positive statements.

Restriction with negation is a special kind of positive statement expressed by double negation. In the following example, double negation is realised partly by lexical means: *interested* (positive attribute) → *uninterested* (negative attribute), and partly by grammatical means → *he was not uninterested*. The Hungarian translator rendered the sentence by a positive statement and restriction is expressed by the word *némi* ('some').

English ST: As I said, Closson is *not uninterested*. (Updike 2. 175)

Hungarian TT: Mint említettem, Closson *némi érdeklődést mutat* a terve iránt. (Göncz 2. 162)

Commentary: Negative approach in English (*not uninterested*) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*némi érdeklődést mutat* 'is showing some interest').

A similarly positive meaning can be found in the next Russian example where a negative property is negated by lexical means: Russian: *durno* ('badly') → *nedurno* ('not badly'). This sentence also became a restricted positive statement in Hungarian translation. Restriction is expressed by *egész* ('fairly').

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: On mezhdy prochim, mog bi ochen' *nedurno* zhit', ... (Zoschenko 273)

Hungarian TT: Különben *egész rendesen* megélhetett volna. (Rab 64)

Commentary: Negative approach in Russian (*nedurno* 'not badly') is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*egész rendesen* 'fairly well').

German sentences containing the construction *nicht ohne* ... ('not without') are positive statements with a certain restriction. They are always translated by positive sentences into Hungarian, in spite of the fact that in Hungarian a similar construction could be created without difficulty. The slight restriction is expressed in Hungarian with words like: *majdnem* ('almost'), *enyhe* ('slight'), *némi* ('some').

German → Hungarian:

German ST: ... war man sicher die Mutter zu finden und fast *nie ohne Gesellschaft* ... (Hofmannstahl 171)

Hungarian TT: ... biztosan otthon találta az anyát, éspedig majdnem *mindig társaságban*. (Kurdi 76)

Commentary: Negative approach in German (*nie ohne Gesellschaft*) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*mindig társaságban* 'always in company').

German ST: ... *nicht ohne eine leichte Scham* eilte er ... (Kafka 130)

Hungarian TT: ... *enyhe szégyenkezéssel* gyorsan bemászott ... (Györfly 131)

Commentary: Negative approach in German (*nicht ohne eine leichte Scham* ‘not without a slight sense of shame’) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*enyhe szégyenkezéssel* ‘with a slight sense of shame’).

German ST: Leonora ist sanft und gefühlvoll, dabei tätig, häuslich, doch *nicht ohne Eitelkeit*; ... (Goethe 6)

Hungarian TT: Leonora szelíd és érzelmes, ugyanakkor szorgalmas és házias, bár *van benne némi hiúság*; ... (Thurzó 7)

Commentary: Negative approach in German (*nicht ohne Eitelkeit* ‘not without vanity’) is replaced by positive approach in Hungarian (*van benne némi hiúság* ‘with a certain vanity’).

This phenomenon is recorded in Vinay and Darbelnet’s glossary under the term **litotés** (1958) and **negation of the opposite** (1995), which they define as “a rethorical figure of speech, which serves to soften the expression to achieve a greater effect, often by means of negating the opposite” (1995: 345).

Negative-positive inversion related to negation of the opposite is also registered in the Russian-Hungarian Dictionary. The following Russian adjectives and adverbs beginning with compound negative prefixes *nebez-* (*ne* ‘not’, *bez* ‘without’) all have Hungarian dictionary correspondences with positive meaning: Russian: *nebezvigodno* → Hungarian: *előnyős* (‘profitable’), Russian: *nebezinteresny* → Hungarian: *érdekes* (‘interesting’), Russian: *nebezdamny* → Hungarian: *tehetséges* (‘talanted’) → Russian: *nebezuspesny* Hungarian: *sikerés* (‘successful’). (RHD I. 925).

The other type of negative-positive inversion which has a more or less systemic character takes place in translating IE sentences into Hungarian, where IE lexical units with negative meaning are used in emphasising function.

Russian ST: Napivshis’ literatori *nemedlenno* nachali ikaty. (Bulgakov 11) (lit.: without delay)

Hungarian TT: A két író felhajtotta és *azon nyomban* csuklani kezdett. (Szöllősy 11) (lit: there and then, on the spot)

Lexical and grammatical devices for negation are closely intertwined in the next Russian sentence. Double negation in Russian expresses a strong positive statement. These “pseudo-negative statements” are generally translated by positive statements into Hungarian.

Russian ST: Slicheniye ih *ne mozhet ne vizvat’ izumleniya*. (Bulgakov 11)

Hungarian TT: E leírások összehasonlítása *mindenkit meg kell, hogy döbbentsen*. (Szöllősy 11)

Commentary: Russian double negation (*ne mozhet ne vizvat’ izumleniya* (‘NEG + can + NEG + cause astonishment’) is replaced by a strong positive statement in Hungarian (*mindenkit meg kell, hogy döbbentsen* ‘everybody have to be shocked by’).

8.2. Positive-negative inversion

Positive-negative inversion is also a bidirectional, non language specific transfer operation that is independent of language pair and direction of translation.

As for word-level inversion, interestingly enough, bilingual dictionaries do not include **ready-made positive-negative** correspondences as in the case of negative-positive inversion. But translators in their everyday practice carry out plenty of word-level and sentence-level positive-negative inversions.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: 'Only **you must remember** I warned you.' (Wilde 232)

Hungarian TT: – Csak **ne feledkezzék meg** arról, hogy én figyelmeztettem. (Tímár 141)

Commentary: Positive approach in English (**you must remember**) is replaced by negative approach in Hungarian (**ne feledkezzék meg** 'do not forget').

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Il **aimait** le gros cidre ... (Flaubert 37)

Hungarian TT: Egyáltalán **nem irtózott** a jó erős almabortól ... (Gyergyai 31)

Commentary: Positive approach in French (**aimait** 'loved') is replaced by negative approach in Hungarian (**nem irtózott** 'he did not abhor').

German → Hungarian:

German ST: Schmutz, wie bekannt, ist Materie am **falschen** Ort. (Fühmann 10)

Hungarian TT: A szenny, mint tudjuk, **nem helyénvaló** anyag. (Kalász 11)

Commentary: Positive statement in German (**falschen** 'false') is translated by negative statement in Hungarian (**nem helyénvaló** 'not proper').

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: – He-he-he! – **prodolzhal** zlobno **podsmei-*vat'sya*** Luzhin. (Dostoyevskiy 181)

Hungarian TT: – Hehehe! – Luzsin **nem hagyta abba a nevetést**. (Görög-Beke 373)

Commentary: Positive statement in Russian: (**prodolzhal ... podsmei-*vat'sya*** 'he continued laughing') is translated by negative statement in Hungarian (**nem hagyta abba a nevetést** 'he did not stop laughing').

In the previous section (LEX 8.1) we discussed two systematic negative-positive inversions in the IE-H translation: (1) restriction may be expressed by negating positive statements, and (2) emphasis may be expressed by negating positive statements. The systemic character of these inversions is reinforced by the examples of

H-IE translation, where **opposite** transfer operation takes place: the positive statements in Hungarian are translated by negative ones in IE:

Hungarian ST: – Hiszen éppen ez a jó – jegyezte meg *némi cinizmus-sal* a fiatalabb Noszty. (Mikszáth 17) (lit.: remarked with some cynicism)
French TT: – C'est la précisément ta chance! fit remarquer le jeune Noszty, *non sans quelque cynisme*. (Körössy 19) (lit.: remarked not without some cynicism)

Hungarian ST: – *Csak* Mariska jár az eszemben. (Örkény 1. 193) (lit.: It is only Marishka I am thinking of)
Russian TT: – Marishka u menya vsyo vremya *iz glolvi ne vihodit*. (Voronkina I. 316) (lit.: I cannot get Marishka out of my head)

Hungarian ST: – *Kitünően* sikerült minden. (Örkény 1. 197) (lit.: Everything went excellently)
Russian TT: – Vsyo oboshlos' *kak nel'zya luchshe*. (Voronkina 1. 318) (lit.: everything went so well that it could not have been better).

8.3. Conversive translation

Antonymous translation is frequently not the expression of a concept by the denial of the opposing concept (*he lives* → *he has not died, he died* → *he does not live*), but rather an opposite **approach**. Instead of *he hesitated for a moment before replying* we say: *he replied after hesitating for a moment*. Instead of *I did not give him the medicine*, we say *he did not receive the medicine from me*.

English ST: He hesitated a moment *before* replying. (Greene 154)
Hungarian TT: A férfi pilanatnyi tétovázás *után* felel. (Borbás 117) ('he replied after hesitating for a moment')

Thus, antonymous translation often involves a **reversal of point of view** rather than an inversion from a positive to a negative statement and vice versa. It is for this reason that in the literature the term **conversive** translation is often applied to those cases where there is no reversal of sign, only a change in perspective. (*before* → *after, below* → *above, give* → *receive, many believe* → *few doubt, remembers* → *forgets*, etc.) As mentioned above, conversion is a case of modulation in Vinay and Darbelnet's terminology (1995: 346).

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Lane took time to light a cigarette for himself *before he said anything*. (Salinger 21)
Hungarian TT: Lane előbb rágyújtott egy cigarettára. *Csak azután válaszolt*. (Elbert 21)
Commentary: *before* in English is replaced by *azután* ('afterwards') in Hungarian.

English ST: He was **the son of** a proprietor of a certain well-known cottonmill in Massachusetts. (James 197)

Hungarian TT: Caspar Goodwood **atyja** ismert pamutfonógyár tulajdonosa volt Massachusetts államban. (Balabán 164)

Commentary: **the son of** in English is replaced by **atyja** ('[his] father') in Hungarian.

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: A búcsúlevél a konyha kőpadlóján hevert, **rajta** egy kis kerámia hamutartó ... (Örkény 1. 31)

English TT: It was tucked **under** a small ceramic ashtray ... (Sollosy 23)

Commentary: **rajta** (on sg.) in Hungarian is replaced by **under** in English.

French → Hungarian:

French ST: La chambre de Jacques se trouvait prise celle de Mahieddine Bachtarzi, **fijs** d'un riche marchand de Saint-Eugène, ... (Cocteau 28)

Hungarian TT: Jacques szomszédja egyik oldalon Machieddine Bachtarzi volt, akinek gazdag kereskedő **apja** Saint Eugène-ben ... lakott, ... (Pór 29)

Commentary: **fijs** ('son') in French is replaced by **apja** ('father') in Hungarian.

Hungarian → French:

Hungarian ST: Egy kripta különben **sem olcsó**: (Örkény 4. 98)

French TT: L 'installation d'un caveau est toujours **onéreuse** (Tardos 2. 99)

Commentary: **sem olcsó** ('not cheap') in Hungarian is replaced by **onéreuse** ('expensive') in French.

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: A két gyermek **odasimult** a lányhoz. (Gárdonyi 13)

German TT: Das gefangene Mädchen **drückte** die Kinder **an sich**. (Schüching 10)

Commentary: In Hungarian, the children press themselves to the girl, in the German translation the girl presses the children to herself.

Hungarian ST: – **Kinek a lánya** vagy? – kérde a főbíró elragadtatva. (Mikszáth 39)

German TT: "Wer ist **dein Vater**?" – fragte der entzückte Burgmeister. (Székács 45)

Commentary: **lánya** ('Whose daughter are you?') in Hungarian is replaced by **dein Vater** ('Who is your father') in German.

8.4. Antonymous translation in situative utterances

The effort of translators to select the most naturally sounding target-language sentence becomes most evident in the translation of so-called **situative utterances**. Situative utterances (Fónagy 1982) are typical utterances (exclamations, requests, questions, commands, etc.) characteristic of certain communicative situations. In translating situative utterances, translators must rely more on the situation itself than on the SL form. The transfer operation carried out in translating situative utterances may be either antonymous translation or total transformation (the latter will be discussed in detail in the next section LEX 9). Here we will give two examples of antonymous translation of situative utterances. This operation is justified by the fact that in both situations (looking for somebody, reminding sy of sg) negative questions are more characteristic of Hungarian usage than positive ones.

English ST: 'Have you seen him anywhere about?' (Christie 54)
Hungarian TT: – Nem látta valamerre? (Borbás 55)
 (lit.: Have you not seen him somewhere?)

German ST: "Wirst du dir das merken?" (Canetti 8)
Hungarian TT: – Nem felejtet el? (Sárközy 8)
 (lit.: Will you not forget?)

8.5. Antonymous translation in dialogues

Antonymous translation is characteristic of the translation of adjacency pairs in dialogues, where the stimuli and reactions are highly stereotypical.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: 'Sorry' he said outside her window with the blinds drawn. 'It's all right, dear' she said. (Hemingway 28)
Hungarian TT: – Bocsáss meg – mondta kívül, a lehúzott, zsalus ablaknál. – Semmi baj, drágám – mondta az asszony. (Szász 29)
Commentary: Semmi baj ('No problem') in Hungarian is a typical response to the apology *Bocsáss meg* ('Sorry').

English ST: 'Where's Cynthia?'
'She isn't in.' (Greene 171)
Hungarian TT: – Hol van Cynthia? – Házon kívül. (Ungvári 236)
Commentary: Házon kívül (lit.: Out of the house) in Hungarian is a typical response to the question *Hol van?* ('Where is she?')

In the case of adjacency pairs in dialogues, the TL response is determined by the TL stimulus and not by the SL response.

Summary comments on antonymous translation

Antonymous translation is an optional transfer operation, independent of language pair or direction of translation. The translator needs considerable experience to perform the operation in a routine manner. It is a typical example of an optional operation. An acceptable target-language sentence can almost always be constructed without inversion or without a change in perspective.

Antonymous translation is a translation specific operation. In searching for a more idiomatic expression to better suit the needs of TL reader, the translator is guided by the principle of following the target-language norm.

The ability to reverse negative statements into positive ones and vice versa and to shift perspective is an important component of the translator's professional competence. As mentioned in the previous chapter, translators are professional language mediators because they can move from mind to language and from language to mind along two different strategic pathways at the same time.

9. Total transformation

Total transformation is a standard lexical transfer operation whereby meanings of the SL text are replaced by other meanings in the TL text, which do not seem to show any logical relation with the SL meanings.

Hungarian ST: A szakácsnő *kávét* adott, azután a konyhába ment főzni. (Csáth 189)

English TT: ... the cook gave us our *cocoa*, and went back to work into the kitchen. (Kessler 99)

Commentary: *kávé* ('coffee') in Hungarian → *cocoa* in English.

Hungarian ST: Özv. Kovács Lőrincné óbudai nyugdíjas az este *róseibnit* süttött vacsorára. (Örkény 1. 212)

German TT: Die Obudaer Rentnerin und Witwe des Lőrinc Kovács buk zum Abendbrot *Omeletten*. (Thies 1. 68)

Commentary: *róseibni* ('fried potatoes') in Hungarian → *Omelette* ('omelette') in German.

The concepts related in total transformation are characterised by **incompatibility**, i.e. they are co-hyponyms of the same superordinate category and are mutually exclusive. This is the relation between Hungarian *kávé* 'coffee' and English *cocoa* (both hyponyms belonging to the superordinate **beverage**) and Hungarian *róseibni* 'fried potato' and German: *Omelette* 'omelette' (both belonging to the superordinate **food**). There is no *coffee* that could be *cocoa* at the same time and no *fried potatoes* that could be an *omelette* as well.

We said above that there was no apparent logical relation between the meanings that were interchanged in total transformation. The relation is that they belong to the same superordinate term. It is exactly this idea that made it possible to use *cocoa* instead of *coffee* in the Hungarian-English translation and use *omelette* instead of *fried potatoes* in the Hungarian-German translation.

So far we have been talking about the **common ground** between the interchanged meanings, which accounts for the fact that in spite of the interchange the target-language word has the same sense. We have not discussed the **reason** for total transformation and what it was that induced the translators to depart so radically from the original.

Among the reasons for total transformation first we must mention **pragmatic differences**, i.e. the differences in the relationship between the linguistic sign and the users of the sign. Translators have an idea of the perspective of the target-language reader and perform total transformation with the target-language reader's cultural schemata and world knowledge in mind.

In the first example, the reason for the *coffee-cocoa* transformation was that the subject was the afternoon snack of children. According to the translator's knowledge of English-American customs, children prefer *cocoa* to *coffee* for their afternoon snack. In the second example, it was important that the food be a kind of very simple, everyday food, characteristic of the dinner of a lonely widow, and for this purpose *omelette* looked better to the German translator than *fried potatoes*.

For this reason, total transformation is frequently referred to as **pragmatic adaptation**. There are two reasons why we do not use the term pragmatic adaptation in lieu of total transformation. One is that in our classification it is the **nature** of the transfer operation that is accorded precedence, and not its reason. The second is that the concept of **total transformation** is both a **broader** and a **narrower** concept than **pragmatic adaptation**. It is broader because total transformation may be needed not only because of pragmatic differences, and narrower since pragmatic adaptation takes place in a number of **other** transfer operations (expanding or narrowing meanings, additions and omissions) as already mentioned repeatedly in the previous sections.

Subtypes:

- 9.1. Total transformation of names of foods and beverages
- 9.2. Total transformation of names of children's games
- 9.3. Total transformation of proper names
- 9.4. Total transformation of address forms
- 9.5. Total transformation of names of historical realia
- 9.6. Total transformation of idiomatic expressions
- 9.7. Total transformation of situative utterances
- 9.8. Total transformation of measurements
- 9.9. Total transformation of intralingual references

9.1. Total transformation of names of foods and beverages

The principal reason for total transformation, as we have mentioned, is the fact that differences between the SL and TL readers' cultural backgrounds necessitate pragmatic adaptation. The first example illustrates total transformation of **food names**.

English ST: It was a pudding he liked, *Queen's pudding* with a perfect meringue ... (Greene 461)

Hungarian TT: Csakugyan olyan tészta volt, amit szeretett, *rakott palacsinta* pompás habbal ... (Szobotka 284)

The principal reason for the *Queen's pudding* → *rakott palacsinta* (lit.: layered pancake) transformation was that *Queen's pudding* means nothing to the Hungarian reader. If the only thing that mattered from the perspective of the story was to find a kind of pastry which is familiar to Hungarian readers, the translator could have selected any kind of pastry, even his own personal favourite. But it was

not so simple. There were minimum three points the translator had to take into consideration. First, that the pastry should not be a typically Hungarian one since the conversation, after all, took place in London. Second, it had to be a kind of pastry that could be covered with meringue, because later meringue has a function in the story. Third, he also had to consider whether this dish was mentioned again later on in the story. Here, for example, Queen's pudding is given again to the little boy at dinner, without the meringue and cold.

This is probably the reason why the translator did not simply omit *Queen's* and use *pudding*, since pudding for the Hungarian reader means a cold cream-like and not a steamed dessert. Hungarian pudding is always cold and therefore the fact that the pudding was served cold would not suggest to the Hungarian reader that some serious problems were brewing in the house and that the adults did not have the time to properly look after the little boy. The translator's solution *rakott palacsinta* (lit.: layered pancake) could satisfy all the three requirements: it was not a typical Hungarian pastry, could be served cold and with meringue or without.

Plum cake in the next example is a typically English dish. Plum cake, usually called *plum pudding*, is a dessert eaten on special occasions like Christmas. It resembles a rich, spicy fruit bread stuffed with raisins, but is round and not loaf-shaped like the Hungarian fruit bread. In the context of the story only the shape is important. Since it must be assumed that the majority of the Hungarian readers have never seen a plum cake, the translator had to find something that raised the image of *mud houses* in the mind of the Hungarian reader. This is why he picked the Hungarian pastry *kakaós sütemény* ('cocoa pastry').

English ST: ... their knobby mud houses were only just completed, still dark brown and damp like rich *plum cake*. (Durrell 106)

Hungarian TT: ... dudoros sárfészkeik éppen csak hogy elkészültek, még sötétbarnák és nyirkosak voltak, mint a *kakaós sütemény*. (Sárközi 111)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Elle déposa du boeuf froid, des bananes, du lait sur une chaise près du malade, transporta des gâteaux secs et de la *grenadine* auprès du lit vide et s'y coucha. (Cocteau 29)

Hungarian TT: A kislány hideg marhahúst, pár banánt s egy pohár tejet tett a székre a beteg mellé, magának viszont süteményt meg *málnaszörpöt* hozott az ágya elé, és lefeküdt. (Gyergyai 82)

Commentary: French *grenadine* ('pomegranate-juice'), which is unfamiliar to Hungarian readers became *málnaszörp*, in the Hungarian translation ('raspberry-flavoured syrup'), which has been a popular non-alcoholic beverage in Hungary until quite recently.

Hungarian → German:

Hungarian ST: Ott legalább folyton eszik az ember. Kemény tojást, savanyú cukrot, sonkás zsemlet, nápolyit. Aztán leöblíti sörrel vagy *bambival*. (Palotai 17)

German TT: Dort kann der Mensch wenigstens zu immerzu essen. Harte Eier, saure Drops, Schinkenbrötchen, Waffeln. Und dann begießt man das Ganze mit Bier oder *Limonade*. (Dira 13)

Commentary: *bambi*, a non-alcoholic lemon-flavoured beverage, characteristic of the 1950–1960s in Hungary, probably named after Felix Salten’s well-known children’s book “*Bambi*”, becomes *Limonade* (‘lemonade’) in German.

Hungarian → Russian:

Hungarian ST: Leült a szálló előtti uzsonnázóasztalok egyikéhez. Itt nagy búsan egy *málnaszörpöt* szivogatott. (Rejtő 27)

Russian TT: Annet sela za stolik nedaleko of vhoda i prinyalas’ pechal’no podtyagivat’ cherez solominku *limonad*. (Aleksandrov 19)

Commentary: *málnaszörp* (‘raspberry-flavoured syrup’), which has been a popular non-alcoholic beverage in Hungary until quite recently, becomes *limonad* (‘lemonade’) in Russian.

9.2. Total transformation of names of children’s games

The total transformation of names of **children’s games** can also be explained on pragmatic grounds. In Graham Greene’s short story *The end of the party* two games are mentioned: *egg-and-spoon races* and *spearing apples in a basin of water*, which are both unfamiliar to a Hungarian audience. The point is that Francis, Peter’s brother is scared that he will be too clumsy in these games. Thus, the translator had to find two Hungarian games requiring skill. His solutions are the following: *zsákban futás* (lit.: sack races) and *célba dobás* (lit.: target throwing).

English ST: The fifth of January, Peter thought again, his mind drifting idly from image of cakes to the prizes which might be won. *Egg-and-spoon races, spearing apples in basins of water, blind man’s buff*. (Greene 552)

Hungarian TT: Január ötödike, gondolta Péter újra, gondolatai lustán vándoroltak ide-oda a sütemények és az elnyerhető díjak között. *Zsákban futás, célba dobás, bújócška*. (Osztovits 311)

When using total transformation, translators have to be very careful not to contradict themselves. It happens that the realia (food, beverages, clothing or games), which form the subject of total transformation, or something related to them, are mentioned again later in the story. One component of the *egg-and-spoon races*, transformed into *zsákban futás* (lit.: sack races), namely the *egg* appears again later in Francis’s thoughts. The translator is now compelled to forget the egg and stick with the sack race, which, of course, does not appear in the original sentence. This transformation cannot be explained on a sentence by sentence basis and can be justified only on the basis of the earlier transfer operation.

English ST: Their sex humiliated him, as they watched him fumble with his **egg**, from under lowered scornful lids. (Greene 552)

Hungarian TT: Hogy “nők”, szinte porig alázta Francist, amikor leeresztett pilláik alól gúnyosan nézik, hogyan ügyetlenkedik **zsákban futás** közben. (Osztovits 311)

Even though **spoons** and **eggs** have no apparent relation to the **sack**, the two races are linked by belonging to the same category of games.

9.3. Total transformation of proper names

One of the most striking manifestations of pragmatic adaptation is the total transformation of **proper names**. In the short stories of Géza Csáth the name of the maid servants are **Maris**, **Julcsa**, etc. These so-called “**low-prestige**” names clearly announce their servant status. In the English translation names had to be found which would raise the image of a slave in the reader. The English name **Maria** corresponds to the Hungarian name **Mária**. The diminutive form **Mary**, however, would obviously be unsuitable for the purpose, and for this reason the translator chose **Rosie**. **Gyuri**, the attendant in the Anatomical Institute became **Peter** in the translation.

Hungarian ST: **Maris** megfordult az ágyban, kinyitotta szemét és kinézett az ablakon. (Csáth 5)

English TT: **Rosie** turn in bed, opened her eyes, and glanced out. (Kessler 185)

Hungarian ST: ... mondta is **Gyuri**, aki a II. számú anatómiában van. (Csáth 13)

English TT: Even **Peter** – he’s in Institute Two – said ... (Kessler 185)

The reason for total transformation was quite different in the next Hungarian-French example. In the French translation of Kálmán Mikszáth’s novel *L’histoire du jeune Noszty avec la Marie Toth*, one of the noblewomen, Mrs. Velkovics is given a new name: **Zsófia** instead of **Zsuzsanna**, probably because **Suzanne** is generally used for maid-servants in 20th century French novels.

Hungarian ST: Hát én azt mondom **Zsuzsanna**, hogy a papok ideje lejárt és nemsokára olyan szegény ördögök lesznek, mint a mi papjaink. (Mikszáth 9)

French TT: Et moi, je te dis **Zsofia**, en disant que le temps des pretres catholiques est révolu et que, bientôt, ils seront d’aussi pauvres diables que nos pasteurs. (Körössy 11)

Occasionally, total transformation is justifiable because the name has **no equivalent** in the other language, even though it is a very common name. In such a situation, the translator does not wish to take the chance of using a Hungarian name in the translation that might evoke unpleasant connotations in an English reader,

and a simple name is chosen used in both languages. Thus *Dezső* became *Peter* and *Eti* became *Anna* in the examples below.

Hungarian ST: Én és *Dezső* mindenből ettünk sorban. (Csáth 38)

English TT: *Peter* and I take turns eating everything. (Kessler 59)

Hungarian ST: Lábat kell mosni. Rendszeresen *Eti* kezdi. (Csáth 38)

English TT: We have to wash our feet. *Anna's* usually first. (Kessler 60)

George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm*, gives numerous examples of the difficulties presented by animal names. If the source-language text contains typical animal names, the translator's job is not to translate them, but to find corresponding names in the target language. In this way, the names of the two horses, *Boxer* and *Clover*, were translated into Hungarian as *Bandi* and *Rózsi*. A typical animal name may have a meaning, which may or may not have a corresponding name in the target language. *Pincher*, the name of the dog in the novel became *Fogdmege* (lit.: catch it) in the Hungarian translation, which is a typical dog name in Hungarian. If the source language contains an animal name that is atypical because it has a connotation that is relevant to the story this should be preserved in the translation, and the name may even be translated literally. This happened in the case of the wise old pig (*Old Major* → *öreg Örnagy*), while the name of the great boar *Napoleon*, who grabbed power and became a dictator, was left as in the original. Where the animals had a regular given name, this was usually changed in the translation (*Jessie* → *Zsuzsi*, *Muriel* → *Malvin*) and the original name was preserved only in exceptional circumstances, such as in the case of the foolish white mare, *Mollie*, who always went her own way and whose English name was preserved.

English ST: ...last of all came the cat, who looked round, as usual, for the warmest place, and finally squeezed herself in between *Boxer and Clover* ... (Orwell 3)

Hungarian TT: ... legeslegutolsóának a macska érkezett, szokása szerint megkereste magának a legmelegebb helyet, aztán végül befészkelte magát *Bandi és Rózsi* közé. (Sziogyártó 7)

English ST: *Muriel* was dead, *Bluebell*, *Jessie* and *Pincher* were dead. (Orwell 85)

Hungarian TT: *Malvin* meghalt, ahogy *Kolomp*, *Zsuzsi és Fogdmege* is elpatkolt. (Sziogyártó 102)

English ST: At the last moment *Mollie*... came mincing daintily in ... (Orwell 7)

Hungarian TT: Az utolsó pillanatban megjelent *Mollie* is, kényesen illegetve magát. (Sziogyártó 7)

In the French translation of the one-minute story by István Örkény *Apróhirdetés* (Classified advertisements) *Joliot Curie tér* ('Joliot Curie square') is replaced by *Place Attila Jozsef* ('Attila József square'). By exchanging the name of a French

scientist for the name of a Hungarian poet, the translator probably tried to achieve a better representation of the Hungarian milieu.

Hungarian ST: Joliot Curie téri, ötödik emeleti, kétszobás, alkóvos, beépített konyhabútorral felszerelt, Sashegyre néző lakásomat sürgősen, ráfizetéssel is elcsérélném Joliot Curie téri, ötödik emeleti, kétszobás, alkóvos, beépített konyhabútorral fölszerelt lakásra, a Sashegyre néző kilátással. (Örkény 1. 230)

*French TT: Échangerais logement deux pièces, entrée, placards, cuisine 5^e ét. vue imprenable sur le mont Sas, contre deux pièces, entrée, placards, cuisine 5^e ét. vue imprenable sur le mont Sas. **Place Attila-Jozsef**, côté impair si possible. Ecrire: 3, **place Attila-Jozsef**. (Tardos 3. 94)*

9.4. Total transformation of address forms

In translating **address forms**, translators may choose from among three different solutions. They may retain the original SL address form in the TT (English: **Sir** → Hungarian: **Sir**; English **Mister** → Hungarian: **Mister**), or may translate it (English: **Yes, Sir** → Hungarian: **Igen, uram**) or may apply total transformation of the SL address form according to the situation. The situational requirement means that the source-language address is not translated, but knowing the whole work and all the elements of a given situation (place, characters, age, sex, social status, etc.), translators seek out the address which would be used in parallel situations in the target language.

*English ST: ‘Some other time I’ll come here.’ I said, and she said, ‘Any time, **kid**’. (Kerouac 35)*

*Hungarian TT: – Na majd legközelebb – biztattam, ő pedig rámondta: – Nézz be, **kisapám**. (Bartos 39)*

*Commentary: English **kid** in Hungarian translation became **kisapám** (lit.: my little father).*

*English ST: Till Saturday, **my flower!** (Salinger 5)*

*Hungarian TT: A szombati viszontlátásig, **bogaram!**(Elbert 9)*

*Commentary: English **my flower** in Hungarian translation became **bogaram** (‘my beetle’).*

In such a situation, we are not dealing with translation but with adaptation. The translator ignores the original address and determines the form of address the characters in the given situation would use. The image created by the participants is obviously influenced by their roles in the whole story. The translator knows their age, social status and interpersonal relationships.

In the next example, we find two different Hungarian translations of the French address form: **mon cher** (‘my dear’). The first is **őregem** (‘my old fellow’), the second is **fiam** (‘my son’). This is a good example of the relativity of age in address

forms. The same phenomenon can be detected in the German example: *Junge* ('my son') is translated by *őregem* ('my old fellow') into Hungarian.

French ST: – Mais il se fâcha: Je ne fais pas de frais, *mon cher*; (Maupassant 15)

Hungarian TT: De ő megsértődött: – Én nem erőlködöm, *őregem!* (Illés 128)

Commentary: French *mon cher* ('my dear') → Hungarian: *őregem* ('my old fellow').

French ST: – Je répondis: regarde les bracelets, *mon cher*, ... (Maupassant 15)

Hungarian TT: – Nézd meg a karkötőit, *fiam* ... (Illés 129)

Commentary: French *mon cher* ('my dear') → Hungarian: *fiam* ('my son').

German ST: "Ach *Junge*", sagte Kuhlmann," ich hör so wenig von der Welt." (Kant 53)

Hungarian TT: – Ugyan *őregem* – mondta Kuhlmann, – én olyan keveset hallok a világból. (Mátrai 52)

Commentary: German *Junge* ('my son') → Hungarian: *őregem* ('my old fellow').

The next example illustrates the relativity of gender in address forms: German: *Mädchen* ('girl') is translated by *fiacskám* ('my little son') into Hungarian. The Hungarian *fiacskám* ('my little son') is a common address form which can be used without gender restriction. The scene below is a dialogue between a landlady and her tenant. The address forms used by the landlady demonstrate her patronising manner towards the poor and pitiable tenant. The address forms used in the Hungarian translation of the dialogue are independent of the German original, they are selected by the translator on the basis of the situation and the relationship between the characters.

German ST: "Nun kommen Sie, *Mädchen*, trinken Sie einen". (Böll 313)

Hungarian TT: – Na, jöjjön *fiacskám*, igyon egy kupicával. (Gergely 196)

Commentary: German: *Mädchen* ('girl') → Hungarian: *fiacskám* ('my little son').

German ST: "Sind sie schwanger, *liebes Kind*?" (Böll 313)

Hungarian TT: – Maga állapotos, *kedvesem*? (Gergely 196)

Commentary: German: *liebes Kind* ('dear child') → Hungarian: *kedvesem* ('my dear').

German ST: "*Armes Kind*", – sagte sie. (Böll 313)

Hungarian TT: – *Szegénykém* – mondta. (Gergely 196)

Commentary: German: *Armes Kind* ('poor child') → Hungarian: *Szegénykém* ('my poor little thing').

German ST: “Sie müssen die Farbe des Lippenstifts wechseln, *Kind*.” (Böll 313).

Hungarian TT: – Más színű rúzszt kell használnia, *kedvesem*. (Gergely 196)

Commentary: German: *Kind* (‘child’) → Hungarian: *kedvesem* (‘my dear’).

The way in which the foreign address forms are rendered may be influenced by a decision between foreignising or domesticating translation. The Russian address forms *batyushka* (‘old fellow’), *bratets* (‘my little friend’), *golubchik*, (‘my little dove’, used for men), *golubushka* (‘my little dove’, used for women), *druzhocek* (‘my little friend’) were preserved in early translations of Russian classics or by transliteration (Russian: *batyushka* → Hungarian: *bátyuska*, or by word for word translation (Russian: *golubchik* → Hungarian: *galambocskám*). The strange Russian address forms with their diminutive suffixes seemed to express an unusually warm and close relationship between the characters in Russian literary works. Using the method of foreignisation, 20th century translators attempted to give readers an idea of Russian thinking and the Russian way of life, that is, to demonstrate the foreign atmosphere. Today most translators prefer domestication and select address forms generally used in Hungary in the given situation.

Russian ST: – Verno, verno *batyushka*, – neterpelivo prevral on Antipova. (Pasternak 30)

Hungarian TT: – Igaz, igaz *öregem* – szakította félbe türelmetlenül Antypovot. ... (Pór 34)

Commentary: Russian *batyushka* (‘old fellow’) → Hungarian: *öregem* (‘my old friend’).

Russian ST: – Ну, idi, *druzhocek*, nakonets laskovo otpustil doktor k soprovozhdayushchemu militsioneru, zhdavsemu za dveryu. (Tendryakov 343)

Hungarian TT: – Na, eredj *pajtás* – eresztette vissza végül kedvesen az orvos a folyosón várakozó kísérő rendőrhöz. (Soproni 329)

Commentary: Russian *druzhocek* (‘little friend’) → Hungarian: *pajtás* (‘mate’).

Russian ST: – *Golubchik ti moy, rodnoy* – voskliknula ona zhalobno. (A. Tolstoy 132)

Hungarian TT: – *Drágám, kedvesem!* – kiáltott fel az asszony fájdalomosan. ... (Wessely 133)

Commentary: Russian *Golubchik ti moy, rodnoy* (‘You my little dove, beloved’) → *Drágám, kedvesem* (‘my dear, my beloved one’).

To some extent, the question of using **second or third person** singular (the problem of *tous/vous* forms) is also part of the address translation problem. It is not easy to translate into English a change from *tous* to *vous* or vice versa since in English the personal pronoun would in both cases be “you”. Translators usually

use: *Call me by my Christian name* for the Hungarian *Tegezz engem* or *Legyüink pertu!*

Hungarian ST: Ami az urat illeti, az ugyan szokott beteg lenni, és az néha gyógyíttatja is magát, és pénze is van néha, de mégse fizet néha se, hanem inkább azt mondja a doktornak jutalom fejében: – *Legyüink, barátocskám, ezentúl pertu.* (Mikszáth 55)

English TT: As for the gentry, they certainly fall ill and sometimes they even have themselves cured; moreover they sometimes have money. But they never pay, not even sometimes. Instead they say to the doctor: “*Call me by my Christian name in the future, old boy!*” (Sturgess 68)

In his *Translator’s notes* attached to the English translation of Móricz’s novel *Rokonok* (Relations), the translator, Bernard Adams attempts to explain Hungarian forms of address to English readers:

In Hungarian a complex system of address is used – the familiar second person *te* (plural *ti*), the honorific *Maga* or *Ön* (plurals *Maguk*, *Önök*) with the third person of the verb, the now old fashioned *kend*, used to a social inferior, and the very formal *tetszik* ‘it pleases’ followed by the infinitive, all of which are alien to modern English. All these forms have been rendered by the second person (Adams 1997: 257).

The change of the *tous/vous* forms does not cause similar problems in the Hungarian-German and Hungarian-Russian translation: *German TT:* “Wir wollen von nun an *auf du und du* sein, Freundchen.” (Schüching–Engl 334); *Russian TT:* – Otnine moy drug mozhesh bit’ so mnoy *na ti*. (Leybutin 66).

9.5. Total transformation of names of historical realia

Similarly to names, dishes, beverages and games, pragmatic adaptations must frequently be used in translating the names of **historical periods**. Mentioning the name of a certain historical period frequently carries meaning well beyond the obvious. The mention of a historical period may be used to characterise customs, morals or building styles which are obvious to the source language reader, but not to the target-language reader who is not linked to that historical period by memories, emotions, etc.

In such a case, the translator must find an *attribute* which has the same meaning for the target-language reader as the name of the historical period has for the source-language reader. *Victorian* (relating to Queen Victoria and to the second half of the 19th Century) or *Jozefinista* (the period of Joseph II) mean something to the Hungarian reader, but *Edwardian* (relating to the period of Edward VII) requires pragmatic adaptation.

English ST: ... and the phrase sounded more *Edwardian* because of the faint American intonation. (Greene 153)

Hungarian ST: ... s a mondat csak annál inkább **múlt századbelinek** hangzott, mert halvány amerikai hangsúly színezte. (Borbás 116)
Commentary: **Edwardian** in the English text became **múlt századbeli** (lit.: of the last century) in the Hungarian translation.

English ST: Old Hall was a big **Victorian** house surrounded by woods and parkland. (Christie 10)
Hungarian ST: Az udvarház hatalmas erdő és park közepén álló **múlt századi** épület volt. (Borbás 11)
Commentary: **Victorian** in the English text became **múlt századi** (lit.: of the last century) in the Hungarian translation.

In mentioning a historical event, the author can choose between naming the event (conquest of Hungary, revolution, millennium) and giving its date (896, 1848, 1896). For the majority of source-language readers an event and its date are tightly linked, but such knowledge cannot be expected from the target-language reader. Should this occur, the name of the event may be replaced or supplemented by the date.

Hungarian ST: – Nem történt a **szabadságharc** óta semmi. (Örkény 1.9)
English TT: ‘You mean nothing has happened since the **war in 1848**?’ (Sollosy 47)
French TT: – Vous n’allez pas me dire que depuis **1848**, depuis notre **Guerre d’Indépendance**, il ne s’est rien passé? (Tardos 1. 9)
Commentary: Instead of the name of the Hungarian historical event **szabadságharc** (‘freedom fight’), its date is used in the English translation: **war in 1848**. In the French translation the date is added to the explanatory translation: **Guerre d’Indépendance** (‘war of independence’).

9.6. Total transformation of idiomatic expressions

As we have already indicated, the justification for total transformation does not always lie in differences in culture, history or customs between the two linguistic communities. Total transformations are frequently mandated by **idiomatic expressions** such as proverbs, sayings or aphorisms. Their meaning is more than the sum of their component words and thus they cannot be broken down into their constituent elements and those elements are not interchangeable at will.

Bilingual dictionaries and glossaries contain numerous examples for such total transformations. For instance, the idea that someone does nothing to achieve his/her goals is expressed in Hungarian by **várja, hogy a sült galamb a szájába repüljön** (‘be waiting for the fried dove to fly into sy’s mouth’), while in English one would say **to let the grass grow under one’s feet**. If someone makes a foolish promise, Hungarians might say **füt, füt ígér** (‘promise grass and tree’), while the English would **promise the moon**; they would also bring down the moon from the sky, and not the stars like Hungarians. A frightened person is **white as a wall** in Hungarian, **white as a sheet** in English and **white as chalk** in Russian.

English ST: ... her little boy who was crying *for the moon*. (Wilde 137)

Hungarian TT: ... kisfia nyafogott, hogy *hozza le neki a csillagokat* (Lengyel 193)

Commentary: English: *crying for the moon* → Hungarian: *hozza le neki a csillagokat* ('bring down the stars').

Hungarian ST: A visszatérő szolga *falfehéren*, remegő térdekkel, hatalmas ezerfrankos köteget hoz. (Rejtő 17)

English TT: The shop assistant looked *white as a sheet* as he returned with the tremendous bundle of thousand-franc notes. (Bozsó 18)

Russian TT: Sluzhashchiy, *belij kak mel*, c tryasuyushchimisy kolenyami prinyos vnushitelnuyu svyazku banknot. (Aleksandrov 15)

Commentary: Hungarian: *falfehér* ('white as a wall') → English: *white as a sheet* → Russian: *belij kak mel* ('white as a chalk').

In their daily work translators perform many more total transformations than those contained in bilingual dictionaries. Those which are used repeatedly and regularly eventually find their way into the dictionary. Below we shall examine the relationship between dictionary equivalents and translational equivalents, comparing five English idiomatic expressions and their Hungarian translations.

English ST: "You want *to look under the stones* too much, Sarah". (Greene 21)

Hungarian TT: – Minek ezt *felhánytorgatni*? (Ungvári 37)

Commentary: The English idiomatic expression: *to look under the stones* cannot be found in the English-Hungarian Dictionary. The translator had to create a Hungarian equivalent without the help of the dictionary. The selected correspondence is not an idiomatic expression but preserves the meaning of the original: *felhánytorgatni* ('to reproach sy with sg').

English ST: ... *a good man in a tight place*. (Christie 8)

Hungarian TT: ... *derekasan helyt tud állni, ha szorul a kapca*. (Sziogyártó 9)

Commentary: The English idiomatic expression: *a good man in a tight place* cannot be found in the English-Hungarian Dictionary. The translator had to find a Hungarian correspondence without the help of the dictionary. The selected correspondence contains two idiomatic expressions: *derekasan helyt tud állni* ('he can hold his own') and *ha szorul a kapca* ('if he is in a tight corner'), so it may be regarded as an overtranslation.

English ST: *He'd cooked Seton's goose* all right. (Christie 53)

Hungarian TT: ... Alaposan *elintézte Setont*. (Sziogyártó 55)

Commentary: The English idiomatic expression: *to cook sy's goose* can be found in the English-Hungarian Dictionary (EHD 1960: 403). There are four Hungarian correspondences listed in the dictionary: *keresztezi* ('to cross sy's plan'), *meghiúsítja vkinek a terveit* ('to counter sy's

designs'), *ellátja a baját* ('to teach sy manners'), *tönkretesz valakit* ('to ruin sy's life'). The Hungarian translator probably was not satisfied with these suggestions and selected a fifth one: *elintéz* ('to settle accounts with sy').

English ST: Some people are just determined *to bring the roof down on themselves*, aren't they? (Wolfe 588)

Hungarian TT: ... Egyesek direkt *kihívják maguk ellen a sorsot!* (Fencsik 460)

Commentary: The English idiomatic expression: *to bring the roof down on themselves* cannot be found in the English-Hungarian Dictionary. The translator had to create a Hungarian correspondence without the help of the dictionary. The Hungarian correspondence found is an idiomatic expression: *kihívják maguk ellen a sorsot* ('to fly in the face of the Providence').

English ST: From then on it was easy. A Tory in riding-breeches, male or female, was always *a sitting duck* for Mr Boggis. (Dahl 132)

Hungarian TT: ... Ettől fogva játszi könnyedséggel ment minden. Him-vagy nőnemű tory, lovaglónadrágban – a mindenkori *eszményi préda*. (Borbás 135)

Commentary: The English idiomatic expression *a sitting duck* can be found in the English-Hungarian Dictionary (EHD 1960: 1980). The Hungarian translator was probably not satisfied with the Hungarian correspondence offered by the dictionary *könnyű célpont* ('easy target') and created an idiomatic correspondence: *eszményi préda* ('ideal prey').

After having examined the Hungarian dictionary equivalents of five English idiomatic expressions, we can say that ready-made equivalents were only offered by the English-Hungarian Dictionary in two cases, and even these were not used by the translators. To find translational equivalents for idiomatic expressions is probably one of the most creative tasks in translation. Translational equivalents created by translators serve as an important source for the enrichment of the TL vocabulary with new idiomatic expressions.

9.7. Total transformation of situative utterances

Total transformation is frequently mandated by the fact that in identical situations following similar conversational patterns speakers of different languages would use different linguistic forms. When meeting, saying good-bye or thanking for a present, we use **routine expressions**, which may not have a single common element with the expression used by another language community. As mentioned earlier, these expressions are called "situative utterances" (Fónagy 1982). Here the source and target languages lack even a single common element, or more accurately, they lack even a single common linguistic element, and the basis for equivalence must lie in the similarity of the situations.

The most commonly used situational equivalents are given in the bilingual dictionaries (Hungarian: *Hogy van?* → English: *How do you do?*; Hungarian: *Tessék!* → English: *Here you are!*; Hungarian: *Egészségére!* → English: *Cheers!*; Hungarian: *Nem számít!* → English: *Never mind!*; Hungarian: *Vegyen még kérem* → English: *Help yourself please!*, etc.). But can a dictionary give guidance on how a husband berates his wife or a boss an employee or a grandmother her grandson? What does a farm girl say when she is chasing pigs around the yard or a boatman when somebody enters the boat, etc.?

Hungarian → English:

Hungarian ST: – Te ilyen ember vagy? Kezdem megbánni, hogy hozzád kötöttem az életemet! (Örkény 1. 188)

English TT: ‘So that is what you’re really like! I’m sorry I ever married you!’ (Sollosy 118)

Hungarian ST: A lány majd elvágódott. Haj-né! sikoltott a fogai között. (Csáth 6)

English TT: ... and the girl slipped. Jesus Christ! she cried through clenched teeth. (Kessler 115)

Hungarian ST: – Tessék beülni – mondta a csónakos. (Örkény 1. 223)

English TT: ‘Climb right in’ the boatman said. (Sollosy 61)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: “Zut! zut!” criait Paul d’une voix courroucée. (Cocteau 140)

Hungarian TT: “A zanyád!” kiáltotta Paul, egyre haragosabb hangon. (Gyergyai 141)

Commentary: French “Zut! zut!” (‘damn’) → Hungarian: *A zanyád* is a distorted form of the Hungarian ‘your mother’ which means also ‘damn’, ‘damned’).

French ST: Que je voie causer avec les va-nu-pieds! (Maupassant 206)

Hungarian TT: Majd adok én, csavargókkal beszélgetni! (Tóth 207)

Commentary: French Que je voie causer (‘let me see you try it’) → Hungarian: *Majd adok én* (‘I’ll give it to you!’).

German → Hungarian:

German ST: “Ich komme da zu dem Club, und wer beschreibt mein Erstaunen: kein Aas da! ...”(Kant 339)

Hungarian TT: – Megérkeztem a klubba, és majd elájulok: sehol egy bűdös lélek ... (Mátrai 332)

Commentary: German: kein Aas da (‘not an ass there’) → Hungarian: *sehol egy bűdös lélek* (‘not a stinking soul was there’).

9.8. Total transformation of measurements

One form of total transformation is a **change in measurement**. Voltaire's famous hero, Candide was sentenced to thirty strokes in the original French text, but in the Hungarian translation the lucky chap got away with twenty five, because twenty five was the usual punishment in Hungary.

French ST: On le fait tourner à droite, à gauche, hausser la baguette, remettre la baguette, coucher en joue, tirer, doubler le pas, et on lui donne *trente* coups de bâton ... (Voltaire 16)

Hungarian TT: ... sőt mindennek a tetejébe *huszonötöt* is kapott a fekére ... (Gyergyai 19)

In one of Graham Greene's stories, a man and a woman sit on a bench. For Hungarian readers it would be very odd to hear how many **feet** separates them from each other (one foot equals 30.48 cm). In the same story, initials carved into a gold ring on the handle of an umbrella can be distinguished even from a "few feet away". In both instances, the translator – correctly – converted the distance into metric units of measurement.

English ST: ... though they were separated by *five feet of green metal*, they could have been a married couple. (Greene 12)

Hungarian TT: ... *másfél méternyi zöld fém* választotta el őket, de lehetek volna akár házaspár is ... (Borbás 115)

English ST: ... the gold band was distinguished, *even from a few feet away* one could see there was a monogram engraved there. (Greene 155)

Hungarian TT: ... előkelő volt az aranykarika, *s egy-két méterről* is látszott, hogy monogramot véstek bele ... (Borbás 118)

The different **units of measurement** in the five languages constantly require that translators use judgment. They have to take into consideration different aspects of the translational situation. One consideration may be whether in a given part of the work an exact determination of temperature, distance or weight was necessary. In the two examples above, the exact determination of the distance obviously was not important, and total transformation was done to avoid an unusual unit of measurement.

Often, however, precision may be essential from the perspective of the text. The average Hungarian reader does not know how many degrees of Celsius a certain degree of Fahrenheit represents or how many centimetres are in an inch. Thus he/she would not know whether a person having a temperature of 112 Fahrenheit had a fever or not and would not know if a room four feet long was large or small. Would a six feet three inch person be tall or short? In the examples below, the high temperature and the small size of the characters is important and therefore the translator – correctly – converted the English units of measurements.

English ST: It's very hard to tell when you have got a temperature of *112 Fahrenheit*. (Townsend 209)

Hungarian TT: Bár **44 foknál** nagyon nehéz ilyesmit megállapítani. (Bé-kés 225)

English ST: He got up with an apologetic air, and stood almost **four feet** tall. (Porter 36)

Hungarian TT: Bocsánatkérő tekintettel felállt, úgy sem volt magasabb **százhúsz centiméternél**. (Róna 39)

English ST: Their height is variable, ranging between **two and four feet** of our measure. (Tolkien 14)

Hungarian TT: Magasságuk változó: a mi mértékegységünk szerint általában **hatvan és százhúsz centiméter** között van. (Göncz 16)

The time **when** the event takes place is also a matter for consideration. In the 17th century, when Jonathan Swift's novel *Gulliver's Travels* takes place, the metric system was not yet used in Hungary, either. This is why Miklós Szentkuthy, the translator of *Gulliver*, kept the foot and inch measures – regardless of how important a function a detailed description of sizes plays in the story.

English ST: It was a frame of wood raised **three inches** from the ground, about **seven feet long** and **four** wide ... (Swift 52)

Hungarian TT: Ennek a fából készült alkotmánynak magassága **három hüvelyk** volt, hossza **hét láb**, és szélessége **négy** ... (Szentkuthy 29)

English ST: ... but that which first surprised me was the length of the grass, which, in those grounds that seemed to be kept for hay was about **twenty feet** high. (Swift 118)

Hungarian TT: ... de az első, ami igazán meglepett az a fű magassága volt. Azokon a réteken, ahol úgy látszik, takarmány céljából növesztették, egy-egy szál meghaladta a **húsz lábat**. (Szentkuthy 134)

The yard (3 feet, 36 inches or 0.914 metres) usually requires no conversion, since it is close in length to a metre. This is illustrated by the first example (**fifty yards** → **ötven méter**), while in the second example the translator shortened the distance and translated yards with steps (**not five yards** → **alig öt lépésnyire**).

English ST: He had got out of the car and walked to the nearest house, a smallish farm building **about fifty yards off the road** ... (Dahl 122)

Hungarian TT: Kiszállt, elment a legközelebbi házig – kis tanya volt, **vagy ötvenméternyire az országtól** ... (Borbás 123)

English ST: While he was waiting for her to fetch it, he happened to glance in through the door to the living-room, and there, **not five yards from where he was standing** he spotted something. (Dahl 122)

Hungarian TT: Míg a vízre várt, pillantása bevetődött a nappali szobába, **s ott alig öt lépésnyire**, olyasmit látott, hogy ... (Borbás 123)

The difference between a mile and a kilometre is sufficiently large to warrant conversion (1 mile = 1,523.99 metres).

Hungarian ST: majdnem *háromszáz kilométert* tettünk meg együtt, néha egy-egy járműre kéredzkedve ... (Örkény 1. 102)

English TT: We stayed together *for nearly two hundred miles*, occasionally catching a ride. (Sollosy 76)

Even though the English *acre* is not the same as the Hungarian *hold* (acre = 0,46 hectare, 0.703 kat. hold, 4040 square metres and 4840 square yards), if the precise dimensions of the area, property or inheritance are not critical, acres and holds may be used interchangeably.

English ST: ... there were *fifteen acres* of garden to explore. (Durrel 106)

Hungarian TT: ... Hozzáfogtunk a *többholdas kert* felkutatásához. (Sárközi 110)

9.9. Total transformation of intralingual references

References to the SL are often made in describing characters. It is almost impossible to render speech characteristics (lispings, foreign accent, regional or social dialect) of SL speakers with the means of the TL. In this case, there are three main standard lexical operations performed by translators: omission, total transformation or compensation. **Omission** takes place when the individual speech properties of a character are irrelevant from the point of view of the message.

German ST: Madame Buddenbrook wandte sich an ihre Schwiegertochter, drückte mit einer Hand ihren Arm, sah ihr kichernd in den Schoß und sagte:

Immer der nämliche, mon vieux, Betsy...? "*Immer*" sprach sie wie "*üimmer*" aus. (Mann 3. 8)

Hungarian TT: Madame Buddenbrook a menyéhez fordult, megszorította a karját, és halk kacajjal mondta:

– Mon vieux csak a régi marad, ugye Betsy? (...) (Lányi 3. 7)

Commentary: In the German text there is a reference to the non-standard pronunciation of a sound in the German word *immer* ('always') characteristic of the speech of one of the minor characters. The translator felt it irrelevant and left out the whole sentence.

Total transformation and **compensation** take place when information given by the individual speech properties of a character is **important**. We shall deal with compensation in the next section.

As for **total transformation**, it is resorted to when the speech characteristics of a character are important and have to be retained "in the spot", that is, it cannot be compensated for in other parts of the text.

As we have already mentioned, Thomas Mann's novel *The Buddenbrooks* is rich in both regional and social dialects. A good example for this is Herr Köppen, the upstart wine-merchant who does not fit in with the traditional merchant families and is scorned by them because of his uneducated style of speaking. His illiteracy manifests itself in incorrect pronunciation of certain words and in excessive repetition of some words. As the figure of Herr Köppen appears only at the beginning of the novel, his speech properties had to be rendered at the same place where they occur.

German ST: "Dann gibt es einen **Konflikt** – !" Herr Köppen stieß zornerbrannt das Queue auf den Boden. Er sagte "**Kongflick**" und stellte jetzt alle Vorsicht in betreff der Aussprache hintan. "**Eine Kongflick**, da versteh' ich mich auf." (Mann 3. 39)

Hungarian TT: Akkor kész a **konviktus!** – Köppen úr haragosan bökte meg dákójával a padlót. "**Konviktust**" mondott **konfliktus** helyett, és most már a kifejezésmódot illetően felhagyott minden elővigyázattal. – **Konviktus** lesz, tessék csak rám bízni. (Lányi 3. 33)

Commentary: **Kongflick** is the distorted version of the German word **Konflikt** (lit.: conflict), which is conveyed by **konviktus** (lit.: boarding-house) in Hungarian translation. The reason for the translator's decision was probably the similar sounding of the two words in Hungarian (**konfliktus** → **konviktus**) which made it a plausible word to be misused by the uneducated Herr Köppen for the Hungarian audience.

An extreme case of intralingual reference is when the reference is made not to the SL text but to the source language itself. The Hungarian idiomatic expression **magyarán mondva** (lit.: said in Hungarian) means that somebody 'speaks frankly, straightforwardly'.

Hungarian ST: – Nem, fiam – válaszoltam határozottan. – Mi most **magyarul fogunk beszélni**. (Örkény 2. 52)

Russian TT: – ... net, sinok, – reshitel'no vozrazil ya. – Na etot raz mi budem **govorit' po chelovecheski**. (Voronkina 1. 287)

Commentary: The Hungarian expression **magyarul fogunk beszélni** (lit.: we will speak in Hungarian) is translated into Russian by **govorit' po chelovecheski** (lit.: we will speak like human beings).

This can be the reason why one of the short stories of István Örkény is generally left out of his translation anthologies. The title of the short story is *Nézzünk bizakodva a jövőbe* (Look in the future confidently) and it informs the reader about the world-wide success of the verb "magyarítani" (lit.: "to Hungarian"). But this already belongs to the topic of inevitable losses in translation, which will be discussed in the next section (LEX 10).

Summary comments on total transformation

Total transformation is a standard transfer operation independent of language pair and of direction of translation. The more a SL text is tied to time, place or culture, the greater the need for total transformation. In literary translation, total transformation is required more frequently than in translating scientific texts.

It is important, however, to make sure that total transformation be accompanied by minimal loss. Total transformation may obscure the very “local colour” that depends on strange-sounding names, dishes, beverages or utensils.

The great success of Wild West novels during the 19th century was probably at least partly due to the fact that the translators did not use total transformation in translating names, addresses or realia and thus the translations provided a tremendous amount of information about a strange culture, unfamiliar to the Hungarian audience. Unfamiliar terminology need not necessarily be disturbing, it may also be **stimulating**. The attraction of old translations of American Wild West novels consists not only in untranslatable realia (*sheriff, coyote, grizzly, prairie, savannah, mustang*) but also in telling us exactly the height of the characters in feet and inches (translators in those days did not convert units of measurement), the distance between sites in yards and the male characters using expressions like: *ördögös fickó, ördög és pokol, menj a pokolba, pokolra való*, etc., which were literal translations of curses, characteristic of the dauntless heroes of the Wild West: *devil of a fellow, hell’s fire and damnation, go to hell, damned*. The translators of those days did not bother with pragmatic adaptation and – rightly – did not transform these into genuine Hungarian curses.

10. Compensation

Compensation is a standard lexical transfer operation whereby those meanings of the SL text which are lost in the process of translation are rendered in the TL text in some **other place** or by some **other means**. **Compensation** is one of the best-described lexical operations. Its first definition was given by Vinay and Darbelnet in 1958. In English translation it goes like this: “The stylistic translation technique by which a nuance that cannot be put in the same place as in the original is put at another point of the phrase, thereby keeping the overall **tone**” (1995: 341). Hervey and Higgins define compensation in the following way: “techniques of making up for the loss of important ST features through replicating ST effects approximately in the TT by means other than those used in the ST” (Hervey and Higgins 1992: 35).

The main difference between our and Vinay and Darbelnet’s approach is that we regard compensation as a **lexical** operation, while they – unlike us – include into it **grammatical** operations as well (cf. compensation for gender differences). The concept of compensation was further developed by Hervey and Higgins (Hervey 1992: 248), and it has been given an independent entry in the *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Harvey 1998: 37).

A classical case of compensation involves the rendering of individual, vernacular or class speech patterns with means available in the target language, e.g., regional expressions, slang words or distorted grammar (**local compensation**). It is also a form of compensation if the translator takes advantage of the opportunities offered by the target language and uses striking and idiomatic expressions thus compensating the reader for having had to use less than ideal solutions in other areas (**global compensation**).

Subtypes:

- 10.1. Types of losses
 - 10.1.1. Serial (multiple) losses
 - 10.1.2. Losses in the translation of metalinguistic information
- 10.2. Local compensation
- 10.3. Global compensation

10.1. Types of losses

10.1.1. Serial (multiple) losses

Losses are inevitable in translation. When translators omit honorific addresses (*méltóztassék*, (lit.: be pleased to deign to) *alázatosan kérem* (lit.: I humbly request), *esedezem* (lit.: I beseech) in translating 19th century Hungarian clas-

sics, they act correctly, since these terms do not have natural and obvious equivalents in IE languages, but by doing so they lose one means of indicating social differences between the characters in the original. This must somehow be compensated for.

We speak about losses when elements of SL meaning cannot be conveyed in the TL. Possible losses have already been discussed in this book in the sections on lexical generalisation and lexical omission (LEX 2, LEX 5). They will be dealt with in more detail in this section, since the compensation as a lexical operation aims exactly at the elimination of losses in translation.

Loss (entropy) (1995) or **perte (entropie)** (1958) are discussed in Vinay and Darbelnet's book slightly differently. They define it as:

“The relation between the **source language** and the **target language** which indicates the absence of **message** constituents in the **target language**; there is loss (or entropy) when a part of the **message** cannot be conveyed because of a lack of structural, stylistic or metalinguistic means in the target language” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 345).

As we can see, they speak about “the lack of structural, stylistic or metalinguistic means in the target language” while we concentrate first of all on the meaning of lexical elements, which have no equivalents in the TL.

Most translations are characterised by a **series of losses** and not by just one or two. A good example for an inevitable serial loss is the translation of Kálmán Mikszáth's novel, *Beszterce ostroma* into different IE languages (The Siege of Beszterce, Der Graf und die Zirkusreiterin, Osada Bestertse). The playfully proverbial, lovingly teasing Mikszáth style has linguistic characteristics which are either untranslatable or become ineffective when translated.

Like Mikszáth's other novels, *Beszterce ostroma* (The Siege of Beszterce) is full of lexical devices which create the unmistakable atmosphere of Felvidék (lit.: Highland) which was the name of the northern part of Hungary before 1921 (today this territory belongs to Slovakia).

These lexical devices include:

- (1) geographic names pertaining to the Felvidék ('Highland'): *gömöri akcentus* ('gömör accent'), *besztercei szilva* ('Beszterce plums'), *lapusnyai szelíd-gesztenyeerdő* ('chestnut forest of Lapuchna'), *gbelai molnár* ('gbela miller'), etc.
- (2) Hungarian historical realia: *Árpád vezér* ('chieftain Árpád'), *Mátyás korabeli fekete sereg* ('King Mathias' Black Brigade'), *török spáhi* ('turkish spahi'), *Rákóczi-féle brigadéros* ('Rákóczi's brigadiers'), etc.
- (3) characteristic officials from the Hungarian county system: *főispán* ('prefect'), *alispán* ('sub-prefect'), *vice-jegyző* ('assistant town clerk'), *pan-dúr* ('pandour'), *csembiztos* ('gendarm'), etc.
- (4) characteristic forms of 19th century Hungarian addresses: *kend* ('you'), *vitéz bátyámuram* ('valiant sir'), *instállom* ('saving your presence'), *alázatos szolgálja* ('your humble servant'), *amice* ('my friend'), *domine* ('my lord'), etc.
- (5) latinisms used by the above officials: *skandalum* ('scandal') *direktor* ('manager'), *jus gladii* ('power of life and death'), *punktum* ('I have told you'),

apelláta ('appeal'), *spektákulum* ('spectacle'), *elokvencia* ('eloquence'), *violenzia* ('violence'), *konfidens* ('confidential'), *elementum* ('element'), etc.

- (6) archaic and regional names of dresses, dishes, beverages and furnishings of the Felvidék: *kócsagos kalpag* ('kalpak with an egret's plum') *atilla* ('hussar jacket'), *veres dolmány* ('scarlet dolman'), *csibuk* ('chibouk'), *susztertallér* ('silver coin'), *bugyelláris* ('wallet'), *ibrik* ('mug'), *rokolya* ('skirt'), *kulacs* ('flask'), etc.
- (7) foreign language insertions in the Hungarian text: mixture of Hungarian, German, Polish and Slovakian, spoken by the characters: *vojna* ('war'), *cserveni* ('scarlet'), *pod szmrty* ('come on death'), etc.

And we have not even mentioned yet the pleasantly witty use of the diminutive of *tót*, *tótockska* ('Slovak', 'little Slovak'), etc.

These characteristic features are almost inevitably lost or become ineffective in English, German and Russian translations. Geographical names and historical realia, as well as the characteristic officials of the Hungarian county system mean nothing to a foreign audience. The traditional address forms and courtesy forms are omitted from translation. The archaic, obsolete names of food, clothes and furnishings which generate the atmosphere of the 19th century *rokolya* ('skirt'), *bugyelláris* ('purse'), *csibuk* ('pipe'), *ibrik* ('mug') are rendered with neutralising translations.

Hungarian → English, German and Russian:

Hungarian ST: Ebéd után *csibukra* gyújtott a várúr ... (Mikszáth 15)

English TT: After lunch the count lit up his *pipe* ... (Sturgess 17)

German TT: Nach dem Essen steckte sich der Burgherr seine *Pfeife* ... (Schüching-Engl 280)

Russian TT: Posle obeda hoz'yain zakurival *trubku*, ... (Leybutin 18)

Commentary: The connotative meaning of the Hungarian word *csibuk* ('chibouk', 'chibouque', 'Turkish pipe'), was neutralised in all the three translations (*pipe*, *Pfeife*, *trubka*):

Hungarian ST: S kevélyen ütött mellének azon helyére, ahol a *bugyellárisát* tartotta, ... (Mikszáth 65)

English TT: And he arrogantly patted his chest on the side where he kept his *wallet*, ... (Sturgess 82)

German TT: Und er schlug sich hochmütig auf die Stelle der Brust, wo er in der inneren Westentasche *die Börse* trug. (Schüching-Engl 349)

Russian TT: I gordo stuknul seb'ya kulakom v grud' s toy storoni, gde u nevo vo vnutrennem karmane zhiletki hranilsya *bumazhnik*. (Leybutin 78)

Commentary: The connotative meaning of the Hungarian word *bugyelláris* ('purse') was neutralised by all three translations (*wallet*, *Börse*, *bumazhnik*).

The speech of the characters in Mikszáth's novels is a strange mixture of Hungarian, German, Polish and Slovak. The Slovak words and expressions *vojna*,

(‘war’), *cserveni* (‘black’), *szmrty* (‘death’) are generally retained and explained in the English translation, but simply translated into German and Russian. As for the Russian translation, there are two interesting aspects which may influence the translator’s decision: (1) preserving the foreign language words requires insertion of Roman letters into the Cyrillic text, and (2) being cognate languages, Slovak words are very similar to Russian ones: Slovak: *vojna* → Russian: *voyna*; Slovak: *szmrty* → Russian: *smert*, which means that they do not contribute much to the representation of the local colour.

Hungarian → English, German and Russian:

Hungarian ST: A „*Rákóczi vojna*” óta nem volt még ilyen felfordulás erre felé. (Mikszáth 29)

English TT: Since the “*Rákóczi vojna*” – *Rákóczi’s wars* – there had not been such an upheaval in these parts. (Sturges 34)

German TT: Seit *Rákóczis Krieg* hatte es hier kein solches Durcheinander gegeben. (Schüchling–Engl 299)

Russian TT: So vremeni *voyn Rakotsi* eti kraya ne vidali takovo stolpotvoreniya. (Leybutin 25)

Commentary: The Slovak words in the Hungarian text *Rákóczi vojna* are retained and explained in the English translation, but are dropped in the German and Russian translations.

Hungarian ST: Délelőtt kisebb hadgyakorlatot tartott cselédjeivel és az újoncokkal, akiket lépegetni tanított. – *Szeno – szlama, szeno – szlama!* (Mikszáth 14)

English TT: In the mornings he held field exercises with his estate workers and with the new recruits, whom he taught to march. *Seno – slama, seno – slama (Hay foot – straw foot, hay foot – straw foot)!* (Sturges 16)

German TT: Vormittags hielt er mit seinem Gesinde und seinen Rekruten kleine Truppenübungen ab, lehrte sie marschieren: *Heu – Stroh! Heu – Stroh!* (Schüchling–Engl 279)

Russian TT: Do poludnya Pongrats provodil “maloe uchenie” c dvorovoy prislugoy i novobrantsami, mustroval ih, zastavlyaya hodit’ v nogu po komande “*seno – soloma, seno – soloma*” (Leybutin 17)

Commentary: The Slovak words in the Hungarian text *Szeno – szlama*, are retained and explained in the English translation, but are dropped in the German and Russian translations.

Kálmán Mikszáth’s loving attitude to the Slovak inhabitants of the region is reflected in his use of diminutives of their Hungarian ethnic name *tót – tótcoska*. This attitude is also lost in IE translations. In the English translation, *tótcoska* became *little Slovak*, in the German translation became simply *Slowaken* or *guten Slowaken*, and in the Russian: *slovaki*, and *malenkie slovaki*.

The preference for diminutive suffixes, characteristic of the regional Hunga-

rian dialect spoken by the Slovak population is reflected in the word *istenke* ('little god'); this nuance is also lost in the English and German translations, where *istenke* became: *good Lord*, *liebe Gott*. The Russian translator was able to preserve the diminutive form of God: *bozhenka* (from the Russian word *bog* 'God'), and he was also able to insert an additional diminutive, *kartohska*, from Russian *kartofel* ('potato').

Hungarian → English, German and Russian:

Hungarian ST: A gondviselő a *tótokkal* a krumpli útján beszél. Ha sok krumpli van az annyt jelent: "szeretek *tótocskák*, szaporodjatok!" Ha nincs krumplitermés, akkor az *istenke* haragszik: "Minek vagytok ti a világon, *tótocskák*?" (Mikszáth 21)

English TT: Providence speaks to the *Slovaks* only through the potato crop. If this is abundant, it means: "I love you, *little Slovaks*. Go forth and multiply." If the crop fails, the *good Lord* is angry. "What are you doing here on earth *little Slovaks*?" (Sturgess 25)

German TT: Die Vorsehung spricht nur durch die Kartoffel zu den *Slowaken*. Gibt es viele Kartoffeln, so bedeutet das: Ich liebe euch, meine guten *Slowaken*, mehret euch! Ist die Kartoffelernte schlecht, dann zürnt der *liebe Gott*: Wozu seid ihr auf der Welt, ihr *Slowaken*? (Schüching-Engl 289)

Russian TT: Providenie obyaznyaetsya so *slovakami* tol'ko cherez posredstvo kartoshki. Bogat urozhay kartofelya – znachit bog blagovolit k nim i kak bi govorit: "Ya lyublyu vas *milen'kie slovaki*, plodites' sebe na zdorov'e." Ne urodilas' kartoska – znachit *bozhenka* gnevaetsya: i zachem, mol, vi tol'ko sushchestvujete na belom svete *slovaki*. (Leybutin 27)

Contemporary Hungarian language has a large number of Latin loanwords in the field of science, culture and administration. As in the previous centuries of Hungarian history Latin had a dominant role in Hungarian state, economic and cultural life, in the novels of the 19th century Hungarian writers (Kálmán Mikszáth, Mór Jókai) there are many Latinisms, which can be unfamiliar even for contemporary Hungarian readers (Balázs 1997). Latinisms in the above-mentioned novel of Kálmán Mikszáth *The Siege of Beszterce* are connected with the language of county administration, student life, medical science, law, etc. In translation from Hungarian into IE, Latinisms are generally omitted, which is one of the characteristic losses in translating from Hungarian into IE: In all the three translations of *Beszterce ostroma* Latinisms are omitted or neutralised (translated by neutral TL words).

Hungarian → English, German and Russian:

Hungarian ST: A *vitalicumot* félévenként kapták ... (Mikszáth 20).

English TT: This *income* was paid every six months ... (Sturgess 23)

German TT: Die Rente bekamen sie halbjährlich, ... (Schüching–Engl 286)
Russian TT: Dengi vplachivalis’ baronam dvazhdi v god. (Leybutin 24)
Commentary: The Latin word *vitalicum* (‘life annuity’) was neutralised in all the three translations (*income, Rente, dengi*).

Hungarian ST: – Hát mi szüksége van az úrnak a lábára? Az csak a parasztnál *numerus*, te ostoba. (Mikszáth 11)

English ST: “What does a gentleman need legs for? Legs are for peasants, you fool ... (Sturgess 12)

German TT: “Was braucht ein Herr seine Beine? Die *zählen* nur beim Bauern, du Dummkopf. ...” (Schüching–Engl 275)

Russian TT: ... – Na sto barinu noga? Noga tol’ko muzhiku *potrebna*, durenny. (Leybutin 12)

Commentary: The Latin word *numerus* (‘counts’) was omitted by the English and neutralised by the German and Russian translators (*zählen* (‘counts’) *potrebna* (‘necessary’)).

Hungarian ST: A Te Deum után *magnum* áldomás következett ... (Mikszáth 13)

English TT: After Te Deum came the *traditional* thanksgiving ... (Sturgess 14)

German TT: Auf das Tedeum folgte ein *großes* Gelage: (Schüching–Engl 277)

Russian TT: Za molebnom sledovalo *velikoye* prazdnestvo. (Leybutin 14)

Commentary: The Latin word *magnum* (‘great’) was totally transformed by the English translator (*traditional*) and neutralised by the German and Russian translators: *grosses* (‘big’), *velikoe* (‘big’).

A good example for **serial losses** can be found in the Russian translation of Mikszáth’s novel, where three of the above-mentioned losses occur in the translation of one single sentence: the ethnic name *tót* has a neutralising translation and appears as *slovak*, the Latinism *disputál* has also been neutralised and has become *sporít’* (‘discuss’), and finally the foreign language (Slovak) insertion *pod szmrty’* has simply been translated into Russian *idi smert’* (‘come death’). The foreign language insertion is preserved in the English translation with an additional explanatory translation.

Hungarian ST: S azonfelül is jó, szelíd nép a *tót*, ha jön a halál, nem kötekedik az vele, *nem disputál*, ... hanem megadja magát: “*pod szmrty’*!” (gyere, halál!) és behunyja a szemeit az örökkévaló álomra. (Mikszáth 54)

English TT: Besides, the *Slovaks* are nice peaceful folk, and when death comes they *don’t pick a quarrel* with him ... They give themselves up, saying “*pod szmrty’!*” (*come on death!*) and close their eyes forever. (Sturgess 68).

Russian TT: I krome tovo *slovaki* narod dobrodusniy, smirniy, esli uzh prishla smert’, *ne sporyat s ney* ... i skazav “*Idi, smert’*” naveki zakriyayut glaza. (Leybutin 65)

Commentary:(1) the specific nationality name *tót* is neutralised both in English *Slovaks*, and in Russian: *slovak*. (2) The Latinism *disputál* ('to dispute', 'to argue') is also neutralised both in the English *to pick up a quarrel* and in Russian *sporít* ('to discuss'). (3) The foreign language insertion *pod szmrty* is preserved in English with explanatory translation and neutralised in Russian: *Idi, smert*.('come on death').

10.1.2. Losses in the translation of metalinguistic information

The number of inevitable losses is increased by the translation of **metalinguistic references**. They can be:

- (1) references to the SL;
- (2) references to the TL;
- (3) references to a third language or languages.

References to the SL may be rendered, if necessary, with the help of total transformation, as it was illustrated in the previous chapter (LEX 9). References to a foreign language – foreign language insertions in the SL text – may not cause problems if the foreign language is not identical with the TL. French insertions in a German text will remain **unchanged** in the Hungarian translation:

German ST: "Excusez, mon cher! ... Mais c'est une folie! Du weißt, dass solche Verdunkelung der Kinderköpfe mir verdrüsslich ist! ..." (Mann 3. 10)

Hungarian TT: Excusez, mon cher! ... Mais c'est une folie! Tudod jól, hogy dühbe hoz, mikor a gyermek eszt így butítják. ... (Lányi 3. 8)

Commentary: The French insertion into the German text "*Excusez, mon cher! ... Mais c'est une folie!* (lit: Sorry my dear ... but this is nonsense) remained unchanged in the Hungarian translation.

If the language of insertions happens to coincide with the TL, losses are inevitable (e.g., Napoleon's French words in Tolstoy's *War and Peace* are inevitably lost in the French translation of that work).

In the closing scene of Kálmán Mikszáth's novel *Beszterce ostroma* (The Siege of Besterce) the dead body of count Pongrácz is surrounded by dilettantish, provincial actors. One of them makes an extempore speech over the dead body and for the sake of solemnity he inserts the following English words in his funeral speech: *Mylordok, ladyk*, (lit.: My lords, ladies). Using English addresses in the Hungarian text arouses the effect of false dignity and nobility, and emphasises the tragicomic character of the scene. This effect in English translation is seriously jeopardised.

Hungarian ST: Csak Lengeffy nézte Nedec mozdulatlan urát közömbösen, ily szavakat ejtvén:

– Oh, mily rettentő a halál keze.

Mylordok, ladyk, im okuljatok,

E por tegnap még parancsolt ...

Mylordok és ladyk nem lévén jelen, hogy okulhattak volna, csak Estella tette a következő észrevételt:

– Jó, jó, de mi lesz mármost énvelem? (Mikszáth 180)

German TT: Nur Lengeffy blickte gleichgültig auf den toten Herrn von Nedecz und sprach dabei die Worte:

“O wie entsetzlich ist die Hand des Todes !

Seht, *Ladys and Mylords*, und zieht die Lehre:

Dies Staubgefäß gab gestern noch Befehle ...”

Da aber keine *Ladys and Mylords* anwesend waren, die die Lehre hätten ziehen können, tat Estella den Ausspruch: “Ja, ja, aber was soll nun aus mir werden?” (Schüching–Engl 505)

Commentary: Inserted English words remain foreign language insertions in the German translation and can fulfil the same function as in the original.

English TT: Only Lengeffy gazed with indifference at the motionless body of the Lord of Nedec. He quoted the following lines:

“Oh, how fearful is the hand of death,

My lords, ladies learn from this,

This dust which yesterday commanded ...”

But there being no *lords or ladies* present to draw the moral from these sad events, it was left to Estella to make the next observation.

“Yes, yes I know. But now what happens to me?” (Sturgess 233)

Commentary: Inserted English words are **automatically neutralised** in the English translation, losing their original function.

The tragicomic effect is also lost in the German translation of the following one-minute story by István Örkény. The title of the story is *In memoriam dr. K.H.G.* It is about the shameful death in WW II of a highly cultured Hungarian scholar, who speaks perfect German, and is well versed in German literature.

Hungarian ST: – *Hölderlin ist Ihnen unbekannt?* – kérdezte dr. K.H.G., miközben a lódögnek a gödröt ásta. (Örkény 1. 39)

English TT: “*Hölderlin ist Ihnen unbekannt?*” Dr. K.H.G. asked as he dug the pit for the horse’ carcass. (Sollosy 27)

Commentary: Inserted German words remain foreign language insertions in the English translation, and can fulfil the same function as in the original.

German TT: “*Hölderlin ist Ihnen unbekannt?*” fragte Dr. K.H.G. während er die Grube für den Pferdekadaver aushob.” (Thies 1. 25)

Commentary: Inserted German words are **automatically neutralised** in the German translation, losing their original function.

French TT: *Vous n’avez jamais entendu parler de Hölderlin?* demanda le professeur K.H.G. tandis qu’il enterrait le cadavre d’un cheval. (Tardos 3. 69)

Commentary: Inserted German words are translated in the French translation.

Foreign language insertions serve as an important source of humour in the novel *Tizennégykarátos autó* (The 14-carat Roadstar) by the Hungarian writer Jenő Rejtő. The main figure of the novel is Ivan Gorcheff, a lovable scoundrel who often mixes his speech with meaningless Russian swift talk. The rendering of the pseudo-Russian address forms (*tanárovics bátyuska*, *bátyuska professorovszka*) in the speech of a pseudo-Russian emigrant is an interesting task for the English translator (cf. *Professorovitch Uncleushka*, *Uncleushka Professorovska*), but almost a hopeless task for the Russian translator of the novel (cf. *batyushka moy professorovich*, *professor moy batyushka*).

Hungarian ST:

- Szóval ön emigráns?
- Bizony, *tanárovics bátyuska* – felelte sóhajtva. – (...) Hej, Volga, ha én még egyszer ott lehetnék.
- De hiszen ön nem emlékezhet Oroszországra, ha huszonegy éves.
- Annál kínosabb, *bátyuska professorovszka*, mert én egyszer sem láttam ezt a csodálatos havas földet, amely oly felejthetetlenül él emlékezetemben ... (Rejtő 8–9)

English TT:

- ‘So, you are an emigrant.’
- ‘Definitely *Professorovitch Uncleushka*,’ Gorchev answered with a sigh. (...) ‘Oh, Volga, if only I could be there once again ...’
- ‘But listen, you can’t remember Russia if you are only twenty-one!’
- ‘That makes it all the more difficult, *Uncleushka Professorovska!* Just imagine! I have never once seen that magnificent snowy land which so unforgettably live in my memory ...’ (Bozsó 6).

Commentary: Inserted Russian words remain foreign language insertions in the English translation and can fulfil the same function as in the original.

Russian TT:

- Vihodit, vi emigrant?
- B tochnosti tak, *batyushka moy professorovich!* – so vzdohom otvetstvoval molodoy chelovek. (...) Ah ti, Volga, hotya bi odnim glazkom razochek vzglyanut’ na tebya! ...
- Pozvol’te, no otkuda zhe vam pomnit’ Rossiyu, pri vasih-to yunih godah?
- Ottovo i toska neizbivnaya, *professor moy batyushka*, sto otrodyas’ ne vidal teh skazochnih zasnezhennih prostorov, kakie zhivut v moyey gennoy pamyati ... (Voronkina 7).

Commentary: Inserted Russian words were only partly **neutralised** in the Russian translation, because with the help of some unusual forms the translator managed to preserve the foreign flavour suggested by the pseudo-Russian address forms.

10.2. Local compensation

The above-mentioned inevitable losses in certain places in literary texts make it necessary to compensate the TL readers. We make a distinction between **local** and **global** compensation. Local compensation is a subtype of compensation which involves the rendering of individual, vernacular or class speech patterns by the means available in the target language.

A classical example of **local** compensation is the case when the translator has to render the individual speech habits of a character. If somebody speaks with a German accent, this will be treated differently in a French novel from a Hungarian one. The fact that somebody speaks a Prussian dialect, that is, has difficulties with the pronunciation of the sound “r” can be illustrated only by TL words containing the sound “r”.

German ST: „Es ist alles bereit“, sagte Mamsell Jungmann und schnurrte das r in der Kehle, denn sie hatte es ursprünglich überhaupt nicht aussprechen können. (Mann 3. 11)

Hungarian TT: – Minden rendben van – szólt Jungmann kisasszony, az “r”-et görgetve a torkában, mert eredetileg egyáltalán nem tudta kiejteni. (Lányi 3. 10)

*Commentary: The German expression „Es ist alles bereit“ (lit.: Everything is ready) is translated into Hungarian like *Minden rendben van* (lit.: It is all right) because the Hungarian literal translation *Minden készen van* (lit.: Everything is ready) does not contain the sound “r”.*

If the characters speak a **regional dialect**, it makes no difference **where in** the original work they use dialectal forms. The translator can indicate a dialect only in words which have a regional dialectal variant.

When the Hungarian translator of Mikhail Solohov’s novel *Silent Don* decided to replace the Don Cossack dialect of Russian with the a Hajdúság (county in Eastern Hungary) dialect of Hungarian, he prepared three different translations of some short passages: one fully dialectal, another in the standard literary language, and a third one in which he used the dialect with moderation to create only a general impression and illusion of reality. In the latter he completely omitted the best-known characteristics of the Hajdúság dialect, which would have moved the action from the banks of the Don to the banks of the Tisza. He omitted vernacular words which would have been understood by only a small number of readers, and vernacular word endings which could have caused misunderstanding. He finally decided in favour of the last one of the three options. He used Hajdúság words only sparingly, to create a general impression and an illusion, and did not use a vernacular word in every case when such a word appeared in the Solohov original (Makai 1981: 575–576).

The situation is the same when rendering **social dialects**. Translators can practically never render uneducated language or fancy language with words of the same stylistic value as those used by the author of the original work.

English ST: “Well, **she – don’t have to worry** about that,” said Kramer. In a room with three people who said **She don’t**, he couldn’t get a **doesn’t** out of his mouth. (Wolfe 199)

Hungarian TT: – Nos... nem kell aggódnia, **eztet** elintézzük – mondta Kramer. Egy szobában, ahol hárman is **eztet** mondanak **ezt** helyett, úgy érezte engednie illik. (Fencsik 157)

Commentary: In the English ST uneducated speech is represented by the incorrect use of the English auxiliary verb *do*. As there are no auxiliary verbs in Hungarian, the translator decided to render uneducated usage with the accusative of the Hungarian demonstrative pronoun *ezt*, which has a lower prestige variant *eztet*.

Regional and social dialects frequently appear together in certain characters. The language of the gamekeeper in D.H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is a good example. It is impossible to avoid the rendering of dialectal forms in his speech, since there are times when the gamekeeper speaks correct English and times when he does not. These times have a significant dramatic meaning in the novel, and are also reflected by the comments of the author.

When Mellors, the gamekeeper first speaks to Lady Chatterley, he uses a vernacular which draws a comment from the author.

English ST: “**Nay, yo’ mun ax ‘er**,” he replied callously, in broad vernacular. (Lawrence 65)

Hungarian TT: – **’tet tesszen kérdeni** – mondta nyersen tájszólásban. (Falvay 65)

Further down, the man chooses the vernacular or uses correct English depending on how much he wishes to show his independence vis à vis Connie. When he fights her, he uses the vernacular. The author of the original work accomplishes this by dropping certain vowels, while the translator uses a different technique. He makes the gamekeeper use vernacular words (*katróc*) and folksy expletives (*oszt*).

English ST: “**Ah’m gettin’ th’ coops ready for th’ young bods**”, he said in broad vernacular. (Lawrence 99)

Hungarian TT: – **Katrócot eszkábálok** a fácáncsibéknek – mondta erős tájszólással. (Falvay 126)

It is generally true that when dialect must be suggested in translation translators rarely attempt to use a TL dialect consistently. They usually just hint at it occasionally. Thus not only the method varies, but also the frequency of dialectal hints. In the English translation of Géza Gárdonyi’s *Egri csillagok* (Eclipse of the Crescent Moon), the low-class vernacular of the Gypsy, Sárközi, is reflected by the translator not only in other places but also less frequently. In the German translation the frequency even increases, because all the *-ch* and *-s* are pronounced by *-sch* in Sárközy’s German speech: *ich* → *isch*, *nicht* → *nischt*, *sollen* → *schollen*, *sein* → *schein*, etc.

Hungarian TT: – Hát *beseğödök* hadnagy uram, ingyen is *beseğöd-nék*, de ha egy pár sarkantyús sárga csizmát is tetszik adni, *bizsöny megkesenem*. Nem baj ha *likas* a talpa, hadnagy uram, csak sarkantyús legyen. (Gárdonyi 20)

English TT: “Well then I’ll enlist, sir. I’d do it for nothing; if you’d throw in a *pair o’ yellow* boots and spurs as well, I’d be grateful. *It don’t matter* if there are ‘oles in them, sir, so long as they’ve got spurs.” (Cushing 298)

German TT: “*Alscho, isch verding misch*, Herr Leutnant, *verding misch* auch *umschonscht*. Aber wenn *isch* auch noch ein Paar gelbe Schtiefel mit Schporen bekomm, schlag *isch rescht* schönen Dank. Tut *nischt*, wenn *Schohle* durch *ischt*, nur Schporen *schollen dran schein*, Herr Leutnant.” (Schüching 279)

It is even more difficult to translate a text where the characters speak with different dialects or have various degrees of foreign accent. In the play *Kitchen* by Arnold Wesker, the cooks, bakers and waiters of the Tivoli Restaurant in London all speak a different sort of broken English, depending upon whether they come from Germany, Italy or Cyprus, and how recently they came. The translator can easily render the German accent because there is a **received German accent** in Hungarian which mainly consists of devoicing and de-palatalisation of consonants pl. *Hogy vagy* (‘How are you’) pronounced as *Hoty faty*, but, of course, not the same consonants are devoiced and de-palatalised as in the English original.

In Mark Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* we frequently encounter both regional and societal dialects. The Southern dialect, generally used by the characters is completely ignored by the translator and it is only in the words of Jim that an attempt is made to indicate that he belongs to a lower social class.

English ST: “Well, ‘*twarn’t no use to ‘sturb* you, Huck, till we could do *sumfn* – but we’s all right now. I *ben a-buyin’* pots and pans *en wittles*, as I got a *chanst*, *en apatchin’ up de raf* nights when.” (Twain 99)

Hungarian TT: – Hát nem *vót, mér* zavarjalak, Huck, amíg valamit ki nem *tanálunk*. De most már minden rendbe *gyütt*. Vásároltam már fazekakat meg tepsit meg ennivalót, és *föszereltem* a tutajt is. (Koroknay-Karinthy 122)

Commentary: We can find two methods in the TL to indicate lower class speech: (1) dropping of certain sounds: volt (‘was’) → *vó(l)t*, miért (‘why’) → *m(i)ér(t)*, fölszereltem (‘equipped’) → *fő(l)szeltem*, and changing certain sounds: jött (‘came’) → *gyütt*, talál (‘find’) → *tanál*.

10.3. Global compensation

Global compensation is a subtype of compensation whereby translators do not compensate for a specific item, but they compensate for compromises imposed upon them by the fact of translation itself as an indirect, mediated type of communication.

The above-indicated losses (and omission and total transformation mentioned in the previous chapters) are only a minute portion of the losses which are inevitable during translation, when the translator is forced to put up with less idiomatic TL solutions.

Yet, there are also cases, when the TL permits the use of a more striking and more idiomatic construction. We may call this phenomenon **enrichment**, although the term may be misleading, since we are not trying to improve the original text, but are dealing with a special case of compensation where translators compensate for the compromises imposed upon them.

Our concept of **enrichment** is not identical with the concept of **gain** as defined by Vinay and Darbelnet, because they define gain as follows: “a phenomenon which occurs when there is explicitation” (1995: 343), or: “we speak of gain when translation expresses a situational element which is unexpressed in the source language” (1995: 170). On the basis of their example, English: *Walk in* and French: *Entrez sans frapper*, their concept of gains is close to our concept of specification.

Enrichment or gains in our understanding means that translators, where possible, utilise and set in move the whole inventory of the target language, and they dare to use more idiomatic solutions when the TL offers them.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: She was a *harsh* girl. (Greene 140)

Hungarian TT: Cynthiát *kemény fából faragták*. (Ungvári 197)

Commentary: The meaning of the Hungarian translational equivalent *kemény fából faragták* = ‘she is a woman of strong character’ (lit: she is made of hard wood).

English ST: *Absolutely no deception*. (Christie 140)

Hungarian TT: *Nem csalás, nem ámtítás*. (Sziogyártó 141)

Commentary: The meaning of the Hungarian translational equivalent *Nem csalás, nem ámtítás* = ‘everything is open and above board’, ‘there is no hocus-pocus about it’ (lit.: no cheating, no deception).

English ST: *There was no point in* calling on the prosperous. (Dahl 118)

Hungarian TT: Jómódúaknál kopogtatni *kész időfecsérlés*. (Borbás 119)

Commentary: The meaning of the Hungarian translational equivalent *kész időfecsérlés* = ‘loss of time’, ‘waste of time’ (lit.: sheer waste of time).

English ST: Then he stood there for five, ten, fifteen seconds at least, *staring like an idiot* ... (Dahl 144)

Hungarian TT: Azután csak ott állt, állt öt, tíz, tizenöt másodpercig, ha nem tovább, és *bámult mint a borjú az újkapura* ... (Borbás 145)

Commentary: The meaning of the Hungarian translational equivalent *bámult mint a borjú az újkapura* = ‘look dounbfounded’, ‘be flabbergasted’, ‘look like a stuck pig’ (lit.: gaze like a calf on a new gate).

In such a situation, translators do not compensate for a specific item, but compensate for the fact that the text of the translation is a **secondary** text produced at the price of numerous compromises and contains many less-than-perfect renditions. Such less-than-perfect renditions are due not only to the reasons given above (cf. differences between languages) but are also inevitable because authors of original texts use a different strategy to move from an idea to a linguistic form. Translators are always aware of how many compromises they have to make, and how often they must be satisfied with a substantially less idiomatic rendering than the original. It is for this reason that whenever the text permits translators to take advantage of the resources of the TL, they will certainly do so.

If they did not do so, if they never probed into their target language resources than absolutely necessary, required by the translation, Hungarian translations would never contain expressions like *száz szónak is egy a vége* ('to cut the long story short'), *aki sokat markol, keveset fog* ('grasp all, lose all'), *kerülgeti mint macska a forró kását* ('he is beating about the bush') and the Hungarian used in translations would be poorer than the Hungarian used in original works. This latter form of compensation may be termed **general or global compensation**, as compared to **local or limited compensation**, which may render linguistic peculiarities.

Global compensation is an attempt to maintain a delicate balance between gains and losses manifested in the whole text. This strange "**add and subtract**" game is part of the ongoing weighing and choosing process which makes translating a creative activity.

The attempt to keep the balance between gains and losses can be illustrated by the Hungarian translation of Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye* (Ortutay 1993). The task of the translator was to render the speech characteristics of Holden Caulfield, a teenage American boy without making him seem arrogant to the Hungarian audience. She had to limit the use of slang words (*goddam, damned, damn*) but somehow compensate for them with words and expressions used by Hungarian young men of the same age. The English slang words (*goddam, damned, damn*) can be translated into Hungarian, but their dictionary equivalents (*istenverte, átkozott*) are not typical among Hungarian teenagers. So the translator tried to compensate for the omission of certain slang words by using some more specific Hungarian verbs and idiomatic expressions, trying to create the same effect as in the original.

Gain:

English ST: The week before that, somebody's *stolen* my camel's hair coat ... (Salinger 8)

Hungarian TT: Az előző héten valaki *megléptette* a teveszőr kabátomat ... (Gyepes 7)

Commentary: The neutral English verb *to steal* is replaced by the slang Hungarian verb *megléptet* 'swipe' sg, 'walk' sg, 'whip' sg. (lit.: make sg walk).

Loss:

English ST: I was the *goddam* manager of the fencing team. (Salinger 7)

Hungarian TT: Én voltam az ügyintézőjük. (Gyepes 7)

Commentary: The English slang expression *goddam* is omitted from the Hungarian translation.

Gain:

English ST: It was icy as hell and I damn near *fell down*. (Salinger 9)

Hungarian TT: Tiszta jég volt az úttest, majdnem *eltaknyoltam*. (Gyepes 8)

Commentary: The neutral English verb *to fall down* is replaced by the Hungarian slang verb *eltaknyol* ‘fall arse over tip’, ‘fall head over heels’ (lit.: prefix+snot+verbal suffix)

Loss:

English ST: ... It cost him *damn* near four thousand bucks. (Salinger 5)

Hungarian TT: Majdnem négyezerbe van neki. (Gyepes 5)

Commentary: The English slang expression *damn* is omitted from the Hungarian translation.

Gain:

English ST: ... and you felt like you were disappearing every time you crossed a road. (Salinger 9)

Hungarian TT: ... és ahányszor átmentem a másik oldalra, mindig úgy éreztem, hogy eltűnök, mint a *szürke szamár*. (Gyepes 8)

Commentary: The neutral English verb *disappear* is replaced by an idiomatic expression in Hungarian: *eltűnik, mint a szürke szamár* ‘disappear against the sunset’, ‘do a disappearing act’, ‘do the vanishing act’ (lit.: he disappears as a grey donkey). The full Hungarian expression *eltűnik, mint a szürke szamár a ködben* (lit: disappears as a grey donkey in the fog).

Loss:

English ST: I am not going to tell you my whole *goddam* autobiography. (Salinger 5)

Hungarian TT: ... Ebből úgysem lesz itten életírás, vagy mit tudom én ... (Gyepes 5)

Commentary: The English slang expression *goddam* is omitted from the Hungarian translation.

By applying global compensation strategies translators compensate for the secondary nature of the TL text, which was conceived originally in another language and if they do not take special care, the language of translation will be poorer than that of authentic TL texts.

Summary comments on compensation

Compensation, i.e. making up for inevitable losses suffered in translation is a transfer operation independent of language pair or direction of translation. It is a **translation specific** operation, since it stems from the very nature of translation: a change in code will inevitably lead to losses. These losses must be remedied by other means.

While **local** compensation (e.g., dialectal features) can be noticed immediately, **global** compensation can be tracked only by examining the whole work. In the

case of global compensation, the translator makes every effort in order that the target-language text resulting from the translation should not be poorer and less colourful than the original source-language text. It would seem that this means simply adherence to target-language standards, but in reality it is much more than that. We are confronted with **translation norms** since translators make a special effort in order that certain expressions should appear in the translation. The “add and subtract” game must be played with a sound sense of proportion, “enrichment” of the target-language text must not be carried to extremes and “overtranslation” must be guarded against.

Part V.

**GRAMMATICAL TRANSFER
OPERATIONS**

Introduction to grammatical transfer operations

The concept of grammatical transfer operations used here is different from the concept of “techniques”, (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958/1995, Newmark 1982), “adjustments”, “procedures” (Nida 1964, Nida and Taber 1969), “shifts” (Catford 1965), “grammatical transformations” (Shveitser 1973, Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Komissarov 1980, 1990, Vaseva 1980) used in the literature. (A good overview of linguistically founded taxonomies of translation techniques is given by Fawcett 1997, 1998 and Shuttleworth 1997).

In our interpretation, “grammatical transfer operations” is a collective term for all systemic and routine-like operative moves developed by generations of translators to handle the difficulties stemming from the different grammatical systems and cultural contexts of the two languages functioning together in the process of translation.

Grammatical transfer operations – similarly to lexical ones – may shed light on interesting differences in the way different languages reflect human experience in their grammatical systems. Such differences are partly described by **contrastive grammars**, which deal with **static** differences between the grammatical systems of languages. Our approach, in contrast, is **dynamic**: we are going to investigate how these systemic differences are **brought into motion** in the process of translation, and how they are handled in the daily routine of translators.

In discussing grammatical operations the word “grammatical” is used in two senses, referring both to the reason for and the scope of operation. They are called “grammatical” because (1) these operations are triggered by grammatical differences between languages, and (2) they influence the grammatical structure of the sentence. Grammatical transfer operations are more spectacular and obvious than lexical ones. While lexical operations often seem to be simple substitutions, and the complex mental processes behind them remain hidden, grammatical operations may entirely reformulate the whole surface of the sentence.

However, distinguishing between lexical and grammatical operations may become difficult when a grammatical transfer operation concerns a **single word**. We have already mentioned the example where the addition of the word *folyó* (‘river’), to the name of the river (*river Vág*), necessitated by the lack of background knowledge on the part of the target-language reader – is regarded as a lexical addition, while the addition of *folyó* (‘going on’) as an adjectiviser in the left branching constructions is regarded as a grammatical addition, because this operation is triggered by the systemic differences between Hungarian and IE languages in the complementation of nominal phrases.

In a similar way, the transfer operation affects a single word in translating from IE languages into Hungarian: personal pronouns (*he/she, il/elle, er/sie, on/ona*) are often replaced by *fiú* (‘boy’), *lány* (‘girl’), *férfi* (‘man’) *nő* (‘woman’) etc. We

regard this as grammatical specification, since it is mandated by the absence of a grammatical category in Hungarian (gender in personal pronouns).

Grammatical operations are either optional or obligatory. Obligatory operations are often automatic as well. They are obligatory because failure to carry them out results in grammatically ill-formed target-language sentences, and automatic because translators perform them automatically without realising what they are doing. If that is so, one might ask: why deal with obligatory operations at all? What is there to be investigated if the translator has no choices? Answers to these questions are given below.

(1) First of all, it must be stressed that translators always have choices. The systemic differences are only “road blocks”, signalling that “this route is closed”, but while one route is closed, a number of other ones may be open for translators and the choice among the different possible solutions requires a complex decision making activity.

(2) Consciously or unconsciously, translators develop their own language pair specific strategies to overcome the difficulties caused by systemic differences between languages. In the case of lexical transfer operations, the results of this systemic transfer activity by translators are partly enshrined in bilingual dictionaries, but in the case of grammatical operations such generalisations have not been made so far.

(3) Transfer operations, which are obligatory in one direction may be optional in the other direction (e.g., the addition of the indefinite article is obligatory in translation from Hungarian into English/French/German while the omission of the indefinite article is not obligatory in translations from English/French/German into Hungarian, and failing to perform it leads to translationese on the text level.)

(4) All grammatical transfer operations – obligatory and optional – have a strong influence on the cohesion of the whole target-language text (e.g., failing to perform optional omissions in IE-H translation may lead to a decrease in the number of elliptical sentences in Hungarian, and consequently to the weakening of the cohesion of the translated text).

One reason why researchers have been reluctant to suggest generalisations concerning grammatical operations could be the fear that they will be blamed for giving “recipes” or offering one-to-one solutions for translators. Instead of giving such recipes, what we offer here is a systematic description, classification and explanation of transfer operations actually performed by translators, and take a closer look at the decision-making process and problem-solving strategies developed by translators in the process of secondary text production.

1. Grammatical specification and generalisation

Grammatical specification is a standard transfer operation whereby a SL grammatical category with general meaning (e.g., a personal pronoun without gender specification) is rendered in the TL by a unit with more specific meaning because a similarly general or unmarked grammatical category is lacking in the TL. The opposite transfer operation, whereby a SL grammatical category with specific meaning (e.g., personal pronoun with gender distinction) is rendered in the TL by a unit with a more general meaning is called **grammatical generalisation**.

The terms **spécification** (1958), **particularisation** (1995), and **généralisation** (1958), **generalisation** (1995), are also used by Vinay and Darbelnet, but with reference only to lexical translation techniques. For gender specification in personal pronouns they use the term “explicitation” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 116).

Both specification and generalisation are prompted in most cases by so-called “missing categories”. Certain grammatical categories (e.g., gender in nouns, pronouns, objective conjugation) exist in one language but not in another. Plus and minus categories are discussed by Nida (1964: 230–232) in the chapter about *Techniques of adjustment* in connection with two techniques, “additions” and “omissions”.

If we translate into a language which has a “plus” category, this must be provided for in the translation. Consequently, the translation will become more specific, regardless of the translator’s intentions. We call this kind of transfer operation “**automatic specification**”. If we translate into a language with a “minus” category, the translation will lose some of its specific quality, again regardless of the translator’s intentions. We call this kind of transfer operation “**automatic generalisation**”.

Given the automatic character of these transfer operations, the question may arise, why take the trouble of dealing with them at all? What kind of theoretical lessons are offered by cases where the translator has no choice, and consequently we cannot form a hypothesis about the decision-making process taking place during translation? The answer we can give is that such transfer operations are still theoretically interesting as they represent one of the universal characteristics of bilingual transfer: **obligatory** transfer operations are very often accompanied by a series of **optional** transfer operations, which are made necessary by the obligatory transfer operation itself. Metaphorically speaking, while one route may be closed for transfer between two languages, translators may still be able to open up many other routes. If there is no other choice but eliminating gender markedness in translation, the identification of characters will be made by other means. If the lack of gender gives rise to confusion in the translation, the translator will employ **intentional specification** by using the name of the characters, their nickname or occupation, etc.

Subtypes:

- 1.1. Automatic specification of gender
- 1.2. Automatic generalisation of gender
- 1.3. Intentional specification

1.1. Automatic specification of gender

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The most common reason for grammatical specification is that one of the languages **lacks a certain grammatical category**, which is present in the other language. While Hungarian does not have grammatical gender at all, all the IE languages under investigation have gender distinction in various degrees: the least marked for gender is English, the most marked for gender is Russian. (As for the differences between English and French, see Vinay and Darbelnet's remarks concerning "useful clarifications" in English-French translations 1995: 115). In the H-IE relation, the total unmarkedness for gender is contrasted with the various degrees of gender-markedness. Therefore when translating from Hungarian into IE languages, the TL text will be more specific regardless of the translator's intention, illustrating Jakobson's famous words: "Languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey" (1966: 236).

The phenomenon is neatly illustrated by the following example. In István Örkény's short story *Eksztázis* (Ecstasy), the following Hungarian sentences, without their context, do not reveal whether the character is a male or female.

Hungarian ST: Fügét is vett, mazsolát is vett. Mélyhűtött őszibarackot és málnát is vett. Be volt rúgva. Hangosan dudorászott, miközben a segítők és a kisasszonyok mértek, csomagoltak, számoltak. Még vett egy kis zöldhagymát. Egy kis üvegházi hónapos retket. Az egész világot meg akarta venni. Tánclelésben libegett a pénztárhoz ... (Örkény I. 59)
(lit.: Bought also figs, bought also raisins. Bought also deep-frozen peaches and raspberries. Was intoxicated. As the assistants and the salesgirls weighed, wrapped and counted, hummed a tune aloud. Also bought some spring onions. A bunch of pre-season, hothouse radishes. Wanted to buy up the whole world. Danced *his* way to the cashier...)

Hungarian readers require no explanation. They know from previous paragraphs that it is Lukács Kopp, who goes shopping for the first time in his life and is so overwhelmed by the offerings of the inner-city delicatessen, that he goes on an insane spending spree. Although English readers should also know all this from earlier paragraphs, the translator is unable to translate this passage into English without specifying several times the gender of the character.

English TT: **Kopp** bought the figs and raisins, deep-frozen peaches and raspberries. **He** was intoxicated. As the assistants and salesgirls weighed, wrapped or reckoned, **he** hummed a tune. **He** also bought some spring onions and a bunch of pre-season, hothouse radishes. **He** wanted to buy up the whole world. **He** danced *his* way to the cashier ... (Sollosy 53)

In the Russian translation of the same Hungarian text the gender markedness is even more conspicuous: it is expressed also by verb inflections.

Russian TT: On kupil figi. I izyum. I svezhemorozhennie persiki, i malinu. On opyanel ot pokupok. On napeval sebe pod nos nechto bravurnoe, poka prodavtsi vzveshivali, upakovivali, podschitivali. Potom kupil zele-novo luka. Molodenkuyu parnikovuyu redhisku. On gotov bil kupit' ves' mir. Pritancovivaya, on poplil k kasse. (Voronkina I. 286)

This kind of obligatory and automatic specification presents no problem for the translator, unless the Hungarian author has a particular purpose in avoiding gender-specification. If there is an option offered by a language, it will be utilised by the users of that particular language. The grammatical system of Hungarian allows Hungarian authors possibility to leave the gender of a character unspecified for some time. In his short stories the well known 20th-century Hungarian writer István Örkény often plays this trick. In his “one-minute” stories, it emerges only at a dramatically pre-determined point whether the character is a male or female, or, perhaps, a bottle or a tulip.

Another “one-minute” story – *Trilla* – is about the dreary and monotonous week-days of an undistinguished little “person”, and it transpires only in the fifth (and last) paragraph that, as a matter of fact, the character is female and is called Mrs. Wolf. Unfortunately, translators into all IE languages have to reveal this in the very first sentence. In this instance, we have to present the whole story to demonstrate this phenomenon.

Hungarian ST:

Örkény István: *Trilla*

Kicsavarja a papírt az írógépből. Új lapot vesz elő. Közibük rakja az indigót. Ír.

Kicsavarja a papírt az írógépből. Új lapot vesz elő. Közibük rakja az indigót. Ír.

Kicsavarja a papírt az írógépből. Új lapot vesz elő. Közibük rakja az indigót. Ír.

Kicsavarja a papírt az írógépből. Új lapot vesz elő. Közibük rakja az indigót. Ír.

Kicsavarja a papírt. Húsz éve van a vállalatnál. Hideget ebédel. Egyedül lakik.

Wölfnének hívják. Jegyezzük meg: Wölfné. Wölfné. Wölfné. (Örkény I. 275)

(lit: Pulls a slip of paper from the carriage of the typewriter. Takes two new slips of paper. Slides a sheet of carbon paper between them. Types. Has been working for the same firm for twenty years. Eats cold sandwich for lunch. Lives alone. Called Mrs Wolf. Remember the name. *Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Wolf.*)

German TT:

István Örkény: *Triller*

Sie dreht die Bogen aus der Schreibmaschine. Nimmt neue Blätter. Legt Kohlepapier ein. Schreibt.

Sie dreht die Bogen aus der Schreibmaschine. Nimmt neue Blätter. Legt Kohlepapier ein. Schreibt.

Sie dreht die Bogen aus der Schreibmaschine. Nimmt neue Blätter. Legt Kohlepapier ein. Schreibt.

Sie dreht die Bogen aus der Schreibmaschine. Nimmt neue Blätter. Legt Kohlepapier ein. Schreibt.

Sie dreht die Bogen heraus. Zwanzig Jahre arbeitet **sie** in dem Unternehmen. Isst mittags Brot. Wohnt allein.

Sie heißt Frau Wolf. Merken wir uns: Frau Wolf, Frau Wolf, Frau Wolf. (Thies 1. 130)

Even more specification can be found in the English TT: the gender is specified four times in each paragraph. The reason for this is very simple: the absence of verb morphology in English makes the expression of the subject inevitable in each sentence.

English TT:

István Örkény: Rondo

She pulls a slip of paper from the carriage of the typewriter. **She** takes two new slips of paper. **She** slides a sheet of carbon paper between them.

She types.

She pulls a slip of paper from the carriage of the typewriter. **She** takes two new slips of paper. **She** slides a sheet of carbon paper between them.

She types.

She pulls a slip of paper from the carriage of the typewriter. **She** takes two new slips of paper. **She** slides a sheet of carbon paper between them.

She types.

She pulls a slip of paper from the carriage of the typewriter. **She** has been working for the same firm for twenty-five years. **She** eats cold sandwich for lunch. **She** lives alone.

Her name is *Mrs. Wolf*. Remember the name. *Mrs. Wolf. Mrs. Wolf. Mrs. Wolf.* (Sollosy 63)

1.2. Automatic generalisation of gender

Predominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

In translation from IE languages into Hungarian, the direct opposite of this transfer operation takes place, that is, automatic generalisation. If there is no natural gender indication in the IE text (e.g., proper names, or generic names for males and females like *boy, girl, man, woman*, etc.) the function of gender specification is fulfilled by personal or possessive pronouns. Hungarian pronouns cannot fulfil this function because they differ from IE pronouns in two respects:

(1) *lack of gender markedness*: as there is no grammatical gender in Hungarian, Hungarian pronouns (personal and possessive) are not marked for gender, either. The Hungarian personal pronoun *ő* (third person, singular) means both 'he' and 'she', the possessive pronoun *ővé* (third person, singular) means both 'her' and 'his'.

(2) *limited referential function*: the Hungarian third person singular personal pronoun *ő* and the possessive pronoun *ővé* cannot fulfil the same referential function as personal and possessive pronouns in IE languages, because the function of subject identification and possessor identification is accomplished by other devices. Perhaps for this reason, Hungarian personal and possessive pronouns in general do not appear on the surface of sentence structure, unless specially emphasised, as in this example:

German ST: Wäre doch die Schwester hier gewesen! **Sie** war klug, **sie** hatte schon geweint, als Gregor noch ruhig auf den Rücken lag. (Kafka 118)

Hungarian TT: Csak itt lett volna a húga! **Ő** okos volt, már akkor is sírt, amikor Gregor még nyugodtan feküdt a hátán. (Győrffy 119)

In the above example from Franz Kafka's novel *Die Verwandlung*, it is emphasised that Gregor's sister was clever, unlike Gregor, and that is why the Hungarian personal pronoun *ő* appears in the Hungarian translation. If there is no special emphasis on the Hungarian third person singular personal pronoun, it will not appear in the Hungarian sentence, because the task of subject identification is fulfilled by the conjugated verb forms.

English ST: **He** came into the room to shut the windows while we were still in bed and I saw **he** looked ill. **He** was shivering, **his** face was white, and **he** walked slowly as though it ached to move ... (Hemingway 163)

Hungarian TT: **Bejött** a szobánkba, **becsukta** az ablakot. Mi még ágyban voltunk. Rögtön láttam, hogy **beteg**. **Borzongott**, **sápadt volt**, és **lassan járt**, mint akinek fáj még a mozgás is. (Róna 163)

All the Hungarian verb forms in the above translation could have been accompanied by the Hungarian third person singular personal pronoun *ő* ('he/she'): (*ő*) *bejött*, (*ő*) *becsukta*, (*ő*) *beteg*, (*ő*) *borzongott*, (*ő*) *sápadt volt*, (*ő*) *lassan járt*, but as subject identification is ensured by verb inflexional (-*t*, -*tt*), the appearance of the personal pronoun in the Hungarian sentence is unnecessary.

The Hungarian third person singular possessive pronoun *ővé* ('his/her') also lacks of gender distinction and has a limited referential function. As possessor identification in Hungarian can be achieved by the use of the possessive suffix attained to the possessed (underlined), the possessive pronoun is redundant in the Hungarian sentence. English: *her son* → Hungarian: *fi-a*, where *fia* means *his or her son*, French: *sa mère et sa soeur* → Hungarian: *any-ja és nővér-e* where *anyja* means *his or her mother* and *nővére* means *his or her sister*.

English ST: It gave me a different idea of him: how tenderly polite he was **with his father**. (Kerouac 34)

Hungarian TT: Meglepett, hogy ilyen gyengéd és udvarias az **apjához**: ezt nem is hittem volna róla. (Déry 122)

Commentary: The English possessive pronoun plus noun construction *his father* is replaced in Hungarian by the noun plus possessive suffix construction *ap-ja*.

The disappearance of any reference to gender in the Hungarian text is well illustrated by the following example, taken from a translation from English:

Hungarian TT: Mint minden éjszaka, most is hallotta, hogy apja körbejárja a házat, bezárja az ajtókat és ablakokat. Az apja irodafőnök volt a Bergson Exportügynökségnél; ahogy feküdt az ágyban utálkozva arra gondolt, hogy az apja otthona olyan mint a hivatal ... (Prekop 260)
(lit: As every other night, listened to father going around the house, locking the doors and windows. Father was head clerk at Bergson's Export Agency, and lying in bed would think with dislike that father's home was like office ...)

The above Hungarian text, translated from English, does not reveal whether the hero is male or female. We said earlier that generally Hungarian readers do not need this information, since they know from previous paragraphs of the story who the hero is. But in this case, this information is important because it is the very beginning of the story. The English reader learns already from the fifth word of the story that the hero is a girl.

English ST: As every other night, *she* listened to *her* father going around the house, locking the doors and windows. *He* was head clerk at Bergson's Export Agency, and lying in bed *she* would think with dislike that *his* home was like *his* office ... (Greene 433)

The reader of the Hungarian translation learns only at the 67th word of the story that the hero is female, when the text reveals that the father going to church on Sundays takes along his *daughters*.

This automatic generalisation i.e., the disappearance of gender from the Hungarian sentence, can cause not only uncertainty, but **misunderstanding** as well, as in the following example:

Hungarian TT: Tizenöt év múlva – gondolta boldogtalanul – a ház az *övé* lesz; apja letette a huszonöt fontot, a többit pedig hónapról hónapra lakbérként fizeti. (Prekop 261)
(lit.: In fifteen years, thought unhappily, the house will be *his/hers* (?); father paid twenty-five pounds down and the rest was paying month by month as rent.)

The reason for the misunderstanding is the lack of gender specification in the Hungarian possessive pronoun *övé*. As mentioned earlier, this pronoun means both 'his' and 'her' in Hungarian. We know from previous parts that the author is describing the thoughts of a girl and the obvious reference of the pronoun "*övé*" would be the girl. We must refer to the original ST to learn that *övé* here means *his* and not *hers*, i.e. that the house will belong to the father.

English ST: In fifteen years, *she* thought unhappily, the house will be *his*, *he* paid twenty-five pounds down and the rest *he* was paying month by month as rent. (Greene 434)

The lack of male-female distinction in Hungarian can be especially confusing when there are male and female characters in the same sentence, and they are referred to only by personal pronouns. In the following sentence from Tolstoy's *Resurrection* the point is that *he* (Nehlyudov) would like to meet with *her* (Katyusha) but *she* tries to avoid *him*, and *his* aunt, Matriona Pavlovna also keeps an eye on *her*. If we translate the Russian sentence into Hungarian without the specification of personal pronouns, the result will be somewhat confusing. We understand on the basis of the previous context that it is Nehlyudov who is longing for Katyusha, but we do not know who the aunt is suspicious of. To avoid this confusion the translator specified the personal pronoun by the proper name (Katyusha) and by the generic name (girl).

Russian TT: Ves vecher on (...) dumal ob odnom, kak bi odnu uvidet' yeyo; no ona izbegala yevo, i Matriona Pavlovna staralas' ne vipuskat' yeyo iz vida. (L. Tolstoy 68)

*Hungarian TT: Egész este (...) egyre csak leste az alkalmat, hogy négy-szemközt találkozhasson *Katyusával*, de a lány került *őt*, és Matrjona Pavlovna is azon volt, hogy állandóan szemmel tartsa *Katyusát*. (Szöl-lősy 71)*

This "deficiency" of the Hungarian grammatical system generally causes no problem for Hungarian readers, because the authors of original Hungarian works compose their writing according to the rules of Hungarian grammar and discourse reference, so that the referents are easily identifiable. But this situation changes in translation. The translator, who creates a secondary text, by expressing the thoughts of an author following the discourse patterns of a different language, has to pay special attention to making the references clear. This is usually accomplished by specification in IE-H translation.

Here we must note an apparent contradiction. As we mentioned in GR 1.1, specification can take place typically in the H-IE direction. It appears, however, that specification can take place in both directions. The difference between the two directions is that while the H-IE translation is characterised by **automatic specification**, the IE-H direction is characterised by **intentional specification**.

1.3. Intentional specification

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Intentional specification is a conscious transfer operation aiming to compensate for losses due to the obligatory and automatic generalisation of gender distinction in the IE-H translation. Losses due to automatic generalisation are usually not realised by the reader, since the missing information can be readily recovered from the immediate or wider textual environment. But if the danger of misunderstanding does occur, it requires a high degree of **conscious effort** on the part of the translator to eliminate it. Applying intentional specification, the translator must weigh several factors simultaneously.

There are many ways in which IE personal pronouns can be concretised. The simplest method is to use the name of the character instead of the personal pronoun.

English ST: **He** looked at **her**. **She** was serene and unyielding. (Christie 78)

Hungarian TT: **Edward** hosszasan ránézett. **Dorothy** fenséges volt és kérlelhetetlen. (Borbás 61)

Commentary: English **he** is specified by the proper name **Edward**, **she** by the proper name **Dorothy**.

German ST: **Sie** mochte etwa so alt sein wie **er**, nämlich ein wenig jenseits der Dreißig. (Mann 1. 68)

Hungarian TT: **Lizaveta** körülbelül egyidős volt **Tonióval**, vagyis valamivel túl a harmincon. (Lányi 1. 69)

Commentary: German **sie** is specified by the proper name **Lizaveta**, German **er** is specified by the proper name **Tonio**.

Using proper names for specification also requires careful consideration. Proper names are not neutral devices: in using them, translators have to consider several factors such as time and place of the plot, personal relationships between the characters and involvement of the author in the structure of the narrative. The use of the given name may suggest an unwarranted intimacy between the narrator and the hero, while using the family name or both names may give the impression of distance between them. Translators often rely on denominations used by the author in other parts of the same work.

English ST: **She** stretched out her hand, raised the cup. **He** held his breath. (Christie 60)

Hungarian TT: **Mrs. Merrowdene** a csészéért nyúlt és felemelte. **Evans** visszafojtott lélegzettel figyelte. (Borbás 61)

In this case, the translator's decision to use the family name for the specification of **she** (**Mrs. Merrowdene**), and the given name for the specification of **he** (**Evans**) is suggested by the author itself. Authors often alternate the denomination of the characters, and use both family name, given name, and nickname (or even patronymic name in Russian literary works) depending on the situation (**Emma** and **Mme Bovary** in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, **Larissa Fyodorovna** or **Larissa** or **Lara** in Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*). In these cases, all the above possibilities can also be used by translators to specify personal pronouns. However, the formal or informal character of the situation and the readers' expectations must be taken into consideration. For Russian readers the use of the conjoined given name and patronymic name (e.g., Larissa Fyodorovna, Anton Pavlovich) is customary even in informal situations, while for Hungarian readers calling somebody by the first name *and* the father's name sounds odd, and suggests a more formal relationship between the characters.

As for the French example drawn from Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, we have two published translations both made by excellent professional translators. The author alternates *elle* with **Emma** and **Madame Bovary**, and *il* with **Rodolphe** and **Monsieur Boulanger**. The earlier translation uses both the given name and the family name for the purpose of specification, while the second translator, working half a century later, probably feels the family name would be too formal and

prefers to use *Emma* and *Rodolphe*, and if the speaker's identity is clear, often skips the reporting clause with *elle* and *il* .

French ST: – Car enfin ..., reprit *elle*, vous êtes libre.

Elle hésita: – Riche.

– Ne vous moquez pas de moi, répondit-*il*.

Et *elle* jurait qu'*elle* ne se moquât pas ... (Flaubert 153)

First translation: *elle* → *Emma*, *Bovaryné*, *il* → *Boulangier úr*:

Hungarian TT:

– Mert végre is ... – folytatta *Emma* –, ön mégiscsak szabad ember.

Majd habozva: – És gazdag is.

– Ne csúfolódjon velem – válaszolt *Boulangier úr*.

S Bovaryné esküdözött, hogy egy cseppet sem csúfolódik... (Gyergyai 176)

Second translation: *elle* → *Emma*, *il* → *skipped*

Hungarian TT:

– Hát mert ... maga szabad. – *Emma* habozott. – Gazdag.

– Ne csúfolódjon!

Emma esküdözött, hogy nem csúfolja ... (Pór 153)

Several other problems may arise in connection with specification by proper names: (1) is it permissible for the translator to use a proper name *before* its first occurrence in the novel (e.g., Laura or “the girl” in Böll’s *Billiard um Halbzehn*), (2) is it permissible for the translator to insert into the author’s text the informal version of proper names used by the characters only (e.g., *Connie* or Lady Chatterly in Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterly’s lover*, *Pista* or István or Kópjás István in Zsigmond Móricz’ *Relations*).

Hungarian ST: Felkönyökölt az ágyban, úgy leste a felesége hangját ... (Móricz 5–6)

English TT: *He* propped himself up on one elbow in bed to listen carefully to his wife’s voice ... (Adams 16)

Russian TT: *Pista* pripodnyalsya na lokte, vslushivayas’ v golos zheni ... (Gromov and Salimon 39)

Further problems may arise when characters do not have proper names in the original and they are referred to by the author only through personal pronouns. In these cases translators have to specify the IE personal pronouns with the insertion of Hungarian generic names like *kisfiú* (‘young boy’), *kislány* (‘young girl’), *fiú* (‘boy’), *lány* (‘girl’), *férfi* (‘man’), *apa* (‘father’), *anya* (‘mother’), *nő* (‘woman’), *asszony* (‘woman’), *öregember* (‘old man’), *öregasszony* (‘old woman’), *idős hölgy* (‘elderly lady’), etc.

These denominations are not neutral linguistic devices and besides gender specification, they carry additional meanings as well. They may introduce undesirable supplementary information into the text, and translators should very carefully weigh a number of other factors too, e.g., the age of the characters (the borderline

between a girl, a woman and an old woman), and also the time and the place of plot, etc.

It helps the translator if the author him/herself alternates the personal pronoun with some other denomination.

German ST: Das Mädchen sah mich an, als ich stehenblieb. (Böll 48)

Hungarian TT: A lány rám nézett, mikor megálltam. (Gergely 166)

German ST: Die ganze Zeit hockte *sie* da zu meinen Füßen ... (Böll 50)

Hungarian TT: A lány ezalatt a lábamnál kuporgott ... (Gergely 167)

Commentary: The author of the original German text alternates the personal pronoun (*sie*) with the generic denomination (*das Mädchen*), which helps the translator to find the proper specification of the personal pronoun.

German ST: Der alte Mann häufte drei Kuchen auf einem Teller und brachte sie mir. (Böll 219)

Hungarian TT: Az öregember három fánkot tett egy tányérra, és oda-hozta. (Gergely 219)

German ST: Er lächelte mir zu, nahm die Hände vom Rücken, hielt sie ungeschickt auf dem Bauch und murmelte ... (Böll 101)

Hungarian TT: Az öregember rám nevetett, kezét, mely eddig hátra volt kulcsolva, ügyetlenül a hasa elé tette, és dünnyögő hangon azt mondta... (Gergely 220)

Commentary: The author of the original German text alternates the personal pronoun (*er*) with generic denomination (*der alte Mann*), which helps the translator to find the proper specification of the German personal pronoun.

The technique of specification may also depend on the **point of view** of the narration, that is, on the **perspective** from which the author looks at the events. Who is the story related by: is it the author's voice or one of the characters? In Graham Greene's story *Cheap in August* we see the events and characters through the eyes of the heroine, Mary. The other principal character is a morbidly obese, elephantine old man, dressed in outmoded garb and endowed with old-fashioned manners, toward whom Mary feels some liking, even though she does not dare to admit this even to herself. We know the man's name, Henry Hickslaughter, but calling him Henry would not reflect Mary's persistent reserve. Therefore the translator alternates different denominations *az öreg* ('the old one'), *öregember* ('old man'), *elefánt* ('elephant'), *hújas öreg* ('bloated old man') with *Mr. Hickslaughter*, depending on how much Mary is able to overcome her dislike of the old man.

English ST: She had confused *him* ... (Greene 98)

Hungarian TT: Az elefánt végre zavarba jött ... (Örkény 104)

Commentary: The English personal pronoun *he* is specified in the Hungarian translation by the word *elefánt* ('elephant') which reflects Mary's negative attitude towards the old man in that particular situation.

English ST: **He** said, 'I never had this in mind.' (Greene 109)

Hungarian TT: – Isten bizony, nem akartam – mondta az **őregember**. (Örkény 114)

Commentary: The English personal pronoun **he** is specified in the Hungarian translation by **őregember** ('old man') which reflects Mary's neutral attitude at a later point in the narration.

English ST: **He** was an old man ... (Greene 100)

Hungarian TT: **Mr. Hickslaughter** már öreg ... (Örkény 197)

Commentary: The English personal pronoun **he** is specified in the Hungarian translation by the name of the character **Mr. Hickslaughter**, in the words of a hotel assistant, which reflects the neutral relation of the hotel personnel towards the character.

If the author's description is unemotional, the translator frequently uses kinship terms for the specification of IE personal pronouns: e.g., **anyja** ('his/her mother'), **apja** ('his/her father'), **vőlegénye** ('her fiancé'), **férje** ('her husband'), **felesége** ('his wife'), **szerelmese** ('his/her lover'), **barátja** ('his/her friend'), **gyermeke** ('his/her child'), etc.

German ST: "Ich hatt' es denken können", klagte **sie**, "es duftete lang so stark". (Mörike 10)

Hungarian TT: – Gondolhattam volna – kesergett **Mozartné** – , hiszen már régóta érzem az erős illatot. (Lengyel 11)

German ST: "Ei, Närrchen" – gab **er ihr** zum Trost zurück ... (Mörike 10)

Hungarian TT: – Ejnye kis bolondom – vigasztalta a **férje**, ... (Lengyel 11)

Commentary: The German personal pronoun **sie** and **er** are specified in Hungarian by the family name **Mozartné** ('Mrs Mozart'), and a name expressing family relationship: **férje** ('her husband').

Profession, occupation and rank or role in the given situation of the characters are also frequently used for specification of IE personal pronouns.

English ST: 'Wait' **he** said. 'I've got something better than this.' (Greene 515)

Hungarian TT: – Várjanak csak – mondta a **tulajdonos** –, ennél jobb italom is van. (Sükösd 30)

Commentary: The English personal pronoun **he** is specified by **tulajdonos** ('proprietor') in Hungarian.

French ST: **Il** appela sa femme par son prénom et quand **elle** se retourna, **il** vit que son visage était couvert de larmes. (Camus 11)

Hungarian TT: Az **orvos** kimondta a felesége keresztnévét, s midőn az **asszony** visszafordult, az **orvos** észrevette, hogy csupa könny az arca. (Győri 247)

Commentary: The French personal pronoun **il** is specified by the name of a profession **orvos** ('medical doctor') and **elle** by the a generic name **asszony** ('woman').

Summary comments on grammatical specification and generalisation

Grammatical specification and **generalisation** are good examples of how a simple difference in the grammatical systems of languages may have far-reaching consequences for translation.

Both specification in the H-IE direction and generalisation in IE-H direction are **automatic** transfer operations. They proceed automatically, regardless of the translator's intentions. There is nothing the translator can do against the concretisation of personal pronouns in the H-IE direction, since IE sentences cannot be structured so that the character's gender is not revealed. Generalisation takes place automatically in the IE-H direction too, as personal pronouns in Hungarian (1) have no gender and (2) generally do not appear on the surface of the Hungarian sentence.

The lack of gender explicitness generally causes no problem in original Hungarian works, because the authors compose their writing according to the rules of Hungarian discourse reference, so that the referents are easily identified. If generalisation in translation would lead to misunderstanding, translators have to apply **intentional specification** to compensate for the losses caused by automatic generalisation. Personal pronouns, which disappear during the process of translation can be compensated for by a variety of means: last name, first name, nickname, the character's occupation, family relationship, etc. These are not neutral linguistic devices however, and choosing the most suitable technique requires from the translator a conscious weighing of a number of different factors.

These two kinds of specification may also illustrate the difference between "operations" and "strategies". Both **automatic specification** in H-IE translation, and **intentional specification** in IE-H translation are transfer operations but only the latter is classified as a "strategy", because only the latter requires conscious **decision-making** on the part of translators.

Let us take a look at these operations from the point of view of **explicitation**. If we regard explicitation as a self-propelled **phenomenon**, both operations can be termed explicitation since both of them result in adding extra information to the TL text. But if we interpret explicitation as a consciously applied **strategy** in the process of translation, employed to facilitate the understanding of the TL text for the TL readers, only intentional specification can be regarded as explicitation.

2. Grammatical division

By **grammatical division** we mean two standard transfer operations: one of them, **separation**, takes place on the sentence level, while the other, **elevation** on the level of clauses. Both operations have far reaching consequences for the TL text as a whole. The **separation** of sentences is a standard grammatical transfer operation, whereby one sentence in the SL is divided into two or several sentences in the TL. **Elevation** is also a standard grammatical transfer operation whereby SL phrases are extended or “elevated” into clauses in the TL.

The term “elevation” was introduced by the Hungarian linguist László Deme (1980), who describes the syntactic structure of sentences as a structure of units on different levels: predicative units (clauses) constitute the “sentence level”, non-predicative units (phrases) constitute the lower levels, which he called “subsentence levels”. Phrases constitute the first “subsentence level”, and phrase constituents (e.g., modifiers in phrases) constitute the second “subsentence level”, etc. This system of levels is flexible; formulating a message is a process in which the relevance of the information conveyed is constantly monitored, and the process ends at a given level, higher or lower, at which the information is best represented in the given sentence. We have adapted this approach and propose to use the term “elevation” to refer to transfer operations when phrases are translated by clauses into the TL.

In this chapter, **separation** and **elevation** will be discussed together because both influence **boundaries** in the text: separation affects sentence boundaries and elevation affects clause boundaries. Separation results in an increase in the number of sentences, while elevation results in an increase in the number of clauses.

Subtypes:

- 2.1. Separation of sentences (more sentences in translation)
- 2.2. Elevation of phrases (more clauses in translation)
 - 2.2.1. Elevation of participial phrases
 - 2.2.2. Elevation of infinitival phrases
 - 2.2.3. Elevation of nominal phrases

2.1. Separation of sentences (more sentences in translation)

Predominant direction: there is no predominant direction

The separation of sentences in the process of translation is an optional transfer operation, because no language has restrictions concerning the number of words in a sentence. Consequently, translators rarely change sentence boundaries. If they do so, it is due to individual translator strategies. For those translators who give precedence to the SL author’s intention rather than to the TL readers’ expect-

tations breaking up long sentences is impermissible. For those who give precedence to the readability of the TL text, breaking up long sentences is not only permissible but is a must.

The divisibility of sentences may also be influenced by the genre of the text, and in the case of literary texts also by the translators' opinion about the author's style. If the translator regards sentence-length as a relevant stylistic device, and an integral part of the author's style, the boundaries of sentences will probably not be tampered with. The length of the sentence as a stylistic device is an important issue in literary translation theory, while linguistic translation theory is primarily concerned with the possible linguistic reasons for separating sentences.

On the basis of evidence provided by our multilingual parallel corpus, the greatest number of separations can be found in German-Hungarian translations. The preference of German authors for long sentences may cause readability difficulties even with readers of the original SL text, but in translation the problems multiply. The obligatory transfer operations in the process of translation may distort the informational structure of the sentence. The hierarchy of information, the relationship between "given" and "new" information, that is, the topic-comment structure of the sentence may become blurred. Doherty (1992) argues that the separation of sentences in English-German translation aims to preserve the information hierarchy by putting the most relevant element in end position, which is the position reserved for the most relevant element in a German sentence (Doherty 1992:76).

Our analysis of a large number of sentence separations in IE-Hungarian translation in general, and in German-Hungarian translation in particular revealed an interesting pattern, IE sentences when translated into Hungarian, seem to "split up" automatically, and offer the possibility of the creation of a new sentence to the translator. These "separation-sensitive" points are to be found at clause boundaries, and the separation itself can be explained as a by-product of two grammatical transfer operations characteristic of the process of IE-Hungarian translation: (1) transformation of IE passive voice into H active voice, and (2) transformation of IE nominal constructions into H verbal constructions.

Both the passive-active transformation and the noun-verb transformation is accompanied by the introduction of a new subject into the clause. A change in subject will necessarily affect the functional perspective of the sentence, i.e. the distribution of given and new information in the clauses. Due to such changes in the functional perspective of the sentence, the retention of the original sentence boundaries becomes unnecessary and more or less impossible.

One sentence in German → four sentences in Hungarian

German ST: Seit Jahren war *er* Reichratsabgeordneter, regelmäßig wiedergewählt von seinem Bezirk, alle Gegenkandidaten schlagend mit Geld, Gewalt und Überrumpelung, Günstling der Regierung und Verächter der parlamentarischen Körperschaft, der *er* angehörte. (Roth 130)
Hungarian TT: (1) Évek óta *képviselő volt*. (2) *Kerülete* rendszeresen megválasztotta újra. (3) Pénzzel, erőszakkal és rohammal könnyen *levert* minden ellenjelöltet. (4) A kormány *hegyence volt* és *megvetője* annak a parlamenti testületnek, amelyhez *maga is tartozott*. (Boldizsár 147)

The cohesion of the long German sentence is supported by the unchanged subject (*er* 'he'), followed by several predicative expressions (active and passive). As there is no passive voice in Hungarian, the passive-active transformation in the second clause requires a **new subject** in Hungarian (*kerülete* '[his]constituen- cy'), and in Hungarian a new subject would signal the start of a new sentence. This and the following subject changes in the sentence ruin the cohesive harmony of the sentence, and the German sentence is falling apart in the Hungarian translation.

Obligatory subject change is probably only one possible reason for separation in the next example. The other reason may be that by using shorter sentences the translator tried to suggest the incoherence of the young peasant's speech, in calling the priest to visit his dying mother.

One sentence in German → four sentences in Hungarian

German ST: Ein Bauer, **die Mütze mit Schnee überstäubt**, stapfte hastig herein, seine alte Mutter läge im Sterben, und der Pfarrer möge eilen, ihr noch rechtzeitig die letzte Ölung zu erteilen. (Zweig 10)

Hungarian TT: (1) Parasztfiú rontott be az ajtón. (2) **Sapkáját hó fődte**. (3) Haldoklik az anyja. (4) Siessen tisztelendő úr, ha még idejében akarja feladni az utolsó kenetet. (Fónagy 11)

Commentary: The German passive construction **die Mütze mit Schnee überstäubt**. (lit.: cap was covered with snow) is translated by an active construction into Hungarian: **Sapkáját hó fődte**. (lit.: Snow covered [his] cap) which involves a change in subject, from *cap* to *snow*, and consequently leads to a new sentence.

The second transfer operation which may lead to separation is noun-verb transformation, termed in the following as "verbalisation". As discussed later in more detail, one of the most characteristic transfer operations in the process of IE-H translation is the transformation of IE nominal phrases into Hungarian verbal phrases. The new verbal phrase, born in the process of translation, requires a new subject, and the introduction of a new subject, as in the case of subject change, may trigger off the starting of a new sentence.

One sentence in English → two sentences in Hungarian

English ST: ... and perceived Lord Warburton sitting under the trees and engaged in **conversation**, of which even at a distance a desultory character was appreciable, with Mrs. Touchett. (James 60)

Hungarian TT: (1)... megpillantották Lord Warburton: ott ült a fák árnyékában és Mrs Touchettel **beszélgetett**. (2) A **beszélgetés** felületes jellege egyébként már jókora távolságból is észlelhető volt. (Balabán 99)

The English noun **conversation** is translated by a verb into Hungarian **beszélgetett** (lit.: [he] chatted). The verbalisation interrupts the sentence and it would be impossible to continue without introducing a new subject (**beszélgetés**, lit.: conversation) and consequently the starting of a new sentence.

A series of verbalisations was necessary to translate the long nominal constructions in the last sentence of Dostoevskiy's *Crime and Punishment* into Hungarian. The new verbal predicates and the new subjects create new sentence boundaries in the translation.

One sentence in Russian → three sentences in Hungarian

Russian ST: No tut zhe nachinaetsya novaya istoriya, istoriya (1) postepenno obnovleniya cheloveka, istoriya (2) postepenno pererozhdeniya yevo, (3) postepenno perehoda iz odnovo mira v drugoy, (4) znakomstva s novoyu, dosele sovershenno nevedomoyu deystvitel'nostyu. (Dostoevskiy 271)

Hungarian TT: (1) De itt már új történet kezdődik. (2) Egy ember fokozatos megújulásának, fokozatos újjászületésének története. (3) Ahogy *átmegy* az egyik világból a másikba, (4) *megismeri* az előtte addig ismeretlen valóságot. (Görög–Beke 559)

Commentary: There are four extended nominal phrases in the Russian text with the same headword *istoriya* ('history'): 'the *history* (1) of the gradual renewal of a man', 'the *history* (2) of his gradual rebirth'; 'the *history* (3) of his gradual transition from one world into the other' and 'the *history* (4) of his becoming acquainted with an entirely new, so far unknown reality'. The third and the fourth nominal phrases are verbalised, and the new verbal predicates *átmegy* (lit.: [he] goes over), and *megismeri* (lit: [he] makes the acquaintance of) break up the sentence.

So far, we have presented IE-H examples for the breaking up of sentences. However, there is no predominant direction with this operation and it can be attested in the opposite direction as well. According to the evidence found in our corpora, the separation of sentences in H-IE translations is also linked to subject changes.

One of the systemic differences between IE languages and Hungarian, as pointed out above, is the synthetic character of Hungarian morphology. Synthetic verb forms in Hungarian express all syntactic relations in the sentence, including identification of the subject, which may not appear on the surface of the sentence at all. Verbal suffixes in Hungarian fulfil the task of subject identification even if the subject changes in the next clause. This is shown by the following example:

One sentence in Hungarian → two sentences in English

Hungarian ST: A nő kipirult arccal, mélyen aludt, kitakarták és megcsókolták, azután előszedték a zsebeikből a drágaságokat. (Csáth 90)

English TT: (1) The woman was sleeping, her face hot. (2) *They* uncovered her and kissed her, taking the precious things from their pockets then. (Kessler 173)

The subject of the first clause in Hungarian is *a nő* ('the woman'), the implied subject of the second clause *a gyerekek* ('the children'), which is implied by the two 3rd person plural transitive verbal forms: *kitakarták* ('[they] uncovered [her]') and *megcsókolták* ('[they] kissed [her]'). The English verbs *uncovered*,

kissed in themselves are unable to identify the new subject, which has to be introduced into the sentence (*they*). The appearance of a new subject may bring with itself the starting of a new sentence (although not necessarily).

2.2. Elevation of phrases (more clauses in translation)

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Grammatical division usually involves a transfer operation in which translators break up sentences, i.e. one SL sentence is translated by two or more TL sentences. Changing the boundaries of **sentences** is used much less frequently than another transfer operation, in which the translator changes the boundaries of **clauses and phrases**, due to which the TL sentence will contain more independent sentence units than the original.

English ST: **two** independent sentence units

(1) In the early morning on the lake sitting in the stern of the boat with his father rowing, he *felt* quite sure (2) he *would never die*. (Hemingway 16)

Hungarian TT: **three** independent sentence units

(1) Kora reggel a tavon, a csónak farában, míg apja *evezett*, (2) biztosan *érezte*, (3) hogy ő *sose fog meghalni*. (Szász 17)

The English sentence contains **two** predicates (*felt*, *would never die*) and in Hungarian the two are turned into **three** predicates: *míg apja evezett* (lit.: while [his] father was rowing), *érezte* (lit.: [he] felt), *ő sose fog meghalni* (lit.: he never will die). The number of predicates and consequently the number of independent sentence units is increased in the process of translation, because a subsentence level unit of the English text (*with his father rowing*) is elevated on the sentence level in the Hungarian translation (*míg apja evezett*).

The term “independent sentence unit”, suggested by Deme (1980) refers to a part of the sentence containing an independent predicate. Since in this respect there are substantial differences between the English and the Hungarian descriptive linguistic tradition and Hungarian linguistic tradition itself is not unified, it seems necessary to clarify what we mean by an independent sentence unit. Keeping in mind English linguistic terminology, we define an independent sentence unit as any segment of the sentence, which contains a “**finite form**”, i.e. a conjugated form of a verb.

We do not consider those parts of a sentence to be independent sentence units which contain a “**non-finite form**”, i.e. participial, infinitival and nominal phrases, even if they are in postposition, have their own complements and are separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma. Contrary to some English grammars which term these cases “non-finite clauses”, we do not regard these as clauses and reserve the term “clause” for independent sentence units containing their own predicates. Thus, the English sentence below consists of a single sentence unit, while the Hungarian translation consists of three sentence units.

English ST: (1) His father *sat* watching him eat. (Hemingway 38)
Hungarian TT: (1) Az apja *ült*, (2) *figyelte*, (3) hogy *eszik*. (Lengyel 39)

The elevation of phrases (subsentence level units) to clauses (sentence level units) is one of the most characteristic transfer operations in the process of IE-H translation. This transfer operation is motivated by the differences between IE and H in the packaging of information in complex sentences. Non-translational comparison of IE and Hungarian complex sentences in scientific texts (Klaudy 1987) showed that in the case of long complex sentences, IE languages use syntactic compression, that is, phrases (nominal and participial) to increase the amount of information per sentence, while Hungarian prefers to accomplish the same without syntactic compression, that is, by the introduction of new clauses. Hungarian sentences contain more explicit predicates, more independent sentence level units than IE sentences. These predicates are also contained in complex IE sentences, but in a compressed form, in the form of nominal, participial and infinitival phrases, i.e. in the form of subsentence-level units. In IE languages, it would be unusual and monotonous to construct a series of independent sentence units containing conjugated verbal predicates.

These differences are linked to the functional perspective of the sentence, and the language specific structuring of information as “new” and “old”, “important” and “less important”, that is, with **information hierarchy**. To distinguish important information from the less important, IE languages use the clause-phrase opposition, while Hungarian, in which the sentences consist mainly of independent clauses, information hierarchy is indicated by other means (conjunctions, demonstrative pronouns, relative pronouns, word order, etc.). The examples below illustrate the typical ways of packaging information in English and in Hungarian. We use the term “information unit” for the chunks of information that are packaged by different languages either into phrases or into clauses.

Information packaging typical for a sentence with **two** information units:

In English: (1) -ing phrase, (2) clause

In Hungarian: (1) clause, (2) clause

English ST: Obediently *shutting* the door, Edna *advanced* into the room. (Christie 6)

Hungarian TT: Edna engedelmesen *becsukta az ajtót*, beljebb *lépett* a szobába. (Borbás 7)

Information packaging typical for a sentence with **four** information units:

In English: (1) -ing phrase, (2) clause, (3) -ing phrase, (4) noun phrase

In Hungarian: (1) clause, (2) clause, (3) clause (4) clause

English ST: *Taking leave* of his friend, he *sauntered down* to the village, *revolving* in his mind the *possibilities* of some kind of successful action. (Christie 48)

Hungarian TT: Amikor *elköszönt* a barátjától, *leballagott* a faluba, és azon *tűnődött*, hogyan *lehetne* sikeresen akcióba *lépni*. (Borbás 49)

Information packaging typical for a sentence with **seven** information units:

In English: (1) clause, (2) -ing phrase, (3) clause, (4-5) infinitival phrase, (6) -ing phrase, (7) -ing phrase

In Hungarian: (1) clause, (2) clause, (3) clause, (4) clause, (5) clause, (6) clause, (7) clause

English ST: The efficient Mary **emerged** from the bedroom and **saying** to Lavinia, “Miss Emily **is asking** for you, madam”, **proceeded to open** the door for Miss Marple, **helping** her into her coat and **handing** her her umbrella in the most irreproachable fashion. (Christie 24)

Hungarian TT: Az utólérhetetlen Mary **kilépett** a betegszobából, és Miss Laviniahoz **fordult** : – Miss Emily **kéreti** a kisasszonyt – majd **indult**, hogy ajtót **nyisson** Miss Marple-nak, **felsegítette** a kabátját, és kifogástalan modorban **nyújtotta** az esernyőjét. (Borbás 25)

The above sentences illustrate the rationing of information typical of English. The author establishes the hierarchy of information by alternating the clauses containing finite verbs with phrases containing non-finite verbs. If we look at the alternation of phrases with clauses and try to find some regularity in their sequence, a kind of “vaulted” or “arched” contour is taking shape. In complex sentences containing several information units, the less relevant information is expressed by phrases in the introductory, – “ascending” part of the sentence, while the relevant information is expressed by clauses, which are followed again by phrases, constituting the “descending” part of the sentence.

The hierarchy of information in Hungarian is indicated by other means. The elevated IE non-finite phrases become coordinate or subordinate clauses, and information hierarchy is ensured by relative pronouns, conjunctions, cataphoric and anaphoric demonstratives, word order, emphasisers, intensifiers, etc. The system of clauses in Hungarian is not very different from that in IE languages; the differences are **functional** rather (preference for clauses to phrases in information packaging) and **distributional**, such as the predominance of the *hogy* (‘that’) clause in Hungarian. A detailed contrastive description of English and Hungarian relative clauses can be found in Nádasdy (1982), and English *that* clauses and Hungarian *hogy* clauses are compared in Hell (1980a). The latter illustrates the relevance of translation specific comparison of languages, which shows that Hungarian *hogy* clauses correspond to English non-finite verb phrases and nominal phrases rather than to *that* clauses.

2.2.1. Elevation of participial phrases

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Participles are non-finite verb forms having properties of both nouns and verbs. Participial phrases are extended participial constructions containing a participle with its complements, functioning adverbially or adjectivally. As the category of participles – both adverbial and adjectival – can be found both in IE languages and in Hungarian, this is not a case of a missing category. A very detailed contrastive description of the formal properties and the functioning of English and Hungarian participles is given by É. Kiss (1980). She reveals that Hungarian participial con-

structions are less flexible and complementable than English ones (É. Kiss 1980: 75). Functional differences between IE and Hungarian participial constructions may be accounted for by this limited complementability of Hungarian participial constructions, to be discussed later.

Participial constructions in IE languages serve as a means of “syntactic compression” or “reduction of sentences” (Doherty 1987), and are “embedded sentences” or “abbreviated clauses” (D. Stephanides 1980). They help to increase the quantity of information per sentence. Since in Hungarian the device needed to increase the amount of information in a sentence is not compression, but increasing the number of independent clauses, the elevation of English participial structures to the level of independent sentence units is a frequent transfer operation in IE-H translation.

The different types of participial constructions (adverbial and adjectival) represent different degrees of compression, and consequently the necessity of their elevation is variable. Let us first look at examples where the IE participle phrase structure fulfils the role of **adverbial participle** in a sentence.

English ST: ... as her father commented, *watching* for the buds on the apple tree. (Greene 435)

Hungarian TT: ... ahogy az apja megjegyezte, *amikor a rügyeket leste az almafán.* (Prekop 262) (lit.: ... when [he] watched the buds on the apple tree.)

French ST: – A tantôt – me dit-elle en me *tendant* la joue. (Nerval 76)

Hungarian TT: – Vizontlátásra – fordult felém, *és csókra nyújtotta az arcát.* (Brodszky 77) (lit.: ... and [she] gave [her] face to be kissed)

German ST: Telegraphenboys mit schiefen Mützen schossen Namen *ausrufend* durch die Gesellschaftsräume, ... (Zweig 6)

Hungarian TT: ... ferde sapkás sürgönyhordófiúk rohantak a termeken át, *s egy-egy nevet kiáltottak.* (Fónagy 7) (lit.: [they] shouted)

Russian ST: Berlioz tosklivo oglyanulsya, nikak *ne ponimaya*, chto yevo ispugalo. (Bulgakov 11)

Hungarian TT: Szorongva nézett körül, *sehogy sem értette*, hogy mitől ijedt meg. (Szöllősy 8) (lit: [he] could not understand)

The IE adverbial participial structures are predicates in disguise, and virtually functioning as independent sentence units. This is shown by the fact that they are often separated by a comma from the clause containing the verbal predicate. Interestingly enough, Hungarian translators could easily retain the adverbial participles in Hungarian as well: English: *watching* → Hungarian: *figyelve* (‘watching’), French: *tendant* → Hungarian: *nyújtva* (‘offering’, ‘giving’), German: *ausrufend* → Hungarian: *kiáltozva* (‘shouting’), Russian: *nikak ne ponimaya* → Hungarian: *sehogy sem értve* (‘not understanding’). This phenomenon is called overcompensation in English-Hungarian contrastive studies. “The translators seem to have overcompensated for the fact that Hungarian participial constructions are less flexible

and complementable than English ones: they often use clauses when adverbial verbalia would have been just as good, or even better” (É. Kiss 1980: 75).

Translation studies take a different view of this phenomenon. In translation studies, the elevation of adverbial participles to sentence level is seen as a systemic transfer operation with consequences on the level of the TL text as a whole. By elevating IE adverbial participial structures, i.e. by converting them into independent sentence units, translators follow a general tendency characterising translations from IE into Hungarian, namely the increase in the number of independent sentence units.

Elevation depends not nearly so much on choice, but rather constitutes a necessity in translating IE **adjectival participles**. Adjectival participles can be very different in terms of predicativity, and they constitute a continuum from adjective-like participles to predicate-like ones. Adjective-like (premodifying) participles rarely compress much information, thus they are rarely elevated to sentence level in the process of translation. Postmodifying participial phrases on the other hand, may have a complex structure, and are supplemented by objects, adverbials, etc. as in the following example:

English ST: Ragmen **struggling** with their great junk-loaded two-wheeled carts, women **selling** breads from baskets in their hands: they all looked. (Doctorow 39)

Hungarian TT: Rongyszedők **küszködtek** púposra rakott nagy kétke-rekű kordéikkal, nők **árultak** kenyeret a karkosarukból; s mind meg-nézték őt. (Göncz 41)

French ST: Il parlait au sergent **assis** à une petite table devant un haut miroir au mur. (Vercors 47)

Hungarian TT: Mondott valamit az őrmesternek, aki egy asztalnál **ült** a magas falitükör előtt. (Rubin 28)

Russian ST: Ih sdulo vetrom, **vletevshim** v komnatu pered nachalom grozi ... (Bulgakov 95)

Hungarian TT: ... szétfújta őket a szél, amely a zivatar kezdete előtt **be-rontott** a szobába. (Szöllősy 137)

The need for the elevation of the above participial phrases is caused by one of the main systemic differences between IE languages and Hungarian, which will be discussed later in more detail: the limited possibilities for **postmodification** in Hungarian. The rules of Hungarian syntax put all the adjectives and adjectival participles **before** the headword. In the case of long strings of adjectives **preposition** has two negative consequences: (1) preposed, left branching constructions tax memory more than postposed ones, (2) preposing necessitate other concomitant obligatory transfer operations (obligatory adjectivisation of all complements), which may distort the functional perspective of the participial phrase. By elevating adjectival participial phrases to clause level, translators can avoid long left branching constructions and at the same time preserve the functional perspective of the sentence.

All the IE participial phrases in the examples above could also be translated by grammatically correct participial phrases into Hungarian. Let us inspect a hypothetical translation of an English **postmodifying** participial phrase by a Hungarian **premodifying** participial phrase: *Ragmen **struggling** with their great junk-loaded two-wheeled carts* → *Púposra rakott nagy kétkerekű kordéikkal **küszködő** rongyszedők* (lit.: with their great junk-loaded two-wheeled carts struggling ragmen). This Hungarian participial phrase contains six words **before** the head noun.

Theoretically, there are no limits to the length and complexity of left branching structures in Hungarian either, but as it was shown by É. Kiss on the basis of an English-Hungarian translational corpus (1980) and also demonstrated by the analysis of our multilingual parallel corpus, the longer the IE postmodifying participial phrases, the more probably they will be elevated in translation to the sentence level, and consequently, they will be translated by independent clauses.

As it was mentioned in connection with adverbial participles, translators apply elevation not only for syntactic reasons. The following example does not contain long strings of postmodifiers, yet elevation does take place. This example is also an apt illustration of our statement concerning the different ways of information packaging. In order to increase the amount of information contained in a sentence, English prefers participial constructions, while Hungarian shows a preference for independent predicative sentence units. In this example, there is a piling of consecutive actions: in the English original they take the form of participial structures, while in the Hungarian translation they become independent sentence units.

English ST: She didn't hear the sounds from below, of a chair **being overturned**, of a door **opening**, of men's feet **running** up the stairs. (Christie 140)

Hungarian TT: Nem is hallotta letről a hangokat, hogy **felborul** egy szék, ajtó **nyílik**, emberek **rohannak** fel a lépcsőn. (Sziójyártó 140)

Commentary: The three phrases of the English sentence are translated by clauses into Hungarian: **felborul egy szék** (lit.: a chair turns over), **ajtó nyílik** (lit.: a door opens), **emberek rohannak fel** (lit.: people run up).

In the above cases, the use of a participle would have been just as acceptable in Hungarian: **felboruló szék**, **nyíló ajtó**, **felrohanó emberek** (lit.: overturned chair, opening door, men running up). As it was argued earlier in connection with adverbial participles, various explanations are possible for the phenomenon. The one given by É. Kiss from the angle of contrastive linguistics is one possibility: "... translators, if they have more than one synonymous Hungarian construction to choose from, tend either to overuse the one that is analogous to the English expression or to neglect it, overcompensating in avoiding interference from the source language" (1980: 66).

The same phenomenon can be evaluated differently from the angle of translation studies. What from a contrastive point of view seems like "avoiding interference from the source language" is seen in translation studies as a conscious translation strategy characteristic of IE-H translation, aimed to increase the number of clauses, that is, independent sentence units in the typical Hungarian way of packaging information.

2.2.2. Elevation of infinitival phrases

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The infinitive is a non-finite verb form having properties of both nouns and verbs. Infinitival phrases are extended infinitival constructions containing an infinitive and its complements and functioning as subject, object, subject complement, object complement, adverbial or attribute. As the category of infinitive can be found both in IE languages and in Hungarian, that is not a case of a missing category. A detailed corpus-based contrastive description of the formal properties and the functioning of English and Hungarian infinitive is given by Stephanides (1980).

On the basis of the analysis of an English-Hungarian corpus, she concludes that “It seems that the use of the infinitive in English is more frequent than in Hungarian” (1980: 140). As our multilingual parallel corpus testifies, all IE languages under investigation use infinitival constructions more frequently than Hungarian. Hungarian translators often transform IE infinitival phrases into clauses in Hungarian.

English ST: I command you not **to touch it**. (Tolkien 147)

Hungarian TT: Megparancsolom nektek, **hogy egy újjal se érjete** hozzá ... (Göncz 149)

French ST: J'ai ainsi vécu seul, **sans personne avec qui parler véritablement** ... (Saint-Exupéry 11)

Hungarian TT: Így éltem magányosan, **anélkül, hogy bárkivel is szót érthettem volna** ... (Rónay 9).

German ST: Ich hatte Mühe, **ruhig zu sprechen**. (von der Grün 13)

Hungarian TT: Minden erőmet össze kellett szednem, **hogy nyugodtan beszéljek**. (Bognár 21)

Russian ST: Anna K idyot ko mne **budit' menya i soobschit'** chto delaetsya v priyomnoy. (Bulgakov 73)

Hungarian TT: Anna K. jön, **hogy felébresszen, és jelentse**, hogy mi a helyzet a rendelőben. (Elbert 63)

The elevation of IE infinitival constructions in IE-H translation can be accounted for partly by syntactic necessity, that is, by the limited complementability of the Hungarian infinitive, and partly by the differences between IE and Hungarian in their ways of information packaging.

The limited complementability of the Hungarian infinitive was shown in a contrastive study of the infinitive in English and Hungarian by Stephanides: the Hungarian infinitive “because of its very strong verbal character ... does not function as an attributive” (1980: 116). The lack of the attributive function means that IE infinitival phrases like: **capacity to recognize, desire to understand, wunsch zu sehen, ugroza arestovtat'** are elevated into clauses in the Hungarian translation by syntactic necessity.

English ST: ...but now he felt an urgent *desire to understand*. (Koestler 204)

Hungarian TT: ...most azonban heves vágyat érzett, *hogy mégiscsak megértse*. (Bart 300)

German ST: Der *Wunsch* Gregors, die Mutter *zu sehen*, ging bald in Erfüllung. (Kafka 154)

Hungarian TT: Gregornak az a vágya, *hogy megláthassa* anyját, nem-sokára teljesült. (Györfly 155)

Russian ST: *Ugroza arestovat'* grazhdan popitavshihsyia prekatit' Styopini paskudstva ... (Bulgakov 127)

Hungarian TT: Fenyegetőzés, *hogy rendőrkézre juttatja* mindazokat, akik megpróbáltak gátat vetni féktelen dorbézolásának ... (Szőlőssy 187)

Since Hungarian syntax does not allow postmodifying infinitive structures of the type *ability to recognise* (lit.: * *képesség felismerni*) or *desire to understand* (lit.: * *vágy megérteni*) type **noun + infinitive** structure, the translator is forced to perform some kind of transfer operation. At this point we have to return to an earlier idea: when one route is closed between languages, there are many others open to translators. When a departure from the SL form is obligatory, a great number of different TL solutions emerge. These “road-blocks” offer interesting insights into the character of the translator’s work. These are the very points where they have to stop for a moment to perform a deeper analysis of the content of the original, carefully weigh the different TL solutions possible, and they have to do this simultaneously.

The **IE noun plus infinitive** constructions constitute such “road blocks” for Hungarian translators. They have to analyse the information “hidden” in the infinitival phrase, because the elevation of the phrase to clause level requires a number of decisions on the part of the translator. The solutions below illustrate how Hungarian translators “unwrap” IE infinitival phrases, and explicate the implied meaning which can be a question, a statement or an appellation.

a) *unwrapping implied questions in an IE infinitival phrase:*

English ST: The maturity of the masses lies in *the capacity to recognize* their own interest. (Koestler 136)

Hungarian TT: A tömegek érettsége abban nyilvánul meg, *hogy képesek-e felismerni* önérdékeiket. (Bart 194)

Commentary: English noun + infinitive is turned into a question in the Hungarian translation: lit.: whether [they] are able to recognise....

b) *unwrapping the implied statement in an IE infinitival phrase:*

English ST: Speaking for my sister and myself: we were born with the capacity and determination *to be utterly happy all the time*. (Vonnegut 74)

Hungarian TT: Ami a nővéremet és engem illet: mi azzal a tehetséggel és elhatározással születtünk, **hogy mindig a legboldogabbak leszünk.** (Borbás 42)

Commentary: English noun + infinitive is turned into a statement in the Hungarian translation: lit.: [we] will be utterly happy all the time.

c) *unwrapping the implied appellation in an IE infinitival phrase:*

English ST: He felt in no state **to continue the argument with Gletkin.** (Koestler 136)

Hungarian TT: Nem érzett magában elég erőt, **hogy folytassa a vitát Gletkinnel.** (Bart 244)

Commentary: English noun+Inf construction is turned into an imperative in the Hungarian translation: lit.: that [he] continues the argument with Gletkin.

It is worth separating **noun-based** and **verb-based infinitive structures**. While noun-based infinitive structures cannot be translated into Hungarian without elevation, as they would result in a syntactically incorrect Hungarian linguistic structure (comp. *remény megtalálni**, *vágy vizionlátni**, etc.), verb-based infinitive structures, on the other hand, are partly translatable without elevation and can be divided from this aspect into three groups: (1) no need for elevation (*el kell menni, szeretnék énekelni, igyekszik rábeszélni*, etc. lit.: I have to leave, I would like to sing, he/she tries to convince him/her), (2) translatable only by elevation, (3) translation without elevation is grammatically correct, but does not correspond to the prevailing norms of contemporary Hungarian usage. After the Hungarian verbs: *ajánl* ('to offer') *javasol* ('to suggest'), *buzdít* ('to encourage'), *elhatároz* ('to decide'), *hisz* ('to believe'), *képzeli* ('to imagine'), *remél* ('to hope'), *kér* ('to ask') the infinitive is possible but has a foreign flavour, a sign of translationese.

German ST: Mühsam **befahl** der Alte, **Hungertobel zu benachrichtigen.** (Dürrenmatt 100)

Hungarian TT: Nagy nehezen **megkérte** Lutzot, **hogy értesítsék** Hungertobelt. (Ungvári 237)

German ST: ... und **beschloss**, aus einem überbordenden Gefühl von Dankbarkeit noch heute nach Notre Dame **hinüberzupilgern** ... (Süskind 143)

Hungarian TT: ... és a túlcorduló hála rohamában **elhatározta, hogy átgyalogol** a Notre-Dame-ba ... (Farkas 105)

In both cases the verb+infinitive structure analogous to German *megkérte értesíteni* (lit.: [he] asked to inform [him]), *elhatározta átgyalogolni* (lit.: [he] decided to walk over) is regarded as translationese in Hungarian, thus elevation is obligatory.

As for the elevation of infinitival phrases, there is less freedom for Hungarian translators as in the previous cases. Because of the limited use of infinitival phras-

es in Hungarian, there is no real choice between retaining the analogous structure or elevating it into an independent clause in the Hungarian. In the case of infinitival phrases elevation is a near-obligatory transfer operation in IE-H translation.

2.3. Elevation of nominal phrases

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Extended noun phrases serve as devices of syntactic compression in all languages under investigation, but IE languages use this device more extensively than Hungarian. A contrastive analysis of English and Hungarian noun phrases can be found in Kenesei (1980), based on the standard version of generative grammar. The author compares the NP-raising in English and Hungarian, which is a “transformation operating on the noun phrases of the embedded sentences, lifting one of them onto the matrix sentence” (1980: 178).

Discussing nominalisation procedures in Hungarian, he points out that “In certain cases, although nominalisation does work in a formal sense, it is much more awkward than an alternative subordinate clause” (1980: 203). In the conclusion of his paper he argues: “NP-raising, a transformation described in early transformational grammars of English, was found to operate in Hungarian too. Although both languages display this transformation as one raising subjects as well as objects of embedded sentences into the matrix sentence, the scope and function of the transformations differ radically in the two languages: it is much more widespread in English than in Hungarian” (1980: 204). Using the terms and methods of early transformational grammar, Kenesei comes to the same conclusion as other authors (Stephanides 1980, É. Kiss 1980) who use the descriptive approaches of traditional structuralism: nominal phrases – like participial and infinitival phrases – are used more extensively in English than in Hungarian.

According to the evidence of our multilingual corpora, the preference for nominal phrases is true for all the IE languages under investigation. However, preference for nominal structures varies even inside the IE group. Comparing the use of text connectors in German and English, Doherty states: “English offers a much greater variety of non-finite structures and probably therefore, does not make as much use of nominal structures as German does” (1987: 212). The strong nominal character of French contrasted with English is emphasised in Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995).

Nevertheless, from the point of view of the Hungarian language, it can be stated that nominal phrases are used more extensively for syntactic compression in IE languages than in Hungarian. The following examples illustrate the elevation of IE extended nominal phrases into clauses in Hungarian:

English ST: The people’s capacity to govern itself is thus proportionate to **the degree of its understanding of the structure and functioning of the whole social body.** (Koestler 136)

Hungarian TT: A népek demokratikus öngazgatási képessége tehát egyenes arányban áll azzal, **hogy az illető nép milyen mértékben értette meg a maga társadalmának szerkezetét és a szerkezet működésének törvényeit.** (Bart 194)

French ST: Le curé refusa l'entrée de l'église à leurs cadavres et sa bénédiction à leurs cercueils. (Maupassant 32)

Hungarian TT: A pap megtiltotta, **hogy holttestüket bevigyék a templomba, és a koporsójukat sem áldotta meg.** (Pór 33)

German ST: ...es gibt überall und jederzeit ... so manche **Unduldsamkeit der Kinder gegen das Eigenleben der Eltern...** (Mann 45)

Hungarian TT: ... mindenütt és mindenkor ... **a gyermekek oly sok türelmetlenséget tanúsítanak szüleik egyéni élete iránt** (Lányi 46)

Russian ST: Trudno skazat' chto imenno podvelo Ivana Nikolaevicha – izobrazitelnaya li sila yevo talanta, ili polnoe **neznakomstvo** s voprosom, po kotoromu on sobralsya pisat'. (Bulgakov 12)

Hungarian TT: Nehéz eldönteni, hogy mi vitte tévútra Ivan Nyikolajevicsét: tehetségének láttató ereje, vagy pedig az a körülmény, **hogy fogalma sem volt a kérdésről, amelyről költeményét írta.** (Szöllősy 9)

The nominal phrases in the above examples are “reduced sentences”, to be elevated to sentence level in the Hungarian translation. Elevation is made necessary partly by the differences in complementability of nominal phrases in IE languages and Hungarian. While IE nouns can be complemented in both directions prepositionally and postpositionally, Hungarian nouns can be complemented almost exclusively prepositionally. Since the possibility of complementation in postposition is unlimited, we can find long right branching structures in IE sentences, as shown in the above examples: English: *the degree of its understanding ... of the whole social body*. German: *Unduldsamkeit der Kinder gegen das Eigenleben der Eltern*, French: *l'entrée de l'église à leurs cadavres et sa bénédiction à leurs cercueils*. Russian: *neznakomstvo s voprosom, po kotoromu on sobralsya pisat'*.

The transformation of IE postmodifiers into premodifiers in Hungarian results in long left branching structures utterly unusual in Hungarian. Theoretically, in Hungarian there are no limitations on the number of words in left branching constructions, but Hungarian authors avoid overburdening the readers' processing capacity, and usually take care not to use too many premodifiers. To avoid the use of lengthy left branching structures is one of the reasons for elevation in translating into Hungarian.

Elevation can be accounted for also by the length of the headword in German nominal phrases (e.g., *Teilnahmslosigkeit, Unvorhergesehenes*.) This phenomenon was discussed in the previous chapter in connection with the division of meaning within the same nominal phrase. In the examples below, German nominal phrases containing long compound nouns as headwords are transformed into clauses in the Hungarian translation.

German ST: Was den guten Pfarrer aber an dem querköpfigen Knaben am meisten erdross, war **seine totale Teilnahmslosigkeit.** (Zweig 10)

Hungarian TT: De a jó páteret főképpen az bosszantotta, **hogy a begyöpösödött fejű fiúból minden érdeklődés hiányzott.** (Fónagy 11) (lit.: But what the good priest was most annoyed with was that the square-head boy lacked all interest.)

German ST: Doch nun ereignete sich etwas *Unvorhergesehenes*. (Zweig 62)

Hungarian TT: A jelenet azonban *nem úgy folytatódott, mint ahogy vártuk*. (Fónagy 63) (lit.: But the scene did not continue in the way we expected.)

The elevation of IE noun phrases is not always motivated by syntactic necessity. Noun phrases **without** long postmodifiers are also often translated by an independent sentence unit into Hungarian.

German ST: "Bileams Esell!" rief erstaunt *bei seiner Rückkehr* der Pfarrer aus ... (Zweig 12)

Hungarian TT: – Bálám szamara! – kiáltott fel meglepetten a lelkész, *amikor visszatért*. (Fónagy 13) (lit: when [he] returned)

German ST: *Nach dem Dienst* ging ich zur Kasse, um mein Gehalt abzuholen. (Böll 257)

Hungarian TT: *Mikor letelt a szolgálatom*, a pénztárhoz mentem, hogy fölvegyem a fizetésemet. (Gergely 41) (lit.: when my service came to its end)

In order to illustrate this form of elevation without syntactic pressure, we shall show both solutions: with elevation and without elevation.

English ST: He seemed to me rather suspect, but I did not yet penetrate *his scheme*. (Koestler 162)

Hungarian TT with elevation: Mindjárt gyanús volt a viselkedése, de nem láttam át, *milyen tervet forgat a fejében*. (Bart 162) (lit.: I did not penetrate what plan he was turning over in his mind.)

Hungarian TT without elevation: Mindjárt gyanús volt a viselkedése, de nem láttam *a tervét*. (hypothetical translation) (lit.: I did not penetrate his scheme.)

English ST: You know *my motives* as well as I do. (Koestler 187)

Hungarian TT with elevation: Maga ugyanolyan jól tudja, *hogy mik voltak az indítékaim*, mint én. (Bart 273) (lit.: You perfectly know, what my motives were.)

Hungarian TT without elevation: Maga éppen olyan jól ismeri az *indítékaimat* mint én. (hypothetical translation) (lit.: You know my motives as well as I do.)

If we look at the English originals, we can see that the noun phrases *his scheme*, *my motives* can hardly be regarded as reduced sentences. The two Hungarian translations – with and without elevation – are equally perfect Hungarian sentences. In elevating the noun phrases into independent clauses the translator followed the **general trend of information packaging** characteristic of Hungarian, the preference of clauses over phrases.

The existence of certain preferences governing translators in their choices between synonymous constructions can be detected in the translation of the following types of noun phrases, too. When portraying a character (face, hair, eyes, etc.) authors of literary works in IE languages frequently use postmodifying prepositional phrases such as English: *with*, French: *avec*, German: *mit*, and Russian: *s*. For example: English: *girl with one stocking coming down*, German: *corpulente Dame mit dicken weißen Locken über den Ohren*. Hungarian translators generally elevate such phrases into independent clauses:

English ST: A man got into a tube train, and there was a *pretty girl with one stocking coming down*. (Greene 126)

Hungarian TT: Egy pasas beszáll a földalattiba, meglát egy csinos lányt, *akinek lecsúszott a harisnyója*. (Borbás 237) (lit.: ... whose stocking had come down)

However, adverbials with the suffix *-val*, *-vel* can also be used in Hungarian for the same purpose and while the necessity of elevation in these cases is handed down from one generation of Hungarian translators to the other as if it were a “rule”, the authors of original Hungarian literary works do not hesitate to use the *-val*, *-vel* suffix in describing characters. These “preference rules”, existing in the different communities of translators, represent a special kind of translational norm, and are followed by translators even more closely than the target-language norms.

Summary comments on grammatical division

Grammatical **division** includes two standard grammatical transfer operations: the **separation** of sentences and the **elevation** of phrases. They are discussed together because both affect the boundaries of the TL sentences. The **separation of sentences** is by and large an **optional** transfer operation. The subject change at clause boundaries may be one reason for separation, but it does not make it obligatory. In general, no difference between the two languages involved in translation would be sufficient in itself to mandate the changing of sentence boundaries in the translation. There is no linguistic system that excludes the construction of a sentence beyond a certain length.

Certain systemic differences may influence the **frequency** of separation, as we have seen in the preceding examples. In general, a change of **sentence** boundaries occurs much more **rarely** than the transfer operation in which the translator changes **clause** boundaries, so that the target-language sentence will have more sentence units than the original. The separation of sentences is a standard transfer operation which is **independent of the language pair and of the direction of the translation**. It is relatively rare, and its occurrence depends on the strategic considerations of individual translators.

The situation is quite different with the **elevation** of participial, infinitival and nominal phrases into independent sentence units. This is a standard transfer operation that **does depend on the language pair and on the direction of the translation**. As we have seen, it occurs in IE-Hungarian translation, too. The reason for elevation can be explained by the differing complementability of IE and Hunga-

rian participial phrases, infinitival phrases and noun phrases, i.e. by systemic differences between the languages. Translators, however, frequently use elevation even when there is no need to do so, and the original sentence could be translated easily, without elevation. In these cases they follow a **language pair specific translation strategy**, that is, a practice of information packaging typical of Hungarian: to increase the amount of information per sentence Hungarian prefers an accumulation of independent clauses rather than the use of syntactic compression.

The elevation of phrases may be explained not only by language pair specific translation strategies but also by one of the **universal translation strategies**, namely, **explicitation**, which means that translators – faced with a choice among several synonymous target-language solutions – are inclined to favour the more explicit ones.

3. Grammatical contraction

By **grammatical contraction** we mean two standard transfer operations: one of them, **conjoining** takes place on the sentence level, while the other, **lowering**, on the level of clauses. Both operations have far-reaching consequences for the TL text as a whole. The **conjoining** of sentences is a standard grammatical transfer operation, whereby two or more sentences in the SL are conjoined into one sentence in the TL. **Lowering** is also a standard grammatical transfer operation whereby SL clauses are reduced to phrases in the TL.

In using the term “lowering”, we follow the Hungarian linguist László Deme (1980), who introduced the terms “sentence level” and “subsentence level” (see previous chapter, GR 2). Here we only refer to his remark on the flexibility of levels in primary text production: the formulation of a message is a process by which the relevance of the information conveyed is constantly monitored, and ends in the elevating or the lowering of the level on which the given piece of information will be represented in the sentence. This is applicable in translation as well: secondary text production is also characterised by a constant weighing of the relevance of the information conveyed. The difference is that in secondary text production the characteristics of the primary text are also taken into consideration. This similarity entitles us to use the terms elevation and lowering also in connection with translation.

In this chapter **conjoining** and **lowering** will be discussed together because both influence **boundaries** in the text: conjoining affects sentence boundaries and lowering affects clause boundaries. Conjoining results in a decrease in the number of sentences, while lowering results in a decrease in the number of clauses.

Subtypes:

- 3.1. Conjoining of sentences (fewer sentences in translation)
- 3.2. Lowering of clauses (fewer clauses in translation)
 - 3.2.1. Lowering of clauses to the level of participial phrases
 - 3.2.2. Lowering of clauses to the level of infinitival phrases
 - 3.2.3. Lowering of clauses to the level of nominal phrases

3.1. Conjoining of sentences (fewer sentences in translation)

Predominant direction: there is no predominant direction

The conjoining of sentences in the process of translation is an optional transfer operation, because no language has restrictions concerning the number of words in a sentence. Consequently, translators rarely change sentence boundaries. In discussing the relativity of sentence boundaries, Doherty points out:

While a good translator will not care about clause boundaries and make use of as many structural changes as may be necessary for a target language adequate translation, he will stick to the sentence boundaries of the original as closely as possible (1992: 72).

Doherty distinguishes three types of strategies influencing sentence boundaries: (1) separation of clauses into independent sentences, (2) conjoining sentences, and (3) the combination of the two strategies. The first strategy was discussed in the previous chapter (GR 2.1), and here we will deal with the second one, namely when two or more sentences of the SL are combined into one sentence in the TL. This operation is called here “conjoining”, using the term suggested by Doherty (1992).

In the previous chapter we gave a detailed description of the reasons which may lead to **separation** of sentences. Interestingly enough, these explanations cannot help when we are looking for the reasons of **conjoining** sentences.

(1) One of the reasons of separation was that, taking into consideration the limited decoding capacity of the TL readers, translators chop up SL sentences, which are too long. Obviously, readability difficulties of TL readers cannot justify the opposite operation, i.e., the conjoining of sentences.

(2) Another reason for separation was that in the process of translation long sentences sometimes, so to say, “split up” automatically, and starting a new sentence seems to be the most natural solution. Obviously, we cannot state that in the process of translation too short sentences are automatically conjoined.

Nevertheless, certain differences in cohesive ties linking two sentences in a paragraph may present a challenge to sentence boundaries, and conjoining may seem desirable, though not obligatory, of course.

The most frequent reason for conjoining two sentences can be found in the different character of **subject identification** in Hungarian and in IE languages. The subject identification ability of conjugated Hungarian verbs (see GR1.2) has sentence level and text level consequences. On the sentence level, it means that Hungarian sentences can be formulated without explicit subjects. On the text level, it means that reference to the same subject can be maintained through more than one subsequent sentence without mentioning the subject again. In IE languages, the beginning of a new sentence requires a new subject. In translating from Hungarian into IE languages the monotonous repetition of the same subject can be avoided by conjoining the sentences.

Three sentences in Hungarian with the same implicit subject → one sentence in English and German:

Hungarian ST: (1) Még egy kávéfőzött. (2) *Lesétált a partra.* (3) *Megkereste a csónakost.* (Örkény 1. 223)
(lit: (1) [He] made himself another cup of coffee. (2) [He] walked down to the shore of the nearby lake. (3) [He] looked for the boatman).

English TT: (1) *He made himself another cup of coffee, then walked down to the shore of the nearby lake to look for the old boatman.* (Sollosy 61)

German ST: (1) Er kochte noch einen Fekete, **spazierte zum Ufer hinunter und suchte den Bootsführer.** (Thies 2. 20)

Two sentences in Hungarian with the same implicit subject → one sentence in Russian:

Hungarian ST: (1) Leült a szálló előtti uzsonnázóasztalok egyikéhez.
(2) **Itt nagy búsan egy málnaszörpöt szívogatott.** (Rejtő 27)
(lit.: (1) [She] sat down to one of the breakfast tables in front of the hotel. (2) There [she] was sipping sadly a raspberry soda.)

Russian TT: (1) Annet sela za stolik nedaleko ot vhoda **i prinyalas' pechal'no podtyagivat' cherez solominku limonad.** (Aleksandrov 19)
(lit.: (1) [She] sat down to one of the breakfast tables in front of the hotel and began to sip sadly a raspberry soda.)

The next reason for conjoining sentences in translation is to be found in the different possibilities of constructing **elliptical sentences**. Ellipsis, i.e. the deletion of certain elements of the sentence, is a cohesive device. The possibilities of constructing elliptical sentences vary from one language to another depending on their morphology and syntax. Since Hungarian marks the possessive relationship doubly, that is, not only on the possessor (as in IE languages) but also on the possessed noun, the possessor is not always repeated. Hungarian sentences beginning with the possessed noun without mentioning the possessor are obligatorily either complemented in IE languages (see chapter GR 4.4) or conjoined to the previous sentence.

Two sentences in Hungarian → one sentence in German:

Hungarian ST: (1) Bölcs és becsületes ember. (2) **A szíve arany.** (Gárdonyi 5)
(lit.: (1) [He] [is] a clever and honest man. (2) [His] heart [is] gold – his is implied by the suffix *-e*).

German TT: (1) Ein weiser und ehrlicher Mann, **mit einem Herzen aus Gold.** (Weissling 5)
(lit.: (1) [He] [is] a clever and honest man with a heart of gold.)

The conjoining of sentences may also be the consequence of two grammatical replacements characteristic of H-IE translation: nominalisation and depredicativisation (see GR 7.4.2, 7.5.2).

In the case of short sentences, the transformation of a SL verb into a noun in the TL (nominalisation) or the transformation of SL predicate into adverbs and attributes in the TL (depredicativisation) may abolish the independence of the sentence, and it is naturally conjoined with the previous sentence:

Two sentences in Hungarian → one sentence in English:

Hungarian ST: (1) Nemsokára jön be Julis. (2) **Hozza a mosdótálat, forró benne a víz.** (Csáth 38)

(lit.: (1) Soon Julis comes in. (2) [She] brings the basin, the water is hot in it.)

English TT: (1) Soon Juli comes in **with hot water in the basin.** (Kessler 60)

Three sentences in Hungarian → one sentence in English:

Hungarian ST: (1) Künn nyílik a konyhaajtó. (2) **Bejő Juliska.** (3) **Egy tálcán hozza a kancsót és a poharakat.** (Csáth 39)

(lit.: (1) The kitchen door opens. (2) Juliska comes in. (3) [She] brings the decanter and glasses on a tray.)

English TT: (1) The kitchen door opens **and Juli comes out with a decanter and glasses on a tray.** (Kessler 61)

Two sentences in Hungarian → one sentence in French:

Hungarian ST: (1) Lukács mély és kábult álomba merült. (2) **Másnap karikás szemmel és erős fejfájással jelent meg a hivatalában.** (Örkény 1. 59)

(lit.: (1) Lukács fell into a deep sleep. (2) The next day he appeared at the office with a splitting headache and circles under the eyes.)

French TT: (1) Après douze heures de sommeil profond, **Kopp-Lukacs arriva au bureau le lendemain, les yeux cernés, le crâne endolori.** (Tardos 65)

In the above cases we illustrated conjoining by citing examples from H-IE translations, but the conjoining of sentences is not a language pair specific operation, and cannot always be explained by language specific reasons. As our corpus testifies, there is an **operational asymmetry** between separation and conjoining. Separation seems to be a more frequent operation than conjoining. As separation of sentences may be regarded as a kind of explicitation, the predominance of separation over conjoining may provide additional proof for the universal character of explicitation.

3.2. Lowering of phrases (fewer clauses in translation)

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

So far we have analysed cases in which translators conjoined two or more sentences, a rather less frequent operation than the one in which the boundaries of **clauses and phrases** are changed, leading to TL sentences with fewer independent sentence units than the original.

Hungarian ST: two independent sentence units

(1) Nagymama a konyhába *siet*. (2) Magával *viszi* a kamrakulcsot.
(Csáth 38)

(lit.: (1) Grandma scurries to the kitchen. (2) [She] takes with her the pantry-keys.

English TT: one independent sentence unit

(1) Grandma *scurries* to the kitchen with the pantry-keys. (Kessler 61)

Hungarian ST: two independent sentence units

(1) Azt *várta*, (2) hogy most valami csoda *fog történni*. (Kosztolányi 23)

(lit.: (1) [He] waited, (2) that a miracle will happen.)

German TT: one independent sentence unit

(1) Er *wartete* auf ein Wunder. (Koriath 135)

(lit.: (1) He was waiting for a miracle.)

The Hungarian sentences contain **two** predicates: *siet* ('to scurry'), *viszi* ('to take') *vár* ('to wait'), *történik* ('to happen'), while in the translations there is only **one** (English: *scurries*, German: *wartete*). The number of predicates, and consequently, of independent sentence units is **reduced** in the process of translation, because one of the two sentence level units was **lowered** to sub sentence level.

The contraction of clauses (sentence level units), that is, the lowering of some of them into phrases (subsentence level units) is one of the most characteristic transfer operations in the process of H-IE translation.

The formal explanation of this phenomenon is based on frequency differences: as demonstrated by Klaudy (1987) on the basis of non-translational comparative analyses, the number of sentence level units is significantly **lower** in the IE sentences than in Hungarian, consequently the number of independent sentence units is bound to **be reduced** in the process of H-IE translation, otherwise the result would be a quasi-correct TL text (translationese).

The functional explanation is based on the language specific structuring of information as "new", "old", "important", and "less important", that is, on **information hierarchy**. To distinguish important information from less important, IE languages use the clause-phrase opposition, while Hungarian sentences consist mainly of independent clauses, and information hierarchy is indicated by other means (conjunctions, demonstrative pronouns, relative pronouns, word order, etc.). From this angle lowering is a means of preserving the information hierarchy of a Hungarian sentence in the process of translating it into an IE language.

3.2.1. Lowering of clauses to the level of participial phrases

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

As mentioned in chapter GR 2.2.1, participial constructions in IE languages serve as a means of “syntactic compression” or “reduction of sentences” (Doherty 1987), and are “embedded sentences” or “abbreviated clauses” (D. Stephanides 1980). They help to increase the quantity of information per sentence. IE languages take advantage of this device to a greater extent than Hungarian.

In Hungarian, the increase in the amount of information per sentence is achieved by increasing the number of independent clauses (sentence level units) rather than by compression or reduction. If translators want to preserve the functional perspective of the sentence, the number of sentence level units must be reduced in the process of H-IE translation. One kind of lowering is the transformation of Hungarian clauses into participial phrases in IE.

Hungarian ST: Azon kapom magam, **hogy régi ismerősöket látogatok meg**, visszamegyek olyan helyekre, ahol először sem éreztem jól magam. (Karinthy 285)

(lit.: [I] find myself that [I] **visit** old acquaintances, [I] return to places, where [I] had never felt at ease.)

English TT: Instead I caught myself **revisiting old acquaintances** and places, where I had never felt at ease. (Barker 28)

Hungarian ST: – Hohó megállj csak! – futott utána Kopereczky **és megcsípte a folyosón**. (Mikszáth 32)

(lit.: Hi there! ran Kopereczky after [him] and caught [him] in the corridor.)

French TT: – Holà, attends donc! – courut après lui Kopereczky, **le rattrappant dans le couloir**. (Körössy 36)

The different types of participial constructions (adverbial and adjectival) represent different degrees of compression. While **adverbial** participial constructions (see above) barely conceal the predicate, and virtually function as independent sentence units, **adjectival** participial structures represent a greater degree of lowering.

Hungarian ST: **A Duna Cipőgyár minőségi ellenőrei azonnal a helyszínre siettek**, és megállapították, hogy a föld méhéből érkező teniszcipők teljesen megfelelnek az előírásoknak. (Örkény 1. 215)

German TT: **Die sofort an Ort und Stelle geeilten Gütekontrolleure der Duna-Schuhfabrik** stellten fest, dass die aus dem Innern der Erde kommenden Tennisschuhe völlig den Vorschriften entsprechen. (Thies 1. 70–71)

Since lowering in H-IE translation is not an obligatory operation and affects only some clauses, the question arises whether there is any regularity in the alternation of clauses and phrases in IE sentences. As our corpus testifies, the lowering of

clauses into participial phrases often takes place at the beginning and at the end of the sentences. In the previous chapter we spoke about the “vault-shaped” architecture that complex IE sentences represent: introductory information is often expressed by phrases (ascending part), the most important information is expressed by clauses, and at the end of the sentence we find phrases again (descending part). Participial phrases in IE sentences help to preserve the information hierarchy which in Hungarian was expressed by other means. The following examples illustrate the function of the participial phrases (lowered to the subsentence level in the process of translation) in providing the ascending part of the IE sentences (*walking away, forgetting*).

Hungarian ST: Zsolozsmai, ahelyett, hogy gyorsan *odébbállt volna*, fél-szegen *kalapot emelt*. (Örkény 1. 209)

(lit.: Zsolozsmai did not walk away quickly, but [he] awkwardly tipped [his] hat instead.)

English TT: Instead of *walking away*, in his embarrassment Zsolozsmai shyly *tipped* his hat. (Sollosy 49)

Hungarian ST: Zavarában *elfelejtette*, hogy egyszer már köszönt, és ezért másodszor is *megemelte* a kalapját. (Örkény 1. 209)

(lit.: In [his] embarrassment [he] forgot, that [he] once already greeted [her] and therefore once again [he] tipped [his] hat.)

English TT: Then, *forgetting* he had already done so, he *tipped* it again. (Sollosy 49)

In the next examples the lowering of clauses into phrases happens at the end of the sentence, providing the “descending part” of the IE sentence.

Hungarian ST: Eközben Lukácsból elpárolgott a düh, *sőt valami bűn-bánatféle foglalta el a helyét*. (Örkény 1. 57)

(lit.: In the meantime the rage evaporated from Lukács, and even some kind of remorse took its place.)

Russian TT: Tem vremenem u Lukacha isparilsya gnev, *ustupiv mesto rasskayaniyu*. (Voronkina 1. 285)

(lit.: In the meantime the rage evaporated from Lukács, even some kind of remorse taking its place.)

Hungarian ST: Az Operaház művészkapujánál váltunk el egymástól, *miután nagyon sokáig és nagyon melegen búcsúzkodtunk*. (Örkény 1. 197)

(lit.: We parted at the artists’ entrance of the Opera House, after we took farewell for a long time warmly.)

Russian TT: U sluzhebnovo vkhoda opernovo teatra mi rasstalis’, *dolgo i zadushevno proshchayas’*. (Voronkina 1. 285)

(lit.: We parted at the artists’ entrance of the Opera House, after taking farewell for a long time warmly.)

3.2.2. Lowering of clauses to the level of infinitival phrases

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian** → **into IE**

As mentioned in chapter GR 3.2.1 the preservation of the functional perspective of the sentence requires a radical restructuring of the information hierarchy in H-IE translation: the number of independent, sentence level units must be reduced by lowering clauses into phrases. Besides participial constructions (discussed in GR 3.2.1.) infinitival constructions also serve as one of the means of lowering sentence level elements in Hungarian texts into subsentence level elements in IE texts.

While the elevation of infinitival phrases into independent sentence units in IE-H translation (discussed in GR 2.2.3) was partly an obligatory transfer operation, the lowering of independent sentence units into infinitival phrases is not obligatory. In general, a corresponding TL sentence can be constructed without lowering, thus in choosing the more compressed form translators are guided by the characteristic features of information packaging in IE languages.

In the case of optional operations, it is very difficult to identify places in the SL sentences where the operation will most probably take place (that is, to separate SL-based subgroups) because translators' decisions are influenced not by the SL form (there are no "road-blocks" in the SL sentence) but the syntactic possibilities of the TL, and the habitual ways of information packaging in TL texts.

On the basis of our corpora, we were able to identify two features that may trigger the lowering of H clauses into IE infinitival phrases. One is meaning-based: Hungarian *hogy* ('that') clauses of **purpose** and goal are often transformed into infinitival phrases in IE sentences.

Hungarian ST: Ennélfogva, ajkára holmi idétlen mosolyt erőltetve feléjük közeledett, *hogy letelepedjék az első padba.* (Kosztolányi 24)

German TT: Folglich näherte er sich ihnen, ein krampfhaft-albernes Lächeln auf den Lippen, *um sich in der ersten Bank niederzulassen.* (Koriath 136)

Hungarian ST: Össze akarom állítani életem aktáit, *mielőtt még egyszer elaludnék.* (Babits 5)

French TT: Je dois impérativement rassamblar les écrits essentiels de mon existence, *avant de m'endormir une fois encore.* (Leully-Szende 13)

Another feature is the position that the clause occupies in the sentence: the lowering of H clauses into IE infinitival phrases is frequently found at the end of the H sentence, in the so called "descending part".

Hungarian ST: Az lesz a legokosabb, ha *bevillamosozik* a városba, *megveszi* a sonkát, és ugyanazzal az átszállóval *hazamegy.* (Örkény 1. 56)

English TT: He had better *take a tram* into the City, *buy* the ham and *use* the transfer ticket *to go home.* (Sollosy 51)

Hungarian ST: Annyi csomagja *volt*, hogy *eldobta* az átszállójegyét, és taxin *ment* haza. (Örkény 1. 59)

English TT: He *ended up* with so many packages, *he decided to discard* his transfer ticket *and take* a cab home. (Sollosy 53)

3.2.3. Lowering of clauses to the level of nominal phrases

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian** → **into IE**

Besides participial phrases (GR 3.2.1) and infinitival phrases (GR 3.2.2), nominal phrases also serve as a device for lowering sentence level elements in Hungarian texts into subsentence level elements in IE texts.

The transformation of clauses into nominal phrases is the ultimate level of lowering, i.e. it represents the greatest degree of compression or reduction. The different means of lowering represent a different degree of departure from the original clause: adverbial participles and infinitival phrases are very close to clauses, and preserve more of the verbal force than phrases with adjectival participles or nominal phrases.

While the limited complementability of Hungarian nouns often makes the elevation of nominal phrases obligatory in IE-H translation (GR 2.2.3), the lowering of H clauses into IE nominal phrases is generally not an obligatory transfer operation. It is performed by translators in order to preserve the functional perspective of the sentence. Though sentences consisting only of clauses with finite verbs are possible in IE, and the function of indicating information hierarchy could rely entirely on conjunctions or relative pronouns and adverbs, as in Hungarian, IE sentences of such structure would become “too much fragmented”. IE languages prefer to indicate information hierarchy by the clause/phrase relationship.

In the following example, two sentence level units of the Hungarian text are lowered, that is, transformed into a nominal phrase.

Hungarian ST: A Vörös Ökör kisharangja a tetőn lévő fatornyocskában dallamosan **gingallózott**, jelezve, hogy nyolc óra és mindjárt **kezdődik** a tanítás. (Kosztolányi 29)

German TT: Die kleine Glocke des “Roten Ochsen” in ihrem hölzernen Dachtürmchen verkündete **mit silberhellem Geläut** die achte Stunde und somit **den Beginn des Unterrichts**. (Koriath 137)

Commentary: Hungarian: **gingallózik** (‘to toll’) → German: **mit silberhellem Geläut** (‘with silvery bell-ringing’); Hungarian: **kezdődik** (‘to begin’) → German: **den Beginn des Unterrichts** (‘the beginning of the classes’).

German offers favourable conditions for lowering independent sentence units into nominal phrases and its long compound nouns may compress whole clauses of the original Hungarian text.

Hungarian ST: ... olyan mozdulatokkal jön-megy a szobában, **mintha némafilmben játszana**. (Palotai 6)

German TT: ... **wie ein Stummfilmstar** bewegt sie sich im Zimmer auf und ab. (Dira 5)

Commentary: Hungarian: **mintha némafilmben játszana** (‘as she was playing in a silent film’) → German: **wie ein Stummfilmstar** (‘like a silent film star’).

Summary comments on grammatical contraction

Grammatical **contraction** includes two standard grammatical transfer operations: the **conjoining** of sentences and the **lowering** of phrases. They are discussed together as both affect the boundaries of TL sentences.

The **conjoining of sentences** is by and large an **optional transfer operation**. The differences in cohesive devices (reference to the subject, ellipsis) may justify the conjoining of two sentences in the TL but do not make it obligatory. In general, no difference between the two languages involved in translation would be sufficient in itself to mandate the changing of sentence boundaries in the translation. The conjoining of sentences is a standard transfer operation, which is **independent of the language pair and of the direction of the translation**. It is relatively rare, and its occurrence depends on the strategic considerations of individual translators.

The situation is quite different with the **lowering** of independent Hungarian clauses into IE participial, infinitival and nominal phrases. This is a standard transfer operation that does **depend on the language pair and on the direction of the translation**. It occurs first of all in Hungarian-IE translation, in order to preserve the functional perspective of the original.

If contraction is compared with division (GR 2), an interesting **operational asymmetry** can be detected between **division** (separation and elevation) in the IE-H direction and **contraction** (conjoining and lowering) in the H-IE direction. On the basis of our corpora, we can state that translators prefer separation (more sentences in the TL) and elevation (more clauses in the TL) to conjoining (fewer sentences in TL) and lowering (fewer clauses in the TL). The fact that translators – faced with a choice of several synonymous target-language solutions – are inclined to favour the more explicit ones, may be a proof of the **universal** character of **explicitation** strategies.

4. Grammatical addition

Grammatical addition is a standard transfer operation whereby new grammatical (functional) elements that cannot be found in the SL text appear in the TL text. While **lexical** additions, as discussed earlier, were mandated by the differing background knowledge of the readers, **grammatical** additions are imposed on the translators by the syntactic differences between languages.

The differences in syntactic possibilities are partly related to the problem of so-called **interlingual asymmetry** (Gak in Zlateva 1993) or to use another term, **missing categories**. Certain grammatical categories (gender, number, case, article, prepositions, postpositions, verbal prefixes, separable verbal prefixes, definite conjugation) exist in one language, but not in the other. If we translate into a language which has “plus” categories, translators will use additions, and where there are “minus” categories, translators will make omissions.

Another reason for grammatical additions may be that although a grammatical category does exist in both languages (e.g. the personal pronoun in both IE languages and Hungarian), it has **different functions** and different rules govern its use in the two languages.

Additions are extensively discussed in earlier taxonomies, too. In their glossary of translation techniques, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) use the term **amplification** (Fr: amplification): “The translation technique whereby a target-language unit requires more words than the source language to express the same idea.” (1995: 339), and **supplementation** (Fr: étoffement): “The translation technique of adding lexical items in the target language which are required by its structure and which are absent in the source languages. Supplementation is a special case of amplification” (1995: 350). **Additions** are also among the three main techniques of adjustment mentioned by Nida (1964), with the following subtypes: *a*) filling out elliptical expressions, *b*) obligatory specification, *c*) additions required by grammatical restructuring, *d*) amplification from implicit to explicit status, *e*) answers to rhetorical questions, *f*) classifiers, *g*) connectives, *h*) categories of the receptor language, *i*) doublets (Nida 1964: 227–231). In these taxonomies the lexical and grammatical additions are handled together. We shall discuss them separately, dealing only with grammatical additions in this chapter.

Grammatical additions are almost exclusively consequences of “syntactic necessity”. Something has to be added to the sentence in order to obtain a grammatically correct sentence. The question arises again: why deal with these operations if they are obligatory? The answer is that, as it was pointed out earlier, the need to carry out an operation does not exclude choice: very often the translator has several different options available. As the elements to be inserted are not neutral linguistic devices, which have only function but no meaning, the additions may require conscious decision-making on the part of translators.

Subtypes:

- 4.1. Addition of “adjectivisers” in left-branching constructions
- 4.2. Addition of missing subject
- 4.3. Addition of missing object
- 4.4. Addition of possessive determiners
- 4.5. Filling the gap in elliptical sentences
- 4.6. Addition of text-organising elements
- 4.7. Addition of text connectors

4.1. Addition of “adjectivisers” in left-branching constructions

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

In IE languages noun phrases can be complemented both postpositionally and prepositionally, while in Hungarian the possibilities of postmodification are strongly limited. Postmodifying adverbial attributes can stand after the noun only in titles (*Darkness at noon* → *Sötétség délben*) or at the end of the sentence. Otherwise all modifiers in Hungarian must come **before** the noun. The principle of “left branching” in Hungarian noun phrases is one of the main systemic differences between IE and Hungarian, with far-reaching consequences not only on the level of sentences but on the level of the text as well, influencing the production of both original and translated Hungarian texts. As this systemic difference generally triggers a chain of consequent (obligatory and optional) operations, it will be referred to several times in this part of the book.

As a consequence of the “left branching” principle, “**left-positioning**” is one of the characteristic transfer operations in IE-H translation. Left-positioning is not merely a change in position: moving an item to this position will automatically lead to change in word-class and/or function: adverbials must turn into adjectives. For this purpose special auxiliary elements, that is, “adjectivisers” are inserted into the Hungarian sentence. Here we call “adjectivisers” several Hungarian adjectival participles formed of semantically empty or weak Hungarian verbs: *való* (‘being’), *lévő* (‘being’), *történő* (‘happening’) *folyó* (‘going on’). Their function is to “adjectivise” the adverbial attributes, making them able to stay in the left-branching side of the Hungarian noun phrase.

English ST: Miss Amelia and the *men on the porch* neither answered his greeting nor spoke. They only looked at him. (McCullers 16)

Hungarian TT: Miss Amelia és a *verandán levő férfiak* nem köszöntek vissza, s nem is szóltak semmit. Csak nézték. (Szász 17) (lit.: on the porch *being* men)

French ST: *La traversée du lac* avait été imaginée peut-être pour rappeler le *Voyage a Cythère* de Watteau. (Nerval 38)

Hungarian TT: A *tavon való átkelésnek*, gondolom, Watteau *Utazás Küttérébe* című képét kellett megelevenítenie. (Brodzsky 39) (lit.: over the lake *being* crossing)

German ST: Leid tat es aber Karl, dass er *die Sachen im Koffer* noch kaum verwendet hatte ... (Kafka 18)

Hungarian TT: De Karl fájlalta, hogy alig használta *a bőröndben lévő holmikat* ... (Györfly 19) (lit.: in the luggage *being* things)

The above “empty” adjectival participles in Hungarian *való*, *lévő* (lit.: being) serve as mere functional elements, and they do not add anything to the meaning of the sentence. The number of such empty “adjectivisers” is rather limited, and they are rarely used in original Hungarian literary texts. Being aware of this fact, translators try to avoid empty adjectivisers and use participles derived from verbs with rich semantic content.

English ST: Liz took her coat off *the peg on the kitchen wall* and they went out the door. (Hemingway 190)

Hungarian TT: Liz levette kabátját *a konyhafalra szegezett fogasról*, és kiléptek az ajtón (Szász 191) (lit.: on the kitchen wall *nailed* peg)

French ST: Je vous l'avouerais, je suis attiré par ces *créatures tout d'une pièce*. (Camus 8)

Hungarian TT: Engem mindig is vonzottak, bevallom, *az egy fából faragott lények*. (Szávai 327) (lit.: from the same wood *carved* creatures)

The frequent use of the empty adjectivisers *való* (‘being’), *lévő* (‘being’) and *történő* (‘happening’, ‘going on’) is a characteristic feature of Hungarian scientific prose or official documents, but not of literary texts. In non-translated Hungarian literary texts the frequency of empty adjectivisers is low, because authors construct their sentences so that they simply do not need this device (they instinctively avoid producing long strings of premodifiers). If they do need adjectivisers, they prefer to use semantically rich ones (see *szegezett* [‘nailed’] or *faragott* [‘carved’]). In translated Hungarian literary texts under the influence of long strings of postmodifiers in the IE original, empty adjectivisers are generally overrepresented, which, on the level of the whole text may lead to a quasi-correct TL text (i.e. “translationese”). Using semantically rich adjectivisers, translators try to avoid this form of translationese.

4.2. Addition of missing subject

Predominant direction: bi-directional but not recursive operation. The reasons for the addition of the missing subject are different in IE-H and in H-IE translation.

Additions frequently occur at the **beginning of sentences**. The beginning of a sentence is a very sensitive place from the point of view of text cohesion. In continuous texts, the beginning of a sentence generally **refers back** to the preceding sentence(s). This anaphoric function can be fulfilled by various different devices. Pronouns are especially important as cohesive devices because, in addition to referring back to the previous sentence(s), they also identify the subject. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, Hungarian personal pronouns cannot fulfil

this function because (1) they are not marked for gender and (2) they may be absent from, with the conjugated verb fulfilling the function of subject identification. Naturally, the personal pronouns that are “missing” from Hungarian text must be added in the IE translation.

Hungarian ST: Különben derék szál legény **volt**, magas, daliás, feltűnő piros arccal, hetyke bajusszal. **Nem volt** más hibája, csak hogy **sántított** egy kicsit. (Mikszáth 11)

English TT: **He was** a fine-looking man; tall, gallant, with a conspicuously red face, and a dashing mustache. Physically, **he was** a perfect specimen, except that **he limped** a little. (Sturges 11)

Hungarian ST: **Lejött** a dobogóról. A kisfiú mellé **állt**. **Megsimogatta** arcát lány, bagószagú kezével. (Kosztolányi 31)

German TT: **Er kam** vom Katheder herunter. **Er stellte** sich neben den kleinen Jungen. **Er streichelte ihm** die Wangen mit seiner weichen, tabakduftenden Hand. (Koriath 139)

Hungarian ST: A kapu alatt felbont mindent, és a zsebébe gyúri. **Kezdi** az ementálin, vastag darabokra **töri le**, bent a zsebben, és hirtelen dugja a szájába, majd megfűl, kivörösödik. (Karinthy 45)

French TT: Sous la porche, **il** défilait tous ses paquets et en fourre le contenu dans ses poches. **Il commence** par l'émenthal, **il en casse** de gros morceaux, dans le fond de sa poche, et les enfourne en vitesse, **il s'étouffe** presque, s'empourpre. (Gal 48)

In the previous chapter, we analysed this phenomenon from the point of view of gender specification. Here we analyse it from a wider angle: that is, the need for the presence of a grammatical subject in the sentence. As in Hungarian the conjugated verb is able to identify the agent, Hungarian sentences do not have to contain explicit subjects. In IE languages, a sentence must contain some kind of a subject, even though there are considerable differences within the group of IE languages with respect to conjugational patterns. In the examples below, the function of the inserted pronouns is not gender specification, but provision of a grammatical subject in the subject slot of the sentence.

Hungarian ST: Jöttek-mentek. Fölszálltak, leszálltak. (Kosztolányi 232)

German TT: **Die Leute** kamen und gingen, stiegen aus und ein. (Buschmann 141)

French TT: **On** allait, **on** venait, **on** montait, **on** descendait. (Komoly 227)

In addition to personal pronouns, names of characters (first name, family name, nickname etc.), or their profession or affiliation can also be used to fill in the subject slot in H-IE translation (*Jutka, Panni, le militaire*).

Hungarian ST: Példás háziasszony volt, maga vásárolt, takarított és mosott ... (Örkény 1. 55)

English TT: **Jutka** was the perfect housewife. **She** did all the shopping herself. **She** cooked, did the dishes, cleaned the house and took care of the laundry ... (Sollosy 50)

Hungarian ST: De nem bírta megállni. Éreztetni akarta az embereivel is, a vendégeivel is, hogy ki ő. (Móricz 420)

German TT: Aber **Panni** konnte nicht widerstehen. **Sie** wollte ihre Leute und auch den Gast fühlen lassen, dass **sie** hier die Herrin war. (Engl 39)

Hungarian ST: Borúsna látszott. (Örkény 2. 227)

German TT: **Le militaire** avait l'air sombre. (Zarmeba 25)

The different problems of denomination were discussed in detail in the chapter about specification and we shall raise here only one controversial point in subject selection: does the translator have the right to name a character earlier than the author of the original does? In the first two paragraphs of a short story by István Örkény *Az utolsó vonat* (The last train), we do not know anything about the character: neither his name nor his profession. It is only in the third paragraph that it becomes clear that he is an army lieutenant. But neither the Russian nor the German translator was in a position to wait that long, so they used the information which is given by the author only in the third paragraph already in the second sentence of the story.

Hungarian ST: A hegyekben olykor-olykor felbrummogott a tüzérség; moraja végighullott a tömegben, átrendezte és még összébb sűrítette rézecskeit, mint vízhullámok a parti fővényt.

Egy fűcsomóval **megtisztogatta csizmáját**, aztán leereszkedett a medereken. (Örkény 3. 311)

German TT: In den Bergen donnerte in längeren Abständen die Artillerie; ihr Getöse durchflutete die Menschenmenge, grupperte sie um und verdichtete sie noch mehr, so wie die Meereswogen den Uferstand. **Der Leutnant reinigte seine Stiefel** mit einem Grasbüschel und kletterte dann den Abhang hinunter. (Thies 3. 64)

Russian TT: ... Пучком травы **leytenant schistil gryaz' s sapog** i spustilsya po krutomu sklonu v niz'. (Voronkina 2. 15)

The addition of a subject may also be necessary in the opposite direction. As the use of a (kind of) passive voice in Hungarian is extremely rare, it is difficult to compose impersonal sentences such as *And a tray was soon brought* or *There was no more to be heard from the other room*. In such cases Hungarian translators have to find a noun (animate or inanimate) which can play the role of subject: **Barbara** (proper name), **nesz** ('noise') see below. This topic will be discussed in depth in the chapter on grammatical replacements and on passive-active transformation (GR 7).

English ST: And a tray was soon brought. (Ch. Brontë 92)

Hungarian TT: **Barbara** csakhamar visszajött a tálcával. (Ruzitska 95)

English ST: There was no more to be heard from the other room.
(Greene 434)

Hungarian TT: A másik szobából már nem hallatszott **nesz**. (Prekop 261)

4.3. Addition of missing object

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The syntactic realisation of the object in Hungarian is greatly influenced by a distinctive feature of the Hungarian language, the existence of **definite and indefinite conjugation**. In Hungarian, different verb forms are used depending on whether the verb has an object or not, and whether the object is definite or indefinite. This distinction does not exist in the IE languages under investigation. In Hungarian the definite conjugation makes it possible to construct sentences without explicit objects. In translating into IE languages, in which the verbs cannot fulfil the function of object-identification, the “missing” object must be added, or, in other words, the implicit object must be made explicit.

Hungarian ST: Vadakat ettek, ha **lőttek**, és halakat, ha a Vágban **fogtak**.
(Mikszáth 20)

English TT: They lived like the nomad tribes: on game if they managed **to shoot any**, and on fish from the Vág if they managed **to catch any**.
(Sturgess 23)

Hungarian ST:

– Egyszer már adtam neked száz forintot kölcsön. Emlékszel?

– De hisz **megadtam**. (Mikszáth 12)

French TT:

– Je t’ai prêté autrefois cent florins. T’en souviens-tu?

– Mais **je les ai remboursés**. (Körössy 15)

Hungarian ST: Születésnapodra azt kívánom ... **szeretnélek boldognak látni** ... kiegyensúlyozottnak. (Palotai 15)

German TT: Zu deinem Geburtstag wünsche ich dir ... **ich möchte dich glücklich sehen** ... ausgeglichen. (Dira 12)

Hungarian ST: Egy kis papírgombóc gurult melléje. **Fölvette, kihajtogatta**. (Molnár 5)

Russian TT: K nogam yevo podkatilsya bumazhniy sarik. **On podnyal yevo, razvernul**. (Rossiyanov 7)

The “vacant” place of the object which has to be “filled in” in the IE sentences gives translators room for manoeuvre, instead of neutral elements (such as pronouns) they can also add other, more specific elements.

Hungarian ST: – Még most sem tudod? Legjobb lenne magnóra venni. S ha újra kérded, **lejátszom**. ... (Palotai 14)

German TT: “Weißt du es noch immer nicht? Es wäre das beste, alles auf

Tonband aufzunehmen. Und wenn du wieder fragst, *spiele ich dir eine Antwort vor*. (Dira 11)

Hungarian ST: A kapu alatt felbont mindent, és a zsebébe gyűri. (Karinthy 45)

French TT: Sous le porche, il déficelle tous des paquets et en *fourre le contenu dans ses poches*. (Gal 48)

Hungarian ST: – Aki a Hyperiont írta – magyarázta dr. KHG. Nagyon szeretett *magyarázni*. (Örkény I. 39)

French TT: – L’auteur du roman *Hyperion*, expliqua le professeur K.H.G. qui aimait toujours *éclairer les gens*. (Tardos 3.69.)

Hungarian ST: Azzal úgy *bekapta*, hogy még a kisujja sem látszott ki. (Illyés 7)

Russian TT: I *proglotila* nenasitnaya utroba *bednyakovuyu zhenu*, da tak lovko, chto i mizintsa ot neyo ne ostalos’ (Voronkina 7)

As the addition of the missing object is an **obligatory** transfer operation in H-IE translation, necessary for the production of a grammatically correct TL sentence, translators perform it automatically. This does not hold, however, in reverse. In translating into Hungarian, the omission of the object is not automatic, the “traces” of the IE object can be easily detected in translated Hungarian texts. This is not a grammatical error, but carries a taste of foreignness.

4.4. Addition of possessive determiners

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

Possessive determiners must often be added in the TL text in H-IE translation. The relation of possession is often marked redundantly in Hungarian: in addition to the possessor noun (as in IE languages), the possessed noun also receives morphological marking (cf. *Mary’s book = Mari+nak a könyv+e*). The possessive suffix of the possessed noun can fulfil the function of possessor identification even in cases when it is not expressed in the sentence. This option is not available in IE languages, where the possessive relationship is marked only on the possessor, which consequently cannot be missing from the sentence. In translating into IE languages, the missing possessive determiners are added, or in other words, implied possessive determiners are made explicit by translators.

Hungarian ST: *Társa* bajszos, hosszú ember, afféle levantei ügynök ... (Karinthy 301)

English TT: *Her partner*, a tall man wearing a mustache, looked like a commercial traveller from the Levant ... (Barker 51)

Hungarian ST: *Gyűrűm* te, gyűszűm te, tápláló búzám, részegítő borom te. Háromszázharcinc legékesebb szavunkat nektek köszönhetem. (Kosztolányi 103)

French TT: Toi ma bague, toi mon dé, toi mon blé nourricier, toi mon vin capiteux! Je vous dois trois cents trente de nos vocables les plus fleuris. (Komoly 101)

Hungarian ST: **Osztálytársai** már mind ültek. (Kosztolányi 24)

German TT: **Seine Klassenkameraden** saßen sämtlich auf ihren Plätzen. (Koriath 136)

Hungarian ST: **Lakása** – a Gellérthegy északi lejtőjén – két hónapig lakhatatlan volt. (Örkény 1. 165)

Russian TT: **Yevo kvartira** na severnom sklone gori Gellert na dva mesyatsa visla iz stroya ... (Voronkina 1. 308)

As the addition of the possessive determiner in H-IE translation is an obligatory transfer operation, needed to form grammatically correct TL sentences, translators carry it out automatically. The same does not apply in the opposite direction. In translating from IE languages into Hungarian, the omission of the redundant possessive determiners is not automatic, the “traces” of the IE possessive determiners can be easily identified in translated Hungarian texts. It is not a grammatical error, but it may sound odd, conveying a taste of foreignness. Thus, the lack of a possessive pronoun at the beginning of Hungarian sentences is often a cohesive device, a kind of ellipsis, which reinforces anaphoric connection with the previous sentence. If possessive determiners are retained, they can have an adverse effect on text cohesion.

4.5. Filling the gap in elliptical sentences

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

Elliptical sentences occur in all languages. We shall discuss two types of ellipsis: structural ellipsis and ellipsis as a stylistic device. **Structural** ellipsis is a possibility of deleting elements, which are redundant in the TL (e.g., personal pronouns in Hungarian). Ellipsis as a **stylistic device** means a deliberate omission of one part of the sentence in order to achieve a certain stylistic effect: for example to tighten connection between the sentences, to create a sense of incompleteness, to intensify the static or dynamic character of the narration, etc.

Structural ellipsis is typical of dialogues. Dialogues are generally elliptical in all languages because, sharing the same situational knowledge, speakers need not make explicit every element of the situation. In IE languages auxiliary verbs make it very easy to give elliptical answers. As there are no auxiliary verbs in Hungarian, translators use additions in translating elliptical answers.

English ST:

‘You must not go!’: she exclaimed energetically.

‘**I must and I shall**’ he replied. (E. Brontë 112)

Hungarian TT:

– Nem fog elmenni! – kiáltotta a lány erőlyesen.

– *El kell mennem és el is fogok menni* – mondotta fojtott hangon.
(Sötér 70)
(lit.: I have to go and I will go.)

English ST:

‘Look here,’ said Edward. ‘You give that to me’.

‘No’

‘*Yes you do*’. (Christie 80)

Hungarian TT:

– Ide figyelj – mondta Edward. – Add csak nekem.

– *Dehogyan adom.*

– *De igenis ideadod.* (Borbás 81)

(lit.: – I do not give you. – But you shall give me.)

Ellipsis at the beginning of a sentence as a **stylistic device** enhances cohesion with the previous sentence. Dropping the verb from the sentence makes the sentence more dependent on the context or the situation, adding to the force of the description. Leaving the sentence unfinished may reflect the worried state of mind of the characters.

The possibility of constructing elliptical sentences varies from one language to another, depending on their morphology and syntax (rich or poor morphology, type of agreement, conjugation patterns etc.). Mental reconstruction of the omitted part may be easy in one language and impossible in another. If the given kind of ellipsis does not work in the TL, and instead of achieving the desired stylistic effects it would make the TL sentence obscure and impenetrable, translators generally sacrifice ellipsis and for the sake of clarity fill in the gap in the TL sentence.

Elliptical sentences are supplemented in both directions. In the H-IE direction, one of the most frequent types of addition is the addition of a **verb** in translating verbless Hungarian sentences.

Hungarian ST: Az osztály túlnyomó többsége parasztfiúkból telt ki. Részint *mezitlábások, tarka kockás ingekben*, mások meg *bársonynadrágban és csizmában*. (Csáth 181) (lit.: Some of them barefoot in checked calico shirts, others in boots and velveteen trousers.)

English TT: Most of the boys were peasants. Some *went barefoot* and *wore checked calico shirts*, others *had boots and velveteen trousers*. (Kessler 92)

Hungarian ST: Iróasztalán egy levelező lapot talált, *vidékről, a szüleitől*. Ennek nagyon megörült. (Kosztolányi 88)

French TT: Sur son bureau, il trouva une carte postale. *Elle venait de province, de ses parents*. Cela lui fit grand plaisir. (Komoly 87)

Hungarian ST: *A vállán* diószínű barna köpönyeg. *A fején* tornyos fehér süveg. (Gárdonyi 7) (lit: Over his shoulder a walnut-brown cloak. On his head a tall white cap.)

German TT: Er *hatte* einen nussbraunen Mantel über *die Schulter ge-*

worfen, und ***auf dem Kopf trug*** er einen turmhohen weißen Kalpak.
(Schüchling 8)

Independently of direction of translation additions are often used in translating short sentences. There can be two explanations for this phenomenon: (1) short sentences are more frequently elliptical than long sentences, and (2) in translating shorter sentences translators have only a limited choice of corresponding linguistic devices.

Hungarian ST: Közben két új tünet. (Karinthy 295)
(lit.: Meanwhile two new symptoms.)

English TT: Meanwhile two new symptoms ***made their appearance***.
(Barker 42)

English ST: Noises of welcome. (Joyce 20)

Hungarian TT: A köszöntések zaja ***hallatszik***. (Szobotka 22)
(lit.: Noises of welcome ***can be heard***.)

German ST: Darum das Tagebuch. (Frank 5)

Hungarian TT: Ezért ***kezdek*** naplót ***írni***. (Solti 8)
(lit.: That is why I ***begin to write*** a diary.)

German ST: Dann zu mir. (Mann 2. 395)

Hungarian TT: Azután hozzám ***intézte a szót***. (Lányi 2. 364)
(lit.: Then he ***addressed his words*** to me.)

French ST: C'est un discours? (Cocteau 90)

Hungarian TT: – Beszédet fog ***tartani?*** (Pór 91)
(lit.: Will you ***deliver*** a speech?)

Russian ST: Sluhi o chom-to grandioznom. (Bulgakov 73)
(lit.: News about great events.)

Hungarian TT: Óriási eseményekről ***érkeznek*** hírek. (Elbert 63)
(lit.: News is ***coming*** about great events.)

Short, elliptical sentences are frequently used in literary works to imitate spoken language in everyday conversations. In translating conversation translators tend to use the most natural spoken language forms.

German ST: “Keine Milch mehr, Junge?” (Böll 52)

Hungarian TT: – Nem ***kérsz*** több tejet, fiam? (Doromboy 59)
(lit.: Don't you ***want*** some more milk, my son?)

French ST: – Un peu de thé? demanda Louise. (Cocteau 148)

Hungarian TT: – ***Iszol egy csésze*** teát? – kérdezte Louise. (Pór 149)
lit.: Would you like ***to drink a cup of*** tea?, asked Louise)

Russian ST: – Chto so mnoy? Etovo nikogda ne bilo ... (Bulgakov 12)

Hungarian TT: – Mi ***történt*** velem? Még sosem ***éreztem*** effélet.
(Szöllősy 8)

(lit.: What *happened* to me? I have never *felt* like this.)

Russian ST: Iz-za granitsi, chto li? (Dostoevskiy 2. 25)

Hungarian TT: Külföldről *jön* talán? (Makai 6)

(lit.: Are you *coming* from abroad?)

In all the above cases, additions are optional, and it would have been possible to provide translations without the additions, so this phenomenon may be another example of the various safety measures taken by translators resulting in explicitation.

4.6. Addition of text-organising elements

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

The differences in text-building strategies often make it necessary to insert additional text-organising elements into the TL text. Translators often make more explicit, for example, anaphoric relations, the borderline between the thematic and the rhematic part of the sentence, cataphoric relations, enumerations, contrasts, comparisons, etc. In the case of enumerations, they may add adverbs like *firstly, secondly, thirdly*, in the case of contrasts adverbs like: *nevertheless, notwithstanding, after all, for all that, at the same time, in spite of everything* etc.

Hungarian syntax has two distinctive features which may create “fuzzy” places in the sentence. The first is its dominant SOV word order and the second the lack of the copula. In other words, a nominal predicate is possible without the verb *van* (is).

Due to the SOV word order the borderline between the subject (topic part of the sentence) and the object (first element of the comment part of the sentence) may be blurred, since they are not separated by the verb as in SVO languages.

Due to the lack of the copula the borderline between the subject (topic part) and the verbless nominal predicate (comment part) may not be clear. In such cases, translators use specific adverbs, which serve as “border signs” in the translated sentences: *actually, as a matter of fact, practically, strictly speaking, after all*, etc. Such additions are especially characteristic of scientific texts, where lengthy and complex nominal phrases make it necessary to provide additional cues for the reader.

In the examples below three types of text organisers are added by the translator to a translation of Sigmund Freud’s *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten*: (1) addition of a borderline marker: *valójában* (‘actually’), (2) addition of an emphasiser: *merőben* (‘quite’), and (3) addition of an anaphoric element: *Ezt figyelembe véve* (‘taking into consideration’), *ugyanis* (‘namely’).

German ST: Von jeher liebte man es, den Witz als die Fertigkeit zu definieren Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Unähnlichem, also versteckte Ähnlichkeiten zu finden. (Freud 7)

Hungarian TT: Régtől fogva közkeletű az a meghatározás, hogy a vicc lé-

nyege **valójában** az a készség, hogy egymástól **merőben** eltérő dolgokban hasonlóságokat, tehát rejtett hasonlóságokat fedezünk fel. (Bart 27)

German ST: Aber wir wollen uns besinnen, dass es ja sich gar nicht um den etwa witzigen Vergleich Souliée, sondern um die Antwort Heines handelt, die gewiss weit witziger ist. **Dann** haben wir kein Recht, an die Phrase vom golden Kalb zu rühren, ... (Freud 49)

Hungarian TT: Ne feledkezzünk meg azonban róla, hogy voltaképpen nem Soulié meglehet szellemes megjegyzésével foglalkozunk, hanem Heine válaszával, mely kétségtől vicces volt. **Ezt figyelembe véve** azonban nincs jogunk kiiktatni az aranyborjút ... (Bart 65)

German ST: Ganz richtig, doch scheint es, dass auch in diesem Falle die Reduktion an unrichtiger Stelle angesetzt hat. Der Witz liegt nicht in der Frage, sondern in der Antwort, ... (Freud 50)

Hungarian TT: Ez így is van, csakhogy úgy tetszik, ez alkalommal nem a megfelelő helyen alkalmaztuk a redukciót. **Ugyanis** nem a kérdés, hanem a válasz a vicces: ... (Bart 66)

Adding text-organising elements is part of a strategy translators often resort to: the logical structure of the ST is made more explicit in the TT.

4.7. Addition of text connectors

Predominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

Text connectors are the most important text-organising elements. By text connectors we mean (1) co-ordinating conjunctions linking coordinate clauses, (2) subordinating conjunctions, introducing subordinate clauses, and (3) cataphoric demonstrative pronouns in the main clause anticipating the subordinate clause. The first two types of connectors are shared by all languages under investigation (cf. Doherty 1987 about the English-German relation). The third type of connectors has a rather limited use in IE languages, but is extensively used in Hungarian, where the relationship between the two clauses may be indicated not only in the subordinate clause by a subordinative conjunction, but also in the main clause by so called “anticipatory” or “cataphoric” or “introductory” or “preparatory” demonstrative pronouns: **az, azok** (‘that’ Nom), **azt, azokat** (‘that’ Acc), **akkor** (‘then’), **ott** (‘there’), **úgy** (‘that way’); constituting pairs of conjunctions: **az ... aki, az ... ami, az ... hogy, akkor ... amikor, ott ... ahol, olyan ... amilyen, úgy... ahogy** (‘that ... who’, ‘that ... what’, ‘that ... that’, ‘then ... when’, ‘there ... where’, ‘such ... like’, ‘that way ... how’).

The function of anticipatory demonstrative pronouns in the main sentence is to prepare (and sometimes to restrict or emphasise) the information contained in the subordinate sentence. This “double anchoring”, i.e., the redundant indication of the relationship between the two sentence units, is often optional, and the cataphoric demonstratives can be omitted from the Hungarian main clause without the loss of information (see the next chapter).

The elevation of IE participial, infinitival and nominal phrases (see GR 2) produces four major clause types in Hungarian:

- (1) coordinate clause without a coordinator:

English ST: I went slowly up the long drive, **trying to see as much of the grounds as possible** ... (Dahl 16)

Hungarian TT: Lassan haladtam a hosszú kocsifeljárón, **igyekeztem minél többet látni a parkból** ... (Borbás 17)

(lit.: I went slowly up the long drive, tried to see as much as...)

- (2) coordinate clause introduced by a coordinating conjunction:

German ST: ... die Hände im Mantel vergraben, **ohne sich umzukehren**... (Dürrenmatt 84)

Hungarian TT: ... kezét kabátjába süllyesztette, **és nem fordult vissza**. (Ungvári 226) (lit.: ... and he did not return.)

Commentary: coordinating conjunction: **és** (and)

- (3) subordinate clause introduced by a subordinating conjunction:

French ST: Les grandes personnes ne comprennent jamais rien toutes seules, et c'est fatiguant, pour les enfants, **de toujours et toujours leur donner des explications**. (Saint-Exupéry 10)

Hungarian TT: A nagyok semmit sem értenek meg maguktól, a gyerekek pedig belefáradnak, **hogy örökös-örökké magyarázgassanak nekik** (Rónay 10) (lit.: 'that all the time explain them.')

Commentary: subordinating conjunction: **hogy** (that)

- (4) subordinate clause introduced by a subordinating conjunction and preceded by a demonstrative pronoun in the main clause:

Russian ST: Sredi passazhirov bili tozhe vozvrashchayushchiesya iz-za granitsi. (Dostoevskiy 2. 24)

(lit.: Among the passengers there were also returning from abroad.)

Hungarian TT: Az utasok között voltak **olyanok** is, **akik külföldről tértek haza**. (Makai 5)

(lit.: Among the passengers were also **such, who** returned from abroad.)

Commentary: cataphoric, anticipatory demonstrative pronoun: **olyanok** (such) and subordinating conjunction: **akik** (who)

In cases like the above, addition of a connector is often necessary, which makes the addition of text connectors a very frequent transfer operation in IE-H translation. To select the appropriate connector, translators have to analyse the relations between phrases and clauses to establish the hierarchy of information conveyed by them. In the examples below, the new clause is linked to the first clause by the

coordinating conjunctions *és, s*, which means that the translator found the two information units of equal importance.

English ST: At that earnest appeal, he turned to her, **looking absolutely desperate**. (E. Brontë 160)

Hungarian TT: Erre a sürgető hívásra a másik is megfordult, **és arcán kétségbeesett elszántság tükröződött**. (Sőtér 161)

(lit.: ... **and** looked absolutely desperate.)

Commentary: *és* – coordinating conjunction in Hungarian

German ST: Aber man denkt eben immer, dass man die Krankheit **ohne Zuhausebleiben** überstehen wird. (Kafka 102)

Hungarian TT: De az ember mindig azt hiszi, hogy átvészeli majd a betegséget, **és nem kell otthon maradnia**. (Györffy 103)

Commentary: *és* – coordinating conjunction in Hungarian

In general, the function of the information conveyed by phrases is to specify the information contained in the main clause, and there is a certain hierarchy of the information contained in the two sentence units. The information hierarchy characteristic of the SL also must be retained in the TL. In order to preserve the information hierarchy, the new, independent Hungarian clause, born in the process of translation must be subordinated somehow to the main clause. Subordination is achieved by the addition of subordinative conjunctions, which makes the relationship between the clauses (temporal, causal, conditional, etc.) more explicit. The examples below illustrate the addition of the Hungarian text connector *amikor, mikor* ('when') specifying the **temporal meaning** of the IE nominal phrase elevated into an independent sentence unit in the Hungarian text.

English ST: It was the smell there had been on the beach that day – **with the tide out** ... (Christie 138)

Hungarian TT: Ugyanaz a szag volt, mint aznap a tengerparton – **amikor elvonult a dagály** ... (Sziogyártó 139)

(lit.: ... **when** the tide went away.)

German ST: **Nach dem Dienst** ging ich zur Kasse, um mein Gehalt abzuholen. (Böll 257)

(lit.: ... after the working day.)

Hungarian TT: **Mikor letelt a szolgálatom**, a pénztárhoz mentem, hogy felvegyem a fizetésemet. (Gergely 41)

(lit.: ... **when** I finished working.)

Russian ST: – Smotri, smotri, Verochka – zasheptala tolstaya mat' – vidis', kak knyazya zhili **v normal'noe vremya**. (Bulgakov 461)

(lit.: ... on normal days.)

Hungarian TT: – Nézd csak, nézd Verocska – suttogetta a kövér mama – látod, hogy éltek a hercegek, **amikor még normális idők járták?** (Sándor 54)

(lit.: ... **when** life was normal.)

The most frequent types of subordinate clauses in Hungarian are the subordinate *hogy* ('that') clauses. Consequently, the most frequently added subordinating conjunction in Hungarian is *hogy* ('that'). A detailed contrastive analysis of the Hungarian *hogy* clause and the English *that* clause is given in Hell (1980ab). Hungarian *hogy*, similarly to English *that*, is the most neutral text connector, with no lexical meaning followed by subordinate clauses of various types. The Hungarian text connector *hogy* is used more frequently than *that* in English (*que* in French, *das* in German, and *что* in Russian), because besides the analogous *that*-clauses, most IE nominal, infinitival and participial phrases are also translated by *hogy* clauses into Hungarian.

(1) Analogous *hogy* clause

English ST: You may think *that* perhaps *I forced* the invitation... (Dahl 14)
Hungarian TT: Szememre vethetik, *hogy provokáltam* a meghívást ... (Borbás 15)

(2) *hogy* clause as a result of elevation

French ST: Puis il leur fit signe *de la suivre* en marchant sur la pointe des pieds ... (Maupassant 134)
Hungarian TT: Azután intett nekik, *hogy kövessék*, és elindult lábujjhegyen ... (Benyhe 135)

While the increase in the number of text connectors is in accordance with the general tendency of IE-H translation, there are two undesirable side effects, leading to translationese in translated Hungarian texts: (1) the overuse of "hogy" clauses, and (2) the overuse of "anticipatory" cataphoric demonstratives in the main clause.

- (1) In spite of the neutral character of the conjunction *hogy*, authors of original Hungarian works do not use more than one or two *hogy* clauses within a sentence, while translators, under the pressure of IE participial, infinitival and nominal structures, tend to overuse this syntactic option.
- (2) Cataphoric demonstratives may serve as a point of reference (foothold) in the main clause to prepare the subordinate clause. In certain cases they cannot be omitted (restrictive function, emphasis, paired conjunctions) but in most cases their use is optional. Translators like to use them because they help the reader to predict the end of the sentence. They constitute one of the safety-measures taken by translators following the predictability principle: the sooner the sentence structure becomes clear, the better for the readers. It is also possible that the increased use of cataphoric demonstratives in non-translated Hungarian texts can be attributed to the influence of translated Hungarian.

The increase in the number of text connectors is, to a certain extent, a universal characteristic of the process of translation. Doherty (1987) found that German

translators translating English texts use more and more explicit text connectors than the original authors. The same phenomenon is described by Vehmas-Lehto on the basis of Russian-Finnish translations (1989).

Summary comments on grammatical additions

While in the case of **lexical** additions translators add semantically **rich** elements, **grammatical** addition involves the insertion of semantically depleted functional elements. The primary role of these elements in the sentence is structural, and they are required by the differences in the syntactic properties of the two languages. Again, the question arises why we should discuss these transfer operations, if they are obviously obligatory and automatic?

There are three reasons for doing so.

The first reason is the phenomenon that we might term as **obligatory departure**, which means that it is only a departure from the SL structure that is obligatory, but the kind of structure used in the TL text depends on the translator's decision. In the case of addition this means that something must be added in order to get a grammatically correct TL sentence, but what exactly (e.g., a personal pronoun or a proper name), it remains a conscious decision on the part of the translator.

The second reason is the **asymmetry** of insertion and omission in the case of missing grammatical elements. Some obligatorily added elements in the H-IE direction (missing object, missing possessive pronoun or missing indefinite article) are not omitted automatically in the IE-H direction, which may result in a taste of foreignness in translated Hungarian texts.

The third reason is the role that additions play in the supposedly universal translation strategy of **explicitation**. Explicitation is a wider concept than addition, because the TL text can be made more explicit by other means as well, not leading necessarily to an increase in the number of words in translation (lexical specification for example is an explicitation strategy which does not involve the addition of words). The main source of explicitation, however, is undoubtedly addition of grammatical or lexical items to the TL texts.

5. Grammatical omission

Grammatical omission is a standard transfer operation whereby certain grammatical (functional) elements of the SL text, which become redundant in the TL text are dropped. While **lexical** omissions discussed earlier (LEX 5) were mandated by the differing background knowledge of the readers, **grammatical** omissions are made possible by the syntactic differences between languages.

The differences in syntactic possibilities are partly related to the problem of so-called **interlingual asymmetry** (Gak in Zlateva 1993) or, in another term, **missing categories**. Certain grammatical categories (gender, number, case, article, prepositions, postpositions, verbal prefixes, separable verbal prefixes, definite conjugation) do exist in one language, but not in the other. If we translate into a language which has “plus” categories, translators use additions, and where there are “minus” categories, translators make omissions.

Another reason for grammatical omissions may be that although a grammatical category does exist in both languages (e.g., the personal pronoun in both IE languages and Hungarian), it has **different functions** and different rules govern its use in the two languages.

Omissions are extensively discussed in earlier taxonomies as well. In their glossary of translation techniques, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) use the term **economy** (Fr: économie): “... the relative smaller quantity of expression forms required in one language for conveying the same content which is expressed by more words in another language (1995: 342)”, and **reduction** (Fr: dépouillement): “The translation technique which selects the essential elements of the **message** and expresses them in a concentrated manner ... Reduction is a special case of **economy**” (1995: 348).

Subtractions are among the three main techniques of adjustment (additions, subtractions, alterations) distinguished in Nida (1964), with the following subtypes: a) repetitions, b) specification of reference, c) conjunctions, d) transitionals, e) categories, f) vocatives, g) formulae (Nida 1964: 231–233).

Opushchenie is one of the four main transformations used in the Russian and Bulgarian literature: opushchenie (‘omission’), dobavlenie (‘addition’), transposit-siya (‘transposition’), zamena (‘replacement’) (Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Vaseva 1980, Komissarov 1990). In these taxonomies lexical and grammatical omissions are handled together; cf. Vinay and Darbelnet: “Economy works at both the lexical and the syntactic level ...” (1995: 194). We shall discuss them separately, dealing only with grammatical omissions in this chapter.

As grammatical omissions are justified by systemic differences between languages, again the question arises why we should deal with these operations if they are obligatory and automatic? On the basis of our corpora it appears that omissions are not carried out automatically by translators, because they are not always obligatory. While additions are often carried out by the force of “syntactic necessity” (e.g.,

addition of a missing object), in the case of omissions we can speak of a “syntactic possibility” which is not always made use of by translators, cf. Vinay and Darbelnet: “Translators lengthen their texts out of prudence but also out of ignorance” (1995: 193), or Nida: “Though, in translating, subtractions are neither so numerous nor varied as additions, they are, nevertheless highly important in the process of adjustment” (Nida 1964: 231).

Finally, as omission as a transfer operation may lead to the creation of **elliptical** sentences in translation, it plays an important role in the cohesion of the TL text.

Subtypes:

- 5.1. Omission of “adjectivisers” in right-branching constructions
- 5.2. Omissions at the beginning of the sentence
- 5.3. Omission of the subject
- 5.4. Omission of the object
- 5.5. Omission of the possessive determiner
- 5.6. Omission of the indefinite article
- 5.7. Creation of elliptical sentences in translation

5.1. Omission of “adjectivisers” in right-branching constructions

Predominant direction: from Hungarian → into IE

In left-branching Hungarian nominal phrases we often find so called “adjectivisers”. They are adjectival participles derived from semantically empty or weak Hungarian verbs: *való* (‘being’), *lévő* (‘being’), *történő* (‘happening’), and *folyó* (‘going on’). Their function is to “adjectivise” postmodifying prepositional phrases, enabling them to appear on the left side of the Hungarian noun phrase.

Being mainly functional elements, they help keep together the chain of prepositional modifiers preceding **before** the Hungarian head noun. In translating from Hungarian into IE languages, some of the modifiers will be moved right and placed **after** the head noun. In the process of right positioning, the empty adjectivisers become unnecessary and are dropped from the translation.

Hungarian ST: ... szótlánul kitergette maga előtt a *tepertőt tartalma-zó papírosokat*. (Krúdy 549)

English TT: ... without a word he set out the *paper with cracklings on it*. (Bozsó 55)

German TT: ... denn er breitete wortlos das *Papier mit den Grieben* aus. (Weissling 90)

Hungarian ST: Elsőnek Marcell tűnt el ... aki tizenkét esztendőn át a *mellette lévő szobában* lakott ... (Szabó 5)

German TT: Als erste verschwand Marcelle aus ihrem Leben, ... das zwölf Jahre lang *im Zimmer nebenan* gewohnt ... (Engl 5)

Hungarian ST: A Monte-Carlo felé vezető országúton a sors különös kegye övta ezen a napon a járműveket egy veszettnek látszó taxitól. (Rejtő 24) (lit.: On the highway leading to Monte Carlo ...)

Russian TT: Na shosse k Monte Karlo tol'ko osobaya milost' sud'bi hranila v etot den' transport i peshehodov ot yavno vzbessivshevosya tak-szi. (Aleksandrov 17)

The omission of empty adjectivisers is an optional transfer operation, their retention does not result in grammatically incorrect IE sentences (cf. paper *containing* cracklings, highway *leading* to Monte Carlo).

The omission of empty adjectivisers in Hungarian-IE translation is less frequent than the addition of adjectivisers in the IE-Hungarian direction, since Hungarian authors, aware of the syntactic resources of their mother tongue instinctively avoid long left-branching structures.

5.2. Omissions at the beginning of the sentence

The beginning of the sentence is always sensitive to additions and omissions. Omissions at the beginning of the sentence are frequently due to the simple fact that in the target language fewer words are needed to refer back to the previous sentence(s), and the translators omit items which are obvious from the previous sentence(s) or from the situation.

Hungarian ST: ... édesanyám azzal fogadott, hogy az apám már nem él. A halálát jelentő levelet azon a napon kellett vona megkapnom, amikor hajóra szálltam, hogy hazajöjjek ... (Csáth 10) (lit.: The letter informing about his death should have arrived the day I embarked.)

English TT: My mother met me ... with the news that my father died. The letter should have arrived the day I embarked. (Kessler 183)

As shown by the example above, the participial structure containing the anaphoric reference (*a halálát jelentő* 'informing about his death'), was omitted and the noun phrase *the letter* alone is used to refer back to the previous sentence. (Note, however, that the noun phrase alone (*a levelet*) would have also been sufficient in Hungarian to establish a link with the previous sentence).

Omissions at the beginning of sentences are made possible and/or necessary because different languages have a different repertoire of cohesive devices (cf. reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion in English as described by Halliday and Hasan 1976). The anaphoric function in the thematic part of the sentence is often realised by the repetition of the rheme of the previous sentence in compressed form. This kind of anaphoric repetition, for instance, is a typical cohesive device in Russian scientific prose but not in Hungarian. In Hungarian, the same anaphoric function can be realised by a definite article or a demonstrative pronoun, and the rest of the repeated rheme can be omitted (Klaudy 1987).

5.3. Omission of the subject

Predominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

In translations into Hungarian, the pronominal **subject** is frequently omitted from the beginning of the sentence, because conjugated Hungarian verb forms are capable of fulfilling the function of subject identification both on the sentence level and the text level. On the text level this means that anaphoric reference does not require the repetition or pronominal substitution of a subject known from previous sentences or from the situation. The Hungarian personal pronoun cannot fulfil this role, because it is not marked for gender, and this limits its referring potential (see GR 1.2). In the examples below the conjugated Hungarian verb forms fulfil the function of subject identification and imply a third person singular subject without using the Hungarian pronouns corresponding to IE personal pronouns.

English ST: He was scarcely four feet tall and *he* wore a ragged, rusty coat that reached to his knees. (...) *He* had a very large head, with deep-set blue eyes and a sharp little mouth ... *He* carried a lopsided old suitcase, which was tied with a rope. (McCullers 16)

Hungarian TT: Alig volt négy lábnál magasabb, rongyos, viharvert felöltöt viselt, amely alig ért a térdéig. (...). Nagyon nagy feje *volt*, mélyen ülő, kék szeme és keskeny apró szája ... Kötélllel átkötött megroggyant bőröndöt *cipelt*. (Szász 17)

French ST: Il m' regardé, *il* m'a fait un sourire, *il* a même mis son chapeau en arrière et *il* a tenu des propos pareils: ... (Ajar 55)

Hungarian TT: Rám nézett, rám *mosolygott*, még a kalapját is *hátrátolta*, és ilyesmi beszédet *intézett* hozzám: ... (Bognár 45)

German ST: Zunächst wollte *er* ruhig und ungestört aufstehen, sich anziehen und vor allem frühstücken, und dann erst das Weitere überlegen, denn, das merkte *er* wohl, im Bett würde *er* mit dem Nachdenken zu keinem vernünftigen Ende kommen. *Er* erinnerte sich ... (Kafka 90)

Hungarian TT: Először nyugodtan és háborítatlanul föl *akart* kelni, felöltözni, és mindenekelőtt megreggelizni, s csak azután mérlegelni a továbbiakat, mert az ágyban nem boldogul a gondolkodással, erre már *rájött*. *Emlékezett* rá ... (Györffy 91)

Russian ST: Podnyavshis' iz zemli naruzhu, doktor smel rukavitsey sneg s tolstoy kolodi, polozhennoy vdol' dlya sideniya u vihoda. *On* sel na neyo, nagnulsya i podperev golovu obeimi rukami, zadumalsya. (Pasternak 368)

Hungarian TT: Kimászott a fedezékből a szabadba, kabátja ujjával *leseperte* a havat a vastag rönkről, amit azért tettek oda a bejáráthoz, hogy legyen mire leülni. *Leült, összegörnyedt* és mindkét kezével megtámasztva a fejét a gondolataiba merült. (Pór 418) (lit.: [he] climbed out of the bunker ... [he] swept off the snow ... [he] sat down and doubled up ...)

While the **addition** (GR 4.2) of the missing subject is an **obligatory** transfer operation in H-IE translation, **omission** of the superfluous pronominal subject in IE-H translation is only **optional** in the sense that if translators fail to perform it, they do not produce grammatically incorrect sentences. The anaphoric pronominal subject (singular: *ő* ‘he’, ‘she’, ‘it’, plural: *ők* ‘they’) has a place and function in the Hungarian sentence but only in the case of **emphasis**. Untrained or novice translators often fail to omit the unemphasised pronominal subjects. In hastily translated operating manuals, or in the examples of language textbooks we can frequently encounter “accidentally retained” pronominal subjects, giving away the foreign origin of the Hungarian text.

5.4. Omission of the object

Predominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

In Hungarian, the form of the verb depends on whether it has an object or not, and whether the object is definite or indefinite. The distinction between definite and indefinite conjugation does not exist in IE languages. Definite conjugation fulfils the function of object identification both on the sentence level and the text-level; in other words, it allows to construct sentences without an explicit object and it also allows anaphoric reference to a previous object without lexical repetition, or pronominal substitution. In translating from IE into Hungarian, objects can often be omitted from the translation.

English ST: Stanford White had *invited her* to his apartments in the tower of Madison Square Garden and *offered her* champagne. (Doctorow 25)

Hungarian TT: Stanford White a lakására *hívta* a Madison Square Garden tornyában, és pezsgővel *kinálta*. (Göncz 24–25)

French ST: Je *l’ai* pris, je *l’ai* caressé et puis j’ai foutu le camp comme une flèche. (Ajar 24)

Hungarian TT: *Fogtam, megsimogattam*, azután leléceltem mint a villám. (Bognár 19)

German ST: Ich nahm einen Hefekringel und *kostete ihn*. (Böll 56)

Hungarian TT: Elvettem egy buktát, *megkóstoltam*. (Bor 50)

Russian ST: On skoro vsdoh, i Kol’ka *pohoronil yevo* v uglu dvora. (Tendryakov 341)

Hungarian TT: Hamarosan megdöglött, és Kolka *eltemette* az udvar sarkában. (Soproni 326) (lit.: ... Kolka buried [it] in the corner ...)

In the examples above the definite conjugation of verbs, *hívta* (‘[he] invited [her]’), *kinálta*, (‘[he] offered [her]’), *megkóstoltam* (‘[I] tasted [it]’), *eltemette* (‘[he] buried [it]’), refers back to the previously mentioned object, which is therefore not needed in any explicit form in the Hungarian sentence.

The omission of the anaphoric pronominal object is a more complicated mat-

ter. While the **addition** (GR 4.3) of the missing object in H-IE translation is an **obligatory** transfer operation because there is an **object slot** in IE sentences to be filled in, the same, however, does not hold in reverse. The **omission** of the anaphoric pronominal object is an **optional** operation in the sense that failing to carry it out does not produce a grammatically incorrect sentence.

In translating from IE into Hungarian, novice translators often fail to omit the anaphoric pronominal object (singular: *azt, őt*, 'it', 'him', 'her', plural: *azokat, őket* 'that', 'them'). In spite of the fact that the presence of the anaphoric pronominal object in the Hungarian sentence is justifiable only in the case of emphasis, its retention cannot be considered a grammatical error and represents various degrees of foreignness: it sounds especially strange as the last word of the Hungarian sentence. Let us repeat the German example with the retention of the anaphoric pronominal objects in the Hungarian translation:

German ST: Ich nahm einen Hefekringel und *kostete ihn*. (Böll 56)
Hungarian TT: Elvettem egy buktát, *megkóstoltam azt*. (illustrative translation)

The Hungarian translation with the redundant pronominal object as the last word of the sentence is grammatically correct, but represents translationese.

5.5. Omission of the possessive determiner

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The possibility of omission of **possessive attributes** in H-IE translation can be explained by a redundancy in Hungarian syntax: The relation of possession is often marked redundantly in Hungarian: in addition to the possessor noun (as in IE languages), the possessed noun also receives morphological marking (cf. *Mary's book* = *Mari+nak a könyv+e*). The possessive suffix of the possessed noun can fulfil the function of possessor identification even in cases, when it is not expressed in the sentence. This option is not available in IE languages, where the possessive relationship is marked only on the possessor, which consequently cannot be missing from the sentence. In translating into Hungarian, anaphoric possessive determiners (nouns or pronouns) can be omitted, i.e. explicit possessive determiners can be made implicit.

English ST: The Doctor and the *Doctor's Wife* (Hemingway)
Hungarian TT: Az orvos és a *felesége* (Szász)

English ST: For two years he loved Miss Amelia, but he did not declare himself. He would stand near the door of *her premises* ... (McCullers 76)
Hungarian TT: Két éven át szerette Miss Améliát, de nem vallotta meg. *Házának* ajtaja körül szokott álldogálni ... (Szász 77)

French ST: Il avait laissé toutes *ses femmes* et *ses enfants* dans *son* pays pour des raisons économiques. (Ajar 173)

Hungarian TT: Gazdasági okokból az összes *feleségét* és *gyerekét* a házában hagyta. (Bognár 144)

German ST: *Ihr* reges *Interesse* für sämtliche Personen, die man im Hause einer Ninon, dem eigentlichen Herd der feinsten Geistesbildung, treffen konnte ... (Mörrike 100)

Hungarian TT: Élénk *érdeklődése* mindazok iránt, akik Ninon szalonjában, a választékos műveltségnek ebben az igazi otthonában megfordultak ... (Lengyel 101)

Russian ST: Polotentsa, kotorimi bil svyazan Ivan Nikolaevich, lezhali grudoy na tom zhe divane. *Ruki i nogi Ivana Nikolayevicha* bili svobodni. (Bulgakov 69)

(lit.: ... hands and legs of Ivan Nikolaevich were now free ...)

Hungarian TT: A törülközők, amelyekkel az étteremben megkötözték Ivan Nyikolajevicst, halomban tornyosultak mellette a kanapén. *Keze, lába* most szabad volt. (Szöllősy 87–88)

(lit.: ... [his] hands and [his] legs were now free ...)

While the **addition** (chapter GR 4.4) of the possessive determiner in H-IE translation is an **obligatory** transfer operation needed to produce grammatically correct TL sentences, the same does not apply in the opposite direction. The **omission** of redundant possessive determiners is **not obligatory** in IE-H translation, and the “traces” of IE possessive determiners can be easily identified in translated Hungarian texts. Hungarian possessive pronouns (singular: *ővé* (‘his’, ‘her’), plural: *ővéké* (‘their’)) have a place and function in the Hungarian sentence, but only if they are emphatic. Retention of unemphasised IE possessive pronouns by novice translators is not a grammatical error, but the double reference (both by the possessive attribute and by the possessive suffix on the possessed noun) may reduce coherence.

5.6. Omission of the indefinite article

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

A typical case of a missing category is the lack of article (both definite and indefinite) in Russian. In this respect, Russian can also be contrasted with English, French, German and Hungarian. The omission of the article in translating into Russian is an obligatory transfer operation: translators have no other choice but dropping the article, and expressing definite and indefinite meaning with other lexical and grammatical devices available in Russian (pronouns, adverbials, word order). As the dividing line here is not between the IE group and Hungarian, we shall not discuss this missing grammatical category here. We must note, however, that in this chapter the term IE languages will be used to refer to English, French and German only.

Similarly to English, French and German, there are two kinds of articles in Hungarian: definite and indefinite. Behind this systemic similarity there are considerable differences in use. As we are interested only in differences that may cause

genuine difficulties in translation, we shall deal only with the functional differences between the **indefinite** article in IE and Hungarian.

The functions of the indefinite article in IE languages and Hungarian overlap to some extent. Indefinite articles function in similar ways in the thematic part of the sentence, where the indefinite article indicates non-specific reference in the subject.

Hungarian → IE:

Hungarian ST: Egy gyászfátyolos nénike megkérdezte, hogy érzi magát. (Örkény 1. 7)

English TT: A little old lady wearing a black mourning veil inquired after the state of her health. (Sollosy 45)

French TT: Une petite vieille, le chapeau enrubanné de crêpe, s'enquit de sa santé. (Tardos 3.7.)

German TT: Ein Muttchen mit Trauerflor fragte, wie sie sich fühle. (Thies 1. 16)

IE → Hungarian:

English ST: A cold and solitary Algerian was always there, leaning over the ramparts ... (Greene 4)

Hungarian TT: A gátra könyökölve mindig ott állt **egy** hűvös és magányos algériai ... (Örkény 141)

French ST: Un jour – elle avait alors onze ans – comme elle passait par ce pays, elle recontra derrière le cimetière le petit Chouquet. (Maupassant 206)

Hungarian TT: Egy napon – tizenegyedik évében járt akkoriban – mikor megint ide kerültek, a temető mögött a kis Chouquet akadt útjába. (Tóth 207)

German ST: Ein junger Mann, mit dem er während der Fahrt flüchtig bekannt geworden war ... (Kafka 6)

Hungarian TT: Egy fiatalember, akivel futólag megismerkedett az úton ... (Györfly 7)

A different functioning is characteristic of indefinite articles in the **rhematic** part of the sentence, where a noun with the indefinite article is part of the predicate. In these cases, the indefinite article is not necessary in Hungarian and can be omitted from the Hungarian translation.

French ST: Au-dessous se menait une guerre sournoise. (Cocteau 88)

Hungarian TT: Alul viszont alattomos háború folyt. (Gyergyai 89)

German ST: Und nun war ein solches Phänomen, *ein* solches sonderbares Genie oder *ein* solcher rätselhafter Narr mir räumlich zum erstenmal ganz nahe ... (Zweig 32)

Hungarian TT: S most, amikor először lakik tözsomszédéságomban ilyen különös lángelme, ilyen rejtélyes csodabogár ... (Fónagy 33)

German ST: Nun bin ich zeitlebens nie *ein* ernstlicher Schachkünstler gewesen ... (Zweig 34)

Hungarian TT: Nem voltam soha életemben komoly sakkjátékos ... (Fónagy 35)

German ST: Ich trat näher heran und glaubte an der rechteckigen Form der Ausbuchtung zu erkennen, was diese etwas geschwellte Tasche in sich verbarg: *ein* Buch! Mir begannen die Knie zu zittern: *ein* BUCH! (Zweig 100)

Hungarian TT: Közelebb léptem, s úgy láttam, hogy a duzzadás négyzetes formájából helyesen következtek arra a tárgyra, melyet a zseb magában rejt. Könyv van a zsebben. Térdem megremegett. KÖNYV! (Fónagy 101)

As the omission of the IE indefinite articles in the rhematic part of the sentence is not an obligatory operation, untrained translators and novices often fail to perform it. The high frequency of redundant indefinite articles (*egy* ‘a’, ‘an’) in translated Hungarian texts is one of the unmistakable signs of the IE origin of the text. The deletion of **superfluous indefinite articles** is an especially frequent editorial operation in the case of translations from German into Hungarian, but English and French source texts are also responsible for this kind of translationese.

5.7. Creation of elliptical sentences in translation

Predominant direction: **there is no predominant direction**

As mentioned in chapter GR 4.5, every language has the potential for creating **elliptical sentences**, in which some component(s) of the sentence are only implied but not explicitly expressed. In the previous chapter we made a distinction between **structural** ellipsis and ellipsis as a **stylistic** device. The deletion of the pronominal subject, object and possessive determiner in Hungarian sentences may be regarded as examples of **structural ellipsis**.

Ellipsis as a **stylistic device** means a deliberate omission of one part of the sentence for stylistic effect: e.g., to create a stronger link between two sentences, to convey a sense of incompleteness, to underline the static or dynamic character of the narration, etc.

In addition to structurally motivated ellipses, which may be more or less obligatory, all languages have plenty of resources to create elliptical sentences for stylistic purposes. In creating elliptical sentences for a stylistic effect, translators have to make sure that the omitted part can be recovered. While in primary text production writers heavily rely on readers’ imagination, this is not typical of secondary text production: translators, especially novices, like to “play it safe”. The creation of elliptical sentences in the TL requires mastery in handling the full repertoire of the resources of the TL, and testifies to the creative abilities of experienced professionals.

In the following example, the second and the third English sentences are compressed into one single word in Hungarian. This operation illustrates the favourable **structural properties** offered by Hungarian for creating elliptical sentences:

- (i) there is no need to repeat the anaphoric pronominal subject at the beginning of the second and third sentences as in English text: (1) Father ... (2) He ... (3) He ... → Hungarian: (1) Apa ... (2) [He] ... (3) [He] ... ;
- (ii) the synthetic character of Hungarian morphology makes it possible to compress into one single word three meanings, which were expressed analytically in English: the action (*borotvál*), the lack of the action (*-atlan*), the manner of the action (*-ul*): He had not shaved → Borotvátatlanul.

English ST: Father came down alone. He was wearing his nightclothes.
He had not shaved. (Vonnegut 64)

Hungarian TT: Apa egyedül jött le. Hálóöltözékben. Borotvátatlanul. (Borbás 59)

Commentary: The underlined parts of the English sentence are omitted from the Hungarian translation.

The second example illustrates ellipsis as a **stylistic device**. The paragraph is taken from a short story by Roald Dahl *Parson's Pleasure*, where the furniture dealer Mr Boggis is trying to gain the confidence of a client, and delivers an eulogy on the extreme Right Wing of the Conservative Party. The deletion of the verb in the Hungarian translation enhances the feeling that this kind of argumentation belongs to the everyday routine of the junk dealer.

English ST: From then on, it was easy ... He spent two minutes delivering an impassioned eulogy on the extreme Right Wing of the Conservative Party, then two more denouncing the Socialists. (Dahl 132)

Hungarian TT: Ettől fogva játszi könnyedséggel ment minden ... Kétperces, szenvedelmes dicshimnusz a Konzervatív Párt szélső-jobbszárnyáról, további két perc: a szocialisták becsmérése. (Borbás 133)

Commentary: The English verb (*spent*) and adverbial participle (*delivering*) are left out from the Hungarian translation and the second adverbial participle (*denouncing*) is nominalised. These operations result in a **fully nominal** sentence (see explanation above).

Summary comments on grammatical omission

The relationship between grammatical **additions and omissions** is another illustration of operational **asymmetry**, which we discussed in connection with elevation and lowering (GR 2, GR 3). As mentioned there, separation and elevation are more likely to be carried out than conjoining and lowering since, following the principle of explicitation, translators, if they can choose, prefer to use longer, more explicit sentences.

The same can be assumed about the relationship of additions and omissions. The addition of syntactically necessary elements (explicit subject, object, possessive determiner) is an obligatory transfer operation in the H-IE direction, and translators perform it automatically. The omission of certain syntactically redundant elements (anaphoric pronominal subject and object, unnecessary possessive determiners and indefinite articles) is more of a syntactic possibility than a necessity in the IE-H relation and is therefore often not performed by inexperienced translators. This is again a proof of the universal character of **explicitation** strategies.

It should be noted, however, that explicitation does not necessarily mean the tightening of cohesive ties between sentences. Redundant functional elements may loosen the cohesion of translated Hungarian texts, therefore the deletion of superfluous pronouns and indefinite articles is a frequent editorial operation aimed at avoiding translationese.

6. Grammatical transpositions

Grammatical transposition is a standard transfer operation whereby translators change the sequence of the elements in the sentence, i.e. the **order of words**. The term “transposition” is used in a different sense by Vinay and Darbelnet. By transposition they refer to the change of the word class in the process of translation (1958, 1995: 351). In Nida’s book, word order problems are discussed very briefly among the so called “alterations”, which is one of the three “techniques of adjustment” (additions, subtractions, alterations) (1964: 235).

Transpositions take place in the course of the translation of almost every sentence, regardless of language pair and direction of translation. Some of these transpositions are **obligatory**, since without them we would not get a grammatically correct TL sentence. Obligatory transpositions can be explained by the systemic differences between languages. Despite their obligatory character they are worth investigating, since it is only a departure from the SL that is obligatory, while the TL often offers a range of options for the translator.

Another class of transpositions is not obligatory but **optional**. Even if they are not performed, translators can still obtain grammatically correct target-language sentences. Optional transpositions are performed in order to ensure the cohesion of the TL text. Every language has different mechanisms to **refer back** to the previous sentence or to the entirety of the foregoing text. They also have various mechanisms to **refer forward** to the following sentence or to the entire subsequent text, and different ways to **emphasise** what they wish to say. Among these cohesive devices, the order of words plays an important role.

There are two major differences between IE languages and Hungarian, which explain the necessity of most word order transpositions. One of these concerns the **basic word order of the sentence**, i.e. the relative position of the arguments to the predicate. The basic word order in the IE languages under investigation is the SVO (subject-verb-object) type, while Hungarian is dominated by the SOV (subject-object-verb) type. The other major difference is in the **position of the modifiers** within the noun phrase. While in IE languages noun phrases can be modified in two directions – postpositively and prepositively – in Hungarian the possibility of postpositive modification is severely limited, and all modifiers are placed **in front of** the head noun. Most obligatory transpositions in IE-H and H-IE translation can be accounted for by these two systemic differences.

Subtypes:

6.1. Obligatory transpositions

6.1.1. Left-positioning of modifiers

6.1.2. Right-positioning of modifiers

6.1.3. Left-positioning of focus

6.1.4. Right-positioning of focus

- 6.1.5. Obligatory topicalisation in H-IE translation
- 6.1.6. Transpositions at the beginning of the sentence

6.2. Optional transpositions

- 6.2.1. Contextual variants
- 6.2.2. Fronting time and place adverbials
- 7.2.3. Fronting the subject
- 6.2.4. Defronting of sentence initial conjunctions
- 6.2.5. Transposition of interruptions
- 6.2.6. Transposition of reporting clauses

6.1. Obligatory transpositions

6.1.1. Left-positioning of modifiers

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The word order of modifiers in noun phrases in English and Hungarian was analysed in detail by Néray (1980). The relative position of the modifiers in IE noun phrases shows both similarities and differences compared with Hungarian noun phrases. They are similar insofar as the primary position of **adjectival** modifier is **to the left** of the head noun (*piros alma*, *red apple*, *roter Apfel*, *krasnoe yabloko*), with the exception of French where adjectival modifiers are in postposition: robe *blanche*. They differ, however, in the primary position of the **possessive and prepositional phrase** modifiers. Their primary position is **to the right** of the head noun in IE languages (right-branching principle), and **to the left** of the head noun in Hungarian (left-branching principle).

The possibilities of the postpositive modification in Hungarian are very limited. Right-branching structures in Hungarian are rarely used in running text, but can be found in headlines, titles, tables of contents, and enumerations. In text sentences they must be placed in end position. The first transfer operation ensuing from these differences is **left-positioning** of IE modifiers in the Hungarian translation: IE **postpositive** modifiers will become **prepositive** in Hungarian. In the examples below headwords will be underlined and modifiers bolded.

English ST: When he arrived at the port, Weld went straight to the taverna **in the upper town** ... (Greene 257)

Hungarian TT: A kikötőbe érve Weld első útja a *felsővárosi* tavernába vezetett. (Örkény 18)

French ST: Il y avait sa robe **blanche**, toute déployée, et les deux robes **d'eau claire d'Isis et d'Alise**. (Vian 55)

Hungarian TT: Ott volt *fehér* ruhája, szépen kiterítve, valamint *Alise és Isis két világos vízkék* ruhája. (Bajomi 51)

German ST: Ein Mann **mit einem Rucksack** stieg aus und ein hochgewachsener Junge. (Seghers 156)

Hungarian TT: A csónakból *hátizsákos ember* szállt ki egy nyurga fiúval. (Thury 308)

Russian ST: Tot *chelovek v kapyushone* pomestilsya nevdaleke ot stol'bi na tryohnogom taburetke ... (Bulgakov 144)

Hungarian TT: A *csuklyás ember* háromlábú zsámolyszéken ült nem messze a megfeszítettektől ... (Szöllősy 209)

As we can see, left-positioning of prepositional phrase modifiers also involves word class changes: the IE prepositional phrase modifiers become adjectival modifiers in Hungarian: English: *taverna in the upper town* → Hungarian: *felsővárosi taverna*; German: *Mann mit einem Rucksack* → Hungarian: *hátizsákos ember*; *chelovek v kapyushone* → Hungarian: *csuklyás ember*. In the French example, left-positioning also affects the adjectival and possessive modifiers: *robe blanche* 'Hungarian: *fehér ruha*; *robes d'eau claire d'Isis et d'Alise* → Hungarian: *Isis és Alise vízkék ruhája*). This word class change, which may be called "adjectivisation", is a relatively simple operation, due to the rich inventory of suffixes for creating denominal adjectives in Hungarian.

In the above cases, left-positioning was a relatively simple operation also because the IE head nouns had no premodification and had only one postpositive prepositional phrase modifier. But if the IE noun phrase is extended both prepositively and postpositively, and if there are several pre- and postmodifiers, left-positioning may result in very long left-branching constructions in Hungarian.

English: (Mod1) (Mod2) **Noun** (Mod3) (Mod4)

Hungarian: (Mod1) (Mod2) (Mod3) (Mod4) **Noun**:

English ST: The shortish (1), flat-faced (2) *man* with a narrow corrugated brow (3) and immensely broad shoulders (4) was Claud. (Dahl 138)

Hungarian TT: A kurta termetű (1), nyomott képű (2), alacsony homlokú (3) és idomtalanul széles vállú (4) *harmadik* a Claud névre hallgatott. (Borbás 139)

French: (Mod1) **Noun** (Mod2) (Mod3) (Mod4)

Hungarian: (Mod1) (Mod2) (Mod3) (Mod4) **Noun**:

French ST: C 'était une vieille fille, en effet, une de ces vieilles (1) *filles* à la voix cassante (2), au geste sec (3), dont l'âme semble dure (4). (Maupassant 62)

Hungarian TT: Valódi vénlány volt, a nyers hangú (1), szögletes mozgású (2), keményszívűnek látszó (3) vén (4) *lányok* közül való. (Pór 63)

Commentary: the prepositive modifier (vieille) is contracted with the head noun (fille).

German: (Mod1) (Mod2) **Noun** (Mod3) (Mod4) (Mod5)

Hungarian: (Mod1) (Mod2) (Mod3) (Mod4) (Mod5) **Noun**:

German ST: Stumm, ... blickten wir auf zu der Hehren, neben deren

großem (1) und südbleichem (2) *Antlitz*, mit strengem Munde (3), den gespannten Nüstern (4), den verdüsterten Brauen (5), die Gagatgehänge-schaukelten. (Mann 2. 397)

Hungarian TT: Némán, ... szótlánul néztük a fennkölt asszonyt, akinek nagy (1), déliesen sápadt (2), szigorú szájú (3), feszült orrcimpájú (4), összevont szemöldökű (5) *arca* mellett borostyánfüggő himbálózott. (Lányi 2. 363)

Obligatory left-positioning may cause three kinds of problems in IE-H translation. The resulting left-branching constructions in the translated Hungarian texts can be (1) too long, (2) too complicated, or (3) both. The examples above illustrate the first problem. In these sentences, the structure of Hungarian premodifiers is not complicated, as they consist exclusively of **coordinated** modifiers, though their length is unusual. The sentences are grammatically correct, because there are no rules in Hungarian that would limit the number of premodifiers before the head noun, but the authors of original Hungarian works do not, as a rule, overuse this syntactic option.

Left-branching structures in translated Hungarian texts can become not only too long but also too complicated. If IE postmodifiers are **subordinated** to each other, their left-positioning in the Hungarian translation may require additions of special adjectivisation devices as was shown in the chapter on grammatical additions. These “adjectivisers” in Hungarian are adjectival participles derived from empty verbs like *lévő, való* (‘being’), *történő, folyó* (‘going on’), *vezető* (‘leading to’).

English ST: For the second time that morning, Mr Boggis explained at some length the aims and ideals of the Society for the Preservation of Rare Furniture. (Dahl 140)

Hungarian TT: Mr. Boggis a nap folyamán immár másodszer magyarázta el részletesen a *Régi Bútorok Megóvására Alakult Társaság* célkitűzései és eszményeit. (Borbás 141)

Commentary: adjectiviser needed for left-positioning: *alakult* (‘formed’).

French ST: Après une journée torride et de solitude absolue ... (Tournier 13)

Hungarian TT: A *teljes magányban eltelt tikkasztó nap* után ... (Szabolcs 11)

Commentary: adjectiviser needed for left-positioning: *eltelt* (‘spent’).

Russian ST: Из личних отношений с арестантами и расспросов адвоката, осторожново сывашченика, smotritelya, ... Nelyudov prishol k zaklyucheniyu ... (Tolstoy 323)

Hungarian TT: A *foglyokhoz intézett kérdésekből, az ügyvéddel, a fogházlelkésszel, a felügyelővel folytatott beszélgetésekből* ... Nyehljudov azt a következtetést vonta le ... (Szöllősy 407)

Commentary: adjectivisers needed for left-positioning: *intézett* (‘put’), *folytatott* (‘carried on’).

IE noun phrases can be extended also by postpositive participial phrases. If translators want to avoid the complications involved in left-positioning, they can elevate them, that is, turn them into independent sentence units. The translator's decision is influenced by several factors: (1) the length of the participial phrase, (2) the relevance of the information contained in the participial phrase, and (3) the position of the participial phrase in the sentence. If the postpositive participial phrase is long, contains relevant information and is placed towards the end of the sentence, translators tend to elevate it to sentence level. If the postpositive participial phrase is short, contains information of secondary importance and is placed in the middle of the sentence, translators tend to use left-positioning.

Translation by left-positioning:

English ST: No arm was yet apparent under the coverlet **printed with pink rabbits**. (Greene 125)

Hungarian TT: A **rózsaszín nyulacskákkal mintázott takaró** alól nem látszott ki semmiféle kar. (Borbás 236)

Translation by elevation:

Russian ST: On hotel odnovo, stobi Yeshua, **ne sdelavshiy nikomu v zhizni ni maleyshevo zla**, izbezhai bi istyazaniy... (Bulgakov 145)

Hungarian TT: Csak azt az egyet kívánta, hogy Jesua, **aki soha életében nem vétett senkinek**, megmenekedjék a kínoktól. (Szöllősy 213)

(lit.: Russian: ...never hurting anybody in his life → Hungarian: ...who never hurt anybody in his life)

It is very likely that most of these transformations are performed by translators intuitively, without weighing up text level consequences. In some cases such transformations may be necessary to preserve the information hierarchy of the original. Sentence level decisions (e.g., about the number of independent sentence units within the sentence) may influence the cohesion of the whole text. On the one hand, the increase in independent sentence units is in accordance with the general trend of IE-H translation, but on the other, translating every postpositive participial phrase with an independent sentence unit would distort the information hierarchy of the original, make the text fragmented, and would reduce the coherence of the Hungarian text.

6.1.2. Right-positioning of modifiers

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

As in IE languages noun phrases can be modified in both directions – prepositively and postpositively – some prepositive Hungarian modifiers move from left to right in H-IE translation.

Hungarian ST: Elől maga Pongrácz István lépkedett ... **kócsagos kalpaggal** ... (Mikszáth 49)

English TT: They were led by István Pongrácz himself ... on his head was a **kalpak with an egret's plume**. (Sturgess 61)

Hungarian ST: Így fog beszélni a **bukott férfi** ... (Karinthy 42)
French TT: Voilà comment l'**homme recalé** va parler ... (Gal 44)

Hungarian ST: Egy **kecskeméti papra** van szükségem! (Mikszáth 13)
German TT: "Ich brauche einen **Pfarrer aus Kecskemét!**" (Székács 12)

Hungarian ST: Egy **piros ruhás lány** a szomszédos asztalnál elneveti magát. (Rejtő 11)
Russian TT: 8) Kakaya-to **devushka v krasnom plat'e** ne uderzhalas' ot ulibki. (Aleksandrov 8)

If there is more than one prepositive modifier in the Hungarian noun phrase, the adjectival modifiers will remain in left-preposition and the prepositional phrase modifiers will be moved right and placed after the head noun.

English ST: Társa **bajuszos** (1), **hosszú** (2) **ember**... (Karinthy 301)
Hungarian TT: Her partner, a **tall** (2) **man wearing a mustache** (1), ... (Barker 51)

Hungarian ST: Ettől olyan külseje lett, mint az apostolnak, különösen, ha még hozzáképzelnék ájtatosan kék szemét és (1) **pezsgődugó formájú**, (2) **szelíd orrát**. (Örkény 1.162)
Russian ST: Ot etovo on stal pohozh na bibleyskovo apostola, tem ne bolee chto u nevo bili chistie, nebesno-golubie glaza, i (2) **akkuratneyshiy nos**, (1) **napominayushchiy probku ot shampanskovo**. (Voronkina I. 307)

As noted in the previous chapter, left-positioning in IE-Hungarian translation is often accompanied by the addition of adjectivisers, that is, **empty participles** which make adjectives from the adverbials. In the process of right-positioning they are dropped from the translation.

Hungarian ST: Édesanyja reggel hétkor benyitott az **udvarra néző** (1) **szerény** (2) **lakás** hosszúkás szobájába ... (Kosztolányi 24)
German TT: Um sieben Uhr in der Frühe öffnete seine Mutter die Tür zum langlichen Zimmer ihrer **bescheidenen** (2) **Wohnung mit Hofblick** (1) ... (Koriath 132)
Commentary: The empty Hungarian participle **néző** ('overlooking') could easily be dropped out from the German translation, because of the compact German noun **Hofblick**, comprising the meaning of **néző** ('**blick**').

In her contrastive analysis of Hungarian and English attributive noun phrases, Néray (1980) attempts to predict difficulties for Hungarian learners of English in finding English equivalents for Hungarian modifiers. She concludes: "When the English equivalent is a prepositional phrase they are not likely to drop the verb from the Hungarian participle: az **otthon töltött** napok – 'days **which he spent at home**', 'days **spent at home**' are more probable than 'days **at home**' (Néray

1980: 349). According to the evidence of our translation corpora, dropping the adjectivisers is a standard operation in H-IE translation, and a proof of the existence of professional translation strategies, different from those of language learners.

6.1.3. Left-positioning of focus

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

Word order changes on the level of the clause/sentence cannot be discussed without investigating the functional perspective of the sentence, in other words, theme/rheme or topic/comment analysis. Functional sentence perspective (FSP — a term introduced by the Prague School) means that besides a grammatical structure sentences also have another, so called “communicative” structure. While grammatical structure (consisting of subject, predicate, object, adjectives and adverbials) characterises sentences independently of the context, “communicative” or “informative” or “logical” or “psychological” structure (consisting of theme and rheme or topic, focus, and comment) will characterise sentences in actual communicative situation.

In actual context, certain parts of the sentence will link the sentence to previous sentences, or to previous knowledge possessed by the reader. This is the theme or the topic. Another part of the sentence will convey new information and this is called rheme or comment. The most prominent element of the comment is called focus. These two modes of structuring the sentence are particularly relevant in translation, where, in spite of numerous changes in the grammatical structure, the communicative structure must be preserved.

A contrastive description of Hungarian and English word order and their roles in expressing theme and rheme was initiated by László Dezső in 1980 from a typological point of view. The topic/comment analysis of Hungarian was given a new impetus in the 80's, motivated by Li and Thompson who hypothesised that not all languages build their sentences upon the subject-predicate structure: “Our typological claim will simply be that some languages can be more insightfully described by taking the topic as basic, while others can be more insightfully described by taking the notion of subject as basic” (Li and Thompson 1976: 459–60).

On the basis of their claim, É. Kiss set out to describe Hungarian as a topic-prominent language in contrast with English as a subject-prominent language (É. Kiss 1982, 1987). Due to the intensive research of the communicative patterning of Hungarian (contrasted with English: Dezső 1980, contrasted with Russian: Klaudy 1987), the peculiarities of Hungarian word order, focusing and topicalisation are neatly described and can be compared with those of IE languages. To describe the sentence level word order transpositions in the IE-H and H-IE translation we will use their terminology.

Word order typology distinguishes between SOV, SVO, VSO and VOS languages according to the relative position of subject, object and verb in the clause/sentence. Besides the primary variants of basic word order, languages can be characterised also by secondary variants, with basic or inverted word order (Greenberg 1963). English is a language with a restricted word order and with SVO as the primary variant, while Hungarian has a “free” word order of the mixed type: the primary variants being SOV and SVO.

Languages with a poor morphology, such as English, tend to have restricted

word orders, while languages with a rich morphology, such as Hungarian, tend to have free word orders. This is quite natural, since in languages with poor morphology the parts of the sentence are identified positionally, while in languages with rich morphology the parts of the sentence are identified with the help of suffixes. In this respect English and Hungarian represent two extremes. In the other three IE languages under investigation (French, German and Russian), independently of their differences in morphological markedness, the basic word order is SVO.

Word order transpositions are justified to a great extent by the communicative structure of the sentence. Since in written discourse there are no special devices for the expression of the communicative structure of the sentence, the communicative intent of the speaker cannot be realised directly either, only through grammatical structure in general and through word order in particular. In languages with a restricted word order the realisation of communicative intent is also restricted (cf. the difficulty of focussing the sentence initial subject in English: e.g. It was Peter who ...). In languages with a free word order, the realisation of communicative intent has fewer impediments. As stated by É. Kiss “... in Hungarian (...) the communicative intensions are not subordinated to the subject predicate structure, but become realised directly” (1982: 48).

The basic clause level transpositions in IE-H translation can be explained by the difference between the SVO word order characteristic of IE languages and the SOV word order characteristic of Hungarian: the complement placed **after** the IE verb will be moved leftward **before** the Hungarian verb.

English ST: His parents were safely gone *for a fortnight's holiday* ... (Greene 457)

Hungarian TT: Szülei *kéthetes vakációra* mentek ... (Szobotka 280)

French ST: Il ne me semblait pas que l'on pût aller là *pour une autre*. (Nerval 14)

Hungarian TT: Eszembe sem jutott, *hogy másért is* járhatnék. (Brodsky 15)

German ST: Sie stiegen *Arm in Arm* über den Graben an der Straße und sofort tiefer in die Tannendunkelheit hinein ... (Mörrike 10)

Hungarian TT: *Karonfogva* ugrották át az út menti árkot, és léptek be a fenyves homályába ... (Lengyel 11)

Russian ST: No ob etom mozhno govorit' *sovershenno svobodno*. (Bulgakov 14)

Hungarian TT: De erről *teljes nyíltsággal* beszélhetünk. (Szöllősy 13)

In the German sentence above, there is more than one complement placed after the verb, but in the Hungarian translation only one of them is left-positioned, occupying the “left slot” before the Hungarian verb. This is the place of the **focus** in Hungarian, as defined by É. Kiss: “The focus of the Hungarian sentence is the sentence constituent (an argument of the verb, or the verb itself) that carries the sentence stress, and occupies the first slot of the comment” (É. Kiss 1982: 43).

Thus, sentence level left-positioning taking place in IE-H translation is actually **left-positioning of the focus**, the most highly stressed constituent of the IE sentence.

As the aim of sentence level word order transpositions is to preserve the communicative structure of the SL text, translators must be aware of communicative patterning both in the SL and TL. In other words, they must be able to analyse the topic-comment structure of the SL sentence and be familiar with the ways of topicalisation and focussing in the TL. In the following we shall discuss some aspects of focussing in translating from IE into Hungarian.

As already mentioned, Li and Thompson (1976) introduced the concept of subject prominent and topic prominent languages. They also hypothesised that subject prominent languages belong to the SVO type and topic prominent languages belong to the SOV type. In our case, four subject prominent SVO type languages (English, French, German, Russian) are contrasted with a topic prominent and dominantly SOV type language (Hungarian).

One of the main differences between the SVO and SOV (SVO) types is the position of the focus. The two types of focus in IE languages are: (1) verbal focus and (2) **postverbal** focus. The two types of focus in Hungarian are: (1) verbal focus and (2) **preverbal** focus. There is no preverbal focussing in IE languages, and there is no postverbal focussing in Hungarian.

In the case of verbal focus, there is no need for word order changes in IE-H translation, because the position of the verbal focus is the same in all the languages under investigation: the first place in the comment part of the sentence. In the following, the border between the topic part and the comment part is marked by #.

English ST: The telephone #rang on his desk. (Greene 484)

Hungarian TT: A telefon #megcsöndült a pulton. (Szobotka 304)

English ST: The charcoal #shifted in the stove. (Greene 485)

Hungarian TT: A szén #szétomlott a kályhában. (Szobotka 306)

German ST: In diesem Moment nun #entwickelte sich das bisher locker eingebundene Segel ... (Mörrike 86)

Hungarian TT: Ebben a pillanatban #kibomlott a lazán összegöngyölt vitorla ... (Lengyel 87)

If the stressed element is not the verb itself but one of the verb complements it is called **nonverbal focus**. The place of the nonverbal focus is the **last** element of the comment in IE languages (end-focus) and the **first** element of the comment in Hungarian (mid-focus). The postverbal focus in IE languages is marked only positionally, while the preverbal focus in Hungarian is marked both positionally and syntactically, that is, by the inverted word order of the Hungarian prefixed verb. It is one of the unique features of the Hungarian language that it has separable verbal prefixes capable of identifying the focus of the sentence. Among the IE languages under investigation, German has separable verbal prefixes but without this function. The example below illustrates the left-positioning of the focus in IE-H translation. The focus occupies the first place in the comment and is followed by inverted prefixed verbs that identify the focus regressively:

French ST: L'animal # *heurta* mon piège (1) des deux jambes de devant (2) ... (Maupassant 58)

Hungarian TT: Az állat # első két lábával (2) *szaladt neki* a csapdámnak (1) ... (Benyhe 59)

As can be seen from the example, the verb in the French clause has two complements, but left-positioning in the Hungarian translation affects only the second one (*des deux jambes de devant*), which is the focus of the French clause and its Hungarian equivalent: *első két lábával* comes **before** the inverted Hungarian verb: *szaladt neki*. The second, non-stressed complement of the French verb (*mon piège*) retains its unstressed position **after** the Hungarian verb (*a csapdámnak*).

The focus in Hungarian can also be identified by the semantic weakness of the verb. Semantically weak verbs in Hungarian, similarly to verbs with inverted word order, have a unique feature of the language: i.e. they are capable of indicating the focus **regressively**. In other words, **they are open to the left**, and whichever element of the sentence is placed on their left they will automatically make it emphatic. In IE languages focussing is **progressive** and the focussed element always follows the verb.

English ST: It began *with turtle soup*. (Vonnegut 40)

Hungarian TT: *Teknősbékalevessel* kezdődött. (Borbás 35)

Regressive focussing, which means that the verb of the Hungarian sentence fulfils the task of focus selection **a posteriori**, may lead to undesirable consequences in translated Hungarian texts, managed by translators with the help of special strategies, to be discussed below.

The first consequence of regressive focussing is the **blurred borderline** between the topic and the comment part of the sentence. In IE languages, in accordance with the SVO word order, the first element of the comment is always the **verbal predicate** which serves as a **borderline marker** between the topic and the comment. In Hungarian, the first element of the comment, in accordance with the dominant SOV word order, is often a noun phrase, which does not show formal differences to topic noun phrase or phrases, and the borderline between them is indicated only regressively by the verb, which may be the last element in the sentence. Note the following example:

English ST: The general opinion of Tai # *had been voiced* long ago by Adam Aziz's father the gemstone merchant. (Rushdie 14)

Hungarian TT: A Táiról alkotott közvélekedést # annak idején még Adam Aziz apja, a drágakőkereskedő *fogalmazta meg*. (Falvay 17)

Another phenomenon of translated Hungarian texts may be called **overburdening of the focus slot**, when there is more than one element in focus position. As inverted verbs or semantically weak Hungarian verbs are open to the left, the focus slot can be occupied not only by the stressed postverbal component of the IE clause, but by all the postverbal components. In this case, the Hungarian verb will be pushed towards the end of the clause/sentence. Because of free word order

in Hungarian, the final position of the verb will not make the sentence grammatically incorrect, but leads to **belated identification** of the communicative structure of the sentence. The consequences of this belated identification will be realised by readers only on the level of the whole text, and is a clear sign of translationese. The example below illustrates the final positioning of the verb in Hungarian translation:

German ST: K. Fischer # erläutert die Beziehung des Witzes zum Komischen mit Behilfe der in seiner Darstellung zwischen beide eingeschobenen Karikatur. (Freud 6)

Hungarian TT: Fischer # a vicc és a komikum viszonyát a szerinte a kettő között elhelyezkedő gúnyrajz segítségével világítja meg. (translation before editing)

Comparing the two sentences, it becomes obvious that while they may be equivalent in terms of grammatical structure, their communicative structures are very different. In the German sentence, the verbal predicate (*erläutert*) is placed right after the topic at the beginning of the comment part, clearly indicating the borderline between the topic and the comment. In the Hungarian sentence, the verbal predicate (*világítja meg*) is the last element, which means that the borderline between the topic and the comment is blurred, and the selection of the focus is belated. The translator has to take special care to remove the non-stressed elements from the focus slot, and place them into a postverbal position or elevate them into independent sentence units.

German ST: K. Fischer # *erläutert* die Beziehung des Witzes zum Komischen mit Behilfe der in seiner Darstellung zwischen beide eingeschobenen Karikatur. (Freud 6)

Hungarian TT: Fischer # a vicc és a komikum viszonyát a gúnyrajz segítségével *világítja meg*, mely szerinte a kettő között helyezkedik el. (edited translation)

Given the left-positioning of the focus on the clause level, and the left-positioning of the modifiers on the phrase level (cf. GR 6.1), we may conclude that IE-H translation can be characterised by a series of left-positioning moves. These two types of leftward shifts are also part of the common-sense, experience-based wisdom of Hungarian translators, who hold that “everything is reversed” in IE, and translation into Hungarian should begin at the end of the sentence.

6.1.4. Right-positioning of focus

Predominant direction: **form Hungarian → into IE**

The wisdom quoted above about IE languages being “reversed” frequently applies to Hungarian-IE translation as well. The examples below illustrate the right-positioning of the focus in H-IE translation.

Hungarian → English:

*Hungarian ST: ... a tanár pedig **zsebredugott kezekkel az esős utcába bámult ki** ... (Csáth 12)*

*English TT: ... and the professor **stared out at the rainy street, his hands in his pockets**. (Kessler 184)*

Hungarian → French:

*Hungarian ST: **Lassan, biztosan múlik** az éj. (Babits 5)*

*French TT: La nuit **s'écoule inexorablement**. (Leuilly-Szende 13)*

*Hungarian ST: **Kemény, katonás, hirtelen haragú ember volt** Stromm lovag. (Mikszáth 37)*

*French TT: Le chevalier Stromm **était un homme dur, brave soldat, sujet à des accès de colère**. (Körössy 39)*

Hungarian → German:

*Hungarian ST: Helyette **egy púpos, félkegyelmű, hebegő beszédű alak vállalta** a levélhordói teendőket. (Örkény 2. 171)*

*German TT: An seiner Stelle **übernahm ein verwachsener, einfältiger, stotternder Mann** das Austragen der Briefe. (Thies 2. 96)*

Hungarian → Russian:

*Hungarian ST: Ám ekkor legnagyobb csodálkozására az alsó polcról **Vanek úr esett ki** a padlóra. (Rejtő 84)*

*Russian ST: Iz nizhnevo yashchika, k nemalomu udivleniyu Gorcheva, kubarem **vikatilsya gospodin Vanek**. (Aleksandrov 125)*

The correctness of the observation described above is born out by the systemic word order differences between Hungarian and the IE languages. In translating from a SOV type language into SVO type languages, right-positioning of the verbal complements is obligatory. The order of complements after the verb, however, depends on their communicative function. As the most highlighted element, the **focus** in IE languages tends to be placed towards the end of the sentence, in translating from a SOV language into SVO languages preverbal focus will be turned into postverbal focus and the regressive focussing into progressive focussing.

6.1.5. Obligatory topicalisation in H-IE translation

In the case of topicless Hungarian sentences obligatory right-positioning of the preverbal focus may result in a phenomenon we refer to as **degradation of the beginning of the sentence**. Degradation means an “empty place” at the beginning of the sentence, which must be filled in. This degradation in H-IE translation requires an additional transfer operation, namely **topicalisation**.

The Hungarian sentences below are all topicless sentences, consisting only of the comment part with a noun phrase occupying the focus slot before the verb. With the right-positioning of the focus, the **verb** would become a **sentence initial** element in the IE sentence, which would be inappropriate. In translating topicless Hungarian sentences into IE, translators must move the focus to the right and they must also find or create an element for the topic role. The topic in the English and German example is a newly created subject, while in the Russian example, it is an adverbial.

Hungarian ST: Janász Jenőnek hívták a dalszerzőt. (Örkény 1.102)
English TT: The songwriter's name was Jenő Janász. (Sollosy 76)

Hungarian ST: A kisfű mellé állt. (Kosztolányi 31)
German TT: Er stellte sich neben den kleinen Jungen. (Koriath 139)

Hungarian ST: Egy kis papírgombóc gurult melléje. Fölvette, kihajtogatta. (Molnár 5)
Russian TT: K nogam evo podkatilsya bumazhniy sharik. On podnyal evo, razvernul. (Rossiyanov 7)

Subjectless sentences, or sentences where the subject is not the topic but the focus of the sentence can often be found in Hungarian. These types of sentences seem to support the hypothesis put forward by Li and Thompson (1976) and further developed by É. Kiss (1982, 1987), which says that Hungarian can be described more appropriately by the topic-comment relation than the subject-predicate relation.

The following examples represent three different types of topicalisation in H-IE translation. In the first example, a topic is created by the explicitation of the general subject implied by the Hungarian first person plural verb form (*We*). In the second example, the translator used the last unstressed part of the Hungarian comment for the topic role (*A court in Budapest*). In the third example, the Hungarian verbal predicate (*beszélgettünk*) is divided into an empty verb (*turn*) and a noun (*conversation*), and the noun becomes the topic of the English sentence (*Our conversation*).

_F[*Az orosz áttörés után*] _T[*csapódtunk egymáshoz*]. (Örkény 1. 102)
_T[*We*] # [*were thrown together*] _F[*by the Russian offensive*]. (Sollosy 76)

_F[*Kaska-Kun Géza volt egyetemi tanár és 16 büntársa ügyében hirdetett ma ítéletet a budapesti bíróság.*] (Örkény 1. 233)
_T[*A court in Budapest*] # _F[*has today brought down a verdict in the case of the state contra former college professor Géza Kashka-Kun and sixteen of his accomplices.*] (Sollosy 100)

_F[*Abrázoló mértanról és fizikáról*] # _T[*beszélgettünk.*] (Karinthy 275)
_T[*Our conversation*] # _C[*turned*] _F[*on geometry and physics.*] (Barker 15)

H-IE translation thus consists of a series of moves to the right. At the sentence level it is the preverbal focus, while at the phrase level, it is premodifiers that are

moved to the right. As we could see in the examples above, the series of the obligatory shifts to the right may affect the beginning of the sentence, which is a very sensitive place for text cohesion.

6.1.6. Transpositions at the beginning of the sentence

Transpositions at the beginning of the sentence are partly obligatory and partly optional transfer operations. In the previous chapter we illustrated obligatory topicalisation in H-IE translation required by degradation of the beginning of the sentence.

Degradation of the beginning of the sentence also takes place in IE-H translation. Some elements “disappear” from the beginning of the Hungarian sentence: e.g., personal pronouns which are dropped, auxiliary verbs incorporated into main verbs and the verb itself will be preceded by the focussed element. The degradation of the beginning of the sentence in IE-H translation results in a topicless sentence, consisting only of the comment and beginning with the focus.

English ST: He moved **to the door** ... (Greene 284)

Hungarian TT: **Az ajtó felé** indult ... (Török 60)

English ST: I will not breathe a word **to a soul**. (Greene 284)

Hungarian TT: **Egy léleknek sem** szólok. (Török 59)

Russian ST: On pospeshno zalez **pod prostinyu**. (Trifonov 366)

Hungarian TT: **Gyorsan a takaró alá** bújt. (Szabó 12)

Russian ST: On polzovalsya eyu **raschetlivo i umno** ... (Trifonov 366)

Hungarian TT: **Számítóan és okosan** élt vele ... (Szabó 21)

Russian ST: On smotrel **iz dveri vihodivshey na zadnyuyu lestnitsu**. (Trifonov 373)

Hungarian TT: **A hátsó lépcsőre nyíló ajtóból** leskelődött. (Szabó 22)

These transpositions create the impression as if Hungarian translators began a sentence right at the middle. This impression is strengthened by the disappearance of sentence initial **there is, there are** in English-Hungarian translation.

English ST: **There were** eight Japanese gentlemen having a fish dinner at Bentley's. (Greene 118)

Hungarian TT: Nyolc japán úr vacsorázik a londoni Bentley étteremben. (Halápy 207)

English ST: **There was** quite a surge of people round the place ... (Greene 424)

Hungarian TT: Egész csomó ember gyűlt össze a tér körül. (Prekop 10)

The changes at the beginning of the sentence may be caused by the passive-active transformation taking place in the IE-H translation (see in detail in GR7).

English ST: They were immediately caught up in the forest. (Greene 502)
Hungarian TT: Azonnal bekerítette őket az erdő. (Osztovcics 81)

In contrast to the H-IE translation, where degradation of the beginning of the sentence required obligatory topicalisation, the Hungarian sentences above do not need anything to be added. Due to its rich morphology and free word order the beginning of the sentence in Hungarian is very flexible.

The flexibility of Hungarian word order from the point of view of communicative patterning means that all parts of the sentence are available for the topic role, and sentences can also begin right from the comment without a topic. The only restriction concerns the place of the nonverbal focus: this is the first left slot before the verb. In spite of the grammatical correctness of topicless sentences in Hungarian, translators often apply **optional topicalisation** in IE-H translation. They move into sentence initial position the time and place adverbials, or subjects, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter which will discuss optional transpositions.

6. 2. Optional transpositions

6. 2.1. Contextual variants

The flexibility of Hungarian word order does not imply a lack of sensitivity. The different word order variants represent different contextual variants. The choice between them may influence the cohesion of the translated text.

Here we must broach the topic of **optional transpositions**. Optional transpositions are made by translators in order to strengthen the cohesive ties of the TL text. In translating from IE languages into Hungarian translators can choose from among several options with respect to word order. The English sentence below has a number of grammatically correct Hungarian translations, each with a different word order. Taken out of context, all of the following translations may be equivalent to the English sentence.

English ST: I found him looking for the dog between the palms of the garden.

Hungarian TT: (possible versions) Amikor összetalálkoztunk, ('When we met')

- ... a kutyát kereste a kert pálmái között.
(lit.: the dog he looked for between the palms of the garden)
- ... a kutyát a kert pálmái között kereste.
(lit.: the dog between the palms of the garden he looked for)
- ... kereste a kert pálmái között a kutyát.
(lit.: he looked for between the palms of the garden the dog)
- ... kereste a kutyát a kert pálmái között.
(lit.: he looked for the dog between the palms of the garden)
- ... a kert pálmái közöt kereste a kutyát.
(lit.:between the palms of the garden he looked for the dog)

... a kert pálmái között a kutyát kereste.
(lit.: between the palms of the garden the dog he looked for)

If, however, we look at the preceding sentence in the context (*Three days later his dog disappeared*), it becomes evident that from among the above six options it is the first that is linked most closely to the previous sentence.

English ST: Three days later *his dog* disappeared. I found him looking for *it* between the palms of the garden. (Greene 429)

Hungarian TT: Három nappal később eltűnt a *kutyája*. Amikor össze-találkoztunk, a *kutyát* kereste a kert pálmái között. (Prekop 17)

The choice of the appropriate word order variant may be influenced not only by the previous sentence but also by the following sentence. Out of the context the English sentence below may also have a number of different grammatically correct translations into Hungarian:

English ST: They met among the ruins at the edge of the village.

Hungarian TT: (possible versions)

A falu szélén találkoztak a romok között.

(lit.: At the edge of the village they met among the ruins)

A romok között találkoztak a falu szélén.

(lit.: Among the ruins they met at the edge of the village)

A falu szélén a romok között találkoztak

(lit.: At the edge of the village among the ruins they met)

A romok között a falu szélén találkoztak.

(lit.: Among the ruins at the edge of the village they met)

If, however, we look at the next sentence (*The ruins had always been there*), it becomes evident that the first sentence must end with “ruins”, since this provides a thread of continuity.

English ST: They met among the ruins at the edge of the village. *The ruins* had always been there. (Greene 300)

Hungarian TT: A falu végén találkoztak *a romok között*. *A romok* időtlen idő óta ott voltak. (Kéry 241)

6.2.2. Fronting time and place adverbials

There are two optional transpositions which frequently occur at the beginning of sentences in both directions: fronting **time or place adverbials** and fronting the **subject**. When fronting an element of the sentence, we move it into sentence initial position.

To begin the sentence with time or place adverbials is quite natural in all languages. They are very suitable for the **topic** role, therefore they are very often used for topicalisation. In the example below, topicalisation is optional because the Hungarian sentence could have begun right with the focus, but the translator decided to move the time adverbial into sentence initial position.

English ST: There was a case of much the same kind in Northumberland **a year ago**. (Christie 18)

Hungarian TT: **Tavaly** nagyon hasonló dolog történt Northumberlandban. (Borbás 19)

Fronting time and place adverbials does not necessarily mean topicalisation. In the following examples time adverbials are in **focus position** in the English sentence (end-focus) and fronting them brings them into focus position in the Hungarian sentence, too (preverbal focus).

English ST: I spoke to Mother on the phone **last night**. (Salinger 5)

Hungarian TT: **Tegnap este** beszéltem anyával telefonon. (Elbert 9)

English ST: The first time she left her chamber was **at the commencement of the following March**. (E. Brontë 171)

Hungarian TT: **Március elején** jöhetett ki először szobájából. (Sötér 130)

6.2.3. Fronting the subject

Fronting the **subject** is a frequent transposition in both directions. In H-IE translation it is often **obligatory** because of the restrictions on word order in IE languages (see GR 6.1.5). In IE-H translation fronting the subject is always **optional**. Since the subject in Hungarian is identified morphologically and not positionally, it can stand anywhere in the sentence. Translators, nevertheless, often place the subject into sentence initial position in IE-H translation.

The type of sentence where the subject is first identified by a personal pronoun (preparatory subject) and is concretised only in the second half of the sentence is fairly common in IE languages. In such cases, the concrete subject may be brought forward in the translation. In the case of the French example from Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, we have two published translations, both made by excellent professional translators. The optional nature of this transposition is illustrated by the difference between the two translations: the subject is fronted only by the first translator.

English ST: Now that **he** realized there was nothing to be done about it ... **Number One** made little trouble. (Greene 305)

Hungarian TT: **Egyes**, látva, hogy nincs mit tennie, most már nem sok vizet zavart. (Kéry 244)

French ST: Comme **il** s'ennuyait beaucoup à Yonville, où **il** était clerc chez maître Guillaumin, souvent **M. Léon Dupuis** (c'était lui, le second habitué du "Lion d'or") reculait l'insistant de son repas ... (Flaubert 84)

First translation, fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: Mivel **Léon Dupuis**, Guillaumin jegyző segédje (mert ő volt az Arany Oroszlán másik állandó vendége) igen unatkozott Yonville-ban, próbálta minél későbbre tolni az étkezés idejét ... (Gyergyai 101)

Second translation, not fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: Nagyon unatkozott Yonville-ban **Léon Dupuis úr** (ő volt az Arany Oroszlán másik kosztosa), Guillaumin jegyző úr segédje, ezért igyekezett késleltetni a vacsorát ... (Pór 89)

This transposition is reversible, in translating from Hungarian into IE translators remove specific subjects from the beginning of the sentence and replace them by preparatory subjects.

Hungarian ST: **Zetelaki** késett ugyan egy kicsit, s az első felvonásban feltűnően fáradtnak látszott (néhol szemlátomást a sűgó segítségére szorult), de aztán egyre jobban magára talált ... (Örkény 1.13)

English TT: Though a few moments late and looking rather the worst for wear during Act 1 (here and there **he** had to rely on the prompter) **Zetelaky** gradually revived ... (Sollosy 57)

Another characteristic IE sentence type begins with an introductory participial or nominal phrase and the subject comes later, in the main clause. Elevation of the IE participial or nominal phrase into an independent sentence unit in IE-H translation is frequently accompanied by fronting of the subject.

English ST: Without looking at his brother, **Francis** said... (Greene 558)

Hungarian TT: **Francis** nem is nézett a testvérére, amikor így szólt:... (Osztoivits 316)

English ST: With all the things that could be made by the hands, **Miss Amelia** prospered. (McCullers 10)

Hungarian TT: **Miss Amelia** mindenem gyarapodott, amit kézzel lehet elkészíteni. (Szász 11)

French ST: Par un mouvement involontaire, et malgré la recommandation faite, **D'Artagnan** lance son cheval au galop (Dumas 394)

Hungarian TT: **D'Artagnan** az intelem ellenére önkéntelen vágára sarkantyúzta a lovát ... (Csatlós 375)

In this case both translators of *Madam Bovary* applied the device of fronting of the subject.

French ST: Sans qu'il s'en aperçut, tout en causant, **Léon** avait posé son pied sur un des barreaux de la chaise où madame Bovary était assise. (Flaubert 89)

First translation, fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: **Leon**, miközben így beszélt, észre sem vette, hogy egyik lábát Bovaryné székének keresztrúdján nyugtatta. (Gyergyai 107)

Second translation, also fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: **Léon** társalgás közben maga se vette észre, hogy ráteszi a lábát Bovaryné székének keresztlécére. (Pór 94)

This transposition is also reversible: when translating into the opposite direction, translators create introductory nominal and participial phrases removing the subject from sentence initial position.

Hungarian ST: A Lear király esti előadása e tragikus esemény ellenére is zavartalanul folyt le. (Örkény 1. 13)

English TT: Despite this terrible misfortune, tonight's performance of King Lear proceeded as usual. (Sollosy 57)

Hungarian ST: Zsolozsmai, ahelyett, hogy gyorsan odébbállt volna, félszegen kalapot emelt. (Örkény 1. 209)

English ST: Instead of walking away, in his embarrassment Zsolozsmai shyly tipped his hat. (Sollosy 49)

Fronting the subject often takes place in IE-Hungarian translation without any visible reason. The optional nature of fronting is illustrated by the two equally adequate versions of the French example: the first without and the second with fronting.

English ST: For the second time that morning, Mr. Boggis explained at some length the aims and ideals of the Society for the Preservation of Rare Furniture. (Dahl 140)

Hungarian TT: Mr. Boggis a nap folyamán immár másodszor magyarázta el részletesen a Régi Bútorok Megóvására Alakult Társaság célkitűzéseit és eszményeit. (Borbás 141)

French ST: De l'autre côté de la cheminée, un jeune homme à chevelure blonde la regardait silencieusement. (Flaubert 89)

First translation, without fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: A tűzhely másik oldalán szőke hajú fiatalember állt és csendesen nézegette. (Gyergyai 101)

Second translation, fronting the subject:

Hungarian TT: Egy szőke fiatalember fiatalember nézte Emmát szótlanul a tűz másik oldaláról. (Pór 89)

The seemingly unjustified fronting of the subject in IE-H translation can be explained partly by the habitual character of this transposition. Translators do it so often that it becomes second nature with them, a language pair specific translation strategy. Another explanation can be that there exists a universal translation strategy that we may call fronting "sign-posting" elements. Translators try to do their best to make clear the structure of a sentence as soon as possible. Where a sentence begins with a subject, the reader will receive an important cue for comprehension from the very first word of the sentence.

6.2.4. Defronting of sentence initial conjunctions

By defronting we mean removing an element from sentence initial position. This happens with certain conjunctions in IE-H translation. Defronting of sentence ini-

tial conjunctions is an optional transposition, which cannot be explained by syntactic differences between languages. In IE-H translation, **some conjunctions and conjuncts**, – for instance the adversative ones: *viszont* ('on the other hand'), *ellenben* ('on the contrary'), the confronting ones: *azonban* ('but'), *pedig* ('however'), the inductive ones: *tehát* ('therefore') and the explanatory ones: *ugyanis* ('namely'), *tudniillik* ('namely') – are removed from the beginning of the sentence and are placed after the first noun or nominal phrase of the Hungarian sentence.

English → Hungarian:

English ST: Perhaps his father was in the right about his age. (Greene 299)

Hungarian TT: Apa alighanem jobban tudja az ő korát. (Kéry 240)

English ST: But he discovered you couldn't laugh at Mrs. Baines. (Greene 465)

Hungarian TT: Most azonban arra jöttek rá, hogy Mrs. Bainsen nem lehet nevetni. (Szobotka 288)

French → Hungarian:

French ST: Cependant, avant d'entrer dans le détail de ces nouveaux événements, le narrateur croit utile de ... (Camus 21)

Hungarian TT: Az elbeszélő azonban, mielőtt újabb események részleteibe hatolna ... (Győri 259)

French ST: – Alors, vous imaginez ma surprise, au lever de jour, quand une drôle de petite voix m'a réveillée. (Exupéry 11)

Hungarian TT: – Elképzzelhető hát, mennyire meglepődtem, amikor hajnalban egy fura kis hang ébreszett fel. (Rónay 46)

French ST: Mais un fétiche ne suffisait point à guérir Paul (Cocteau 216)

Hungarian TT: Egy varázsszer azonban nem volna elég Paul meggyógyítására. (Gyergyai 217)

German → Hungarian:

German ST: Aber unter Tonio's runder Pelzmütze blickten aus einem brünetten und ganz südlich scharfgeschnittenen Gesicht dunkle und zart umschattete Augen mit zu schweren Lindern träumerisch und ein wenig zaghaft hervor ... (Mann 1. 10)

Hungarian TT: Tonio kerek prémsüvege alól barnás és déliesen éles metszésű arcából ellenben sötét, szelíden árnyékolt, túlságosan súlyos pillájú szempár pillantott elő álmodozón és kissé félénken. (Lányi 1. 11)

German ST: Augenscheinlich liebten ihre Töchter, Ines und Clarissa, dies Lachen nicht. (Mann 197)

Hungarian TT: Lányai, Ines és Clarissa, **szemlátomást** nem szívelték ezt a kuncogást. (Szöllősy 240)

Russian → Hungarian:

Russian ST: **Vprochem**, kucher bil ne ochen' unil i ispugan. (Dostoyevskiy 87)

Hungarian TT: A kocsis **egyébként** nem is bánkódott túlságosan, ijedtek sem látszott. (Görög-Beke 179)

Russian ST: **Odnako** istoriya znaet yeshcho bolee visokuyu tsenu. (Zoshchenko 258)

Hungarian TT: A történelem **azonban** még magasabb vérdíjat is feljegyzett. (Rab 37)

Removing certain types of the conjunctions from sentence initial position in IE-H translation is an optional transposition, which cannot be explained by grammatical differences between the languages. Nevertheless, it is a habitual transfer operation: professional translators do it regularly, and apparently it is a language pair specific translation strategy with them. Explanation might be given by the analysis of the **functional perspective** of the Hungarian sentence. We have already mentioned that because of the SOV word order in Hungarian, the **borderline** between the topic and comment can be **blurred**. If we analyse the above examples, we can see that conjunctions are placed after the topic part of the sentence, serving as special borderline markers between the topic and the comment.

This function becomes clear if we look at the Hungarian translation of the first German example, in which the topic consists of long, extended nominal phrases and the verb is shifted towards the end of the sentence. In this Hungarian translation, the conjunction **ellenben** (cf. sentence initial **Aber** in German) is an important borderline marker between the topic and the comment, and helps the reader to better (and earlier) understand the sentence structure.

6.2.5. Transposition of interruptions

By interruption we mean cases when certain elements (phrases or clauses) are inserted into the sentence, separating two elements, which would normally follow each other. The possibilities of interruption vary from language to language. In languages with a rich morphology and a free word order, sentences can be interrupted more easily than in languages with a poor morphology and fixed word order. Since sentences can only rarely be interrupted at the same point, translators are frequently compelled to change the position of the inserted structure, or eliminate the interruption.

In translating interrupted sentences, translators have to construct a new **framework** for interruption in the translated text. The framework divides the sentence into the part preceding the interruption (left frame) and that following the interruption (right frame). The left frame must contain enough information to predict the ensuing structure of the sentence. In the example below, because of the degradation of the beginning of the sentence in IE-H translation, the left frame would

be too short and therefore the translator removed the focus from the right frame in German and transposed it into the left frame in Hungarian.

German ST: Er schritt – **und niemand schritt wie er, elastisch, wogend, wiegend, königlich** – auf die Herrin des Hauses zu, verbeugte sich und wartete, dass man ihm die Hand reiche. (Mann 1. 40)
Hungarian TT: A ház úrnőjéhez lépett – **és senki sem lépdelt olyan rugalmasan ingva-ringva, oly királyian** –, meghajtotta magát, és várta, hogy a hölgy kezét nyújtsa. (Lányi 1. 41)

The following examples illustrate the **elimination** of interruption in E-H translation. Because of the usual degradation of the sentence beginning in IE-H translation (obligatory omission of the personal pronoun, incorporation of the auxiliary verb into the main verb and the left-position of the non-verbal focus), there is nothing left in the translation which could give a left framework for the insertion. Therefore the translator moved the inserted part into sentence initial position, and transformed it into a topic in the English-Hungarian translation and into an independent sentence unit in the French-Hungarian translation.

English ST: He could even, **with some difficulty**, look back into the past. (Greene 299)
Hungarian TT: **Némi megerőltetéssel** még a múltba is vissza tudott tekinteni. (Kéry 240)

French ST: Il s'était enveloppé, **au sortir du bain**, d'une ample serviette de tissu bouclé ... (Vian 9)
Hungarian TT: **Amikor kijött a kádból**, hatalmas bolyhos törülközőbe csavarta magát ... (Bajomi 7)

In the second example, the interruption had to be eliminated because in English it is much less acceptable to separate the subject and the predicate than in Hungarian.

6.2.6. Transposition of reporting clauses

Changing the position of reporting clauses is another word order transposition, affecting the whole sentence structure. This is also a partly obligatory and partly optional transfer operation. The reporting clauses accompanying a quotation may be transposed freely around the quotation in all the languages under consideration. The reporting clauses may **introduce, interrupt or close** the quotation.

Short introductory reporting clauses (like *helshe said, erlsie sagte, onlona skazala*) are often transposed into the middle or the end of the sentence in IE-H translation. The reason for this operation is very simple: omission of the personal pronoun would leave the introductory reporting clause incomplete:

English ST: **She said**, 'It is lovely. Let's drive a long way.' (Greene 436)
Hungarian TT: – Nagyszerű. Menjünk el jó messzire – **mondta a lány**. (Prekop 263)

German ST: Er sagte, wir wären verrückt, weil wir kein Geld hatten, wir sollten doch etwas verscheuern; (Böll 33)

Hungarian TT: – Eszünk sincs, ha pénzünk nincs, – mondta a tizedes, – miért nem dobunk el valamit; (Bor 33)

Perhaps under the influence of analogy, Hungarian translators often remove reporting clauses from sentence initial position even in cases where there is no danger of incompleteness. Again, this procedure can be seen as a specific translation strategy.

English ST: The very first question she asked Snowball was: ‘Will there still be sugar after the Rebellion?’ (Orwell 10)

Hungarian TT: – Lesz-e cukor a forradalom után is? – kérdezte legelőszőr is Hógolyótól. (Sziógyártó 17)

If the reporting clause **interrupts** a quotation, the same principles apply as in the case of sentence interruption. Options for interrupting are heavily dependent on the syntactic possibilities of individual languages. If the left frame of the interruption is too short, or incomplete, translators eliminate the interruption and transpose the reporting clause to the end of the sentence.

French ST: – Aussi, disait Rodolphe, je m’enfonce dans une tristesse ... (Flaubert 152)

Hungarian TT: – Magam is egyre jobban belesüppedek a szomorúságba ... mondta Rodolphe. (Pór 152)

French ST: – Je devrais, dit Rodolphe, me reculer un peu. (Flaubert 156)

Hungarian TT: – Hátrább kellett volna húzódnom — szólalt meg Rodolphe. (Pór 156)

French ST: – Alors, Jacques, dit sa mère, tu te portes bien? (Cocteau 52)

Hungarian TT: – Szóval jól vagy, Jacques? – szól az édesanyja. (Pór 53)

In the following examples, the interruption is eliminated and the reporting clauses interrupting the quotation in the original are transposed to the beginning of the sentence in the translation. The reason is the same: obligatory word order changes eliminate the left frame (first example) or cut it too short (second example).

German ST: “So einen Blick”, erzählte er zwei Jahre später, “hab ich in meinem Leben noch nicht gesehen.” (Seghers 146)

Hungarian TT: Két esztendővel később így beszélt el a dolgot: – Életemben nem láttam olyan tekintetet. (Thury 142)

German ST: Man gerät, sagte ich unbeirrt, damit in die Rolle des Verneiners der Werke, man wird zum Anwalt des Nichts. (Mann 187)

Hungarian TT: Én azonban makacsul folytattam a magamét: Az ember ezáltal a művek tagadójává, a Semmi prókátorává szegődik. (Szöllősy 229)

If the left frame is a complete clause, the interrupting reporting clause retains its place in the translation.

The end of the quotation is the most natural place for the reporting clause in all the languages under investigation. The optional character of the transposition of reporting clauses is illustrated by the following examples, where closing reporting clauses of the original are transformed into interrupting reporting clauses in the translation.

English ST: ‘If you were my boy I’d take you out and gamble’, *he said*. (Hemingway 3)

Hungarian TT: – Ha az én fiam volnál – *mondta* –, vállalnám a kockázatot és magammal vinnélek. (Ottlik 7)

English ST: ‘The germs of influenza can only exist in an acid condition’, *he explained*. (Hemingway 162)

Hungarian TT: – Az influenza kórokozói – *magyarázta a doktor* – csak az acidosis állapotában tenyésznek. (Róna 163)

The explanation can be found in the topic-comment structure of the reporting clauses. In Hungarian, the most typical reporting verb *mondta* is a weak verb which is open to the left and puts the emphasis on the first element standing on its left side. With transposing the reporting clause after the first clause or after the first noun phrase, the transposed reporting verb puts the emphasis on them.

Summary comments on grammatical transpositions

By grammatical transposition we mean (1) **obligatory** word order changes performed by translators in order to obtain grammatically correct TL sentences, and (2) **optional** word order changes performed in order to achieve a cohesive TL text.

In connection with **obligatory** word order transpositions we must explain the intuition and experience-based advice given by teachers, editors and instructors to novice translators, namely that in translating from IE languages, one should always “begin at the end”. This advice is based on the correct observation that translation from IE into Hungarian consists of a **series of left-positioning**. At the phrase-level, postmodifiers in noun phrases are moved to the left. At the sentence-level, in accordance with the dominantly characteristic SOV word order of Hungarian, the most emphatic complement of the verb is moved to the left.

The advice that “the translation must start from the end” is naturally valid in H-IE translation as well, but “in reverse”. Translation from Hungarian into IE languages consists of a **series of right-positioning**. At the phrase level, some noun phrase premodifiers are moved to the right. At the sentence level, in accordance with the SVO word order typical of IE languages, the most emphatic complement of the verb is moved to the right towards the end of the sentence.

Word order changes on the clause/sentence level cannot be discussed without the consideration of the **communicative structuring** (topic-comment structure) of the sentence. Obligatory word order changes which lead to a grammatically correct TL sentence may **distort** the communicative structure: cohesive ties get

loose, unimportant elements get highlighted and important elements are blurred. Many **optional** word order changes are performed in order to **preserve the communicative structure** of the sentences, and thus the **cohesion** of the text.

Optional word order changes can be explained by the different means of the communicative structuring in Hungarian and IE languages: for example, mid-focus in Hungarian and end focus in IE, regressive focussing in Hungarian and progressive focussing in IE, blurred borderline between the topic and the comment in Hungarian and clear borderline in IE, etc.

Some optional word order changes cannot be explained by the requirements of communicative structuring. Hungarian translators, for instance, often move the subject to sentence initial position although the subject can stand anywhere in the sentence. They often transpose introductory reporting clauses to the end of the sentence, even though it is not always necessary, etc. These are **habitual transfer operations** which Hungarian translators perform regularly in translating from IE languages.

And finally, especially in translation into Hungarian where word order is free, there are a lot of word order changes, which can be explained only by the translator's **individual preferences**. This is similar to our inability to always explain the choices between synonyms in the case of lexical transfer operations. This is the translator's playground, the province of translational freedom. While translating, the translators do not only see the text, but hear it as well. For them the text has an "internal melody" and it is this internal melody they follow in choosing among the various word order options.

7. Grammatical replacements

Grammatical replacements are standard transfer operations whereby certain grammatical forms of the SL are replaced by other grammatical forms of the TL **within** the same grammatical category: e.g., within the category of tense (present → past), within the category of number (singular → plural), or within the category of voice (passive → active). In spite of their seemingly automatic character, grammatical replacements are widely discussed in the literature, because these operations may shed light on interesting differences between languages in the linguistic reflection of human experience.

They are an interesting topic for research both in contrastive linguistics and translation studies. As mentioned above, while contrastive linguistics is concerned with systemic differences between languages, translation studies takes up the question of how these differences are set in motion in the process of translation, that is, in the process of the joint functioning of languages, and how they are handled in the daily routine of translators.

The operations, called grammatical replacements here, are termed by “chassé-croisé” (1958) or “interchange” (1995) in Vinay and Darbelnet’s work. They use the term “interchange” in the following sense: “A translation technique by which two lexical items permute and change grammatical category” (1995: 344). They regard interchange as a “translation technique” which is a special case of the fourth “method” of translation, i.e. “transposition”. Nida uses the term “alterations” which is one of the three “techniques of adjustment” in his system. “Alterations” is a very heterogeneous category in Nida’s work, including alterations in the following fields: *a*) sounds, *b*) categories, *c*) word classes, *d*) order, *e*) clause and sentence structure, *f*) semantic problems involving single words, and *g*) semantic problems involving exocentric expressions (Nida 1964: 233–238).

Mainly grammatical replacements are included in Catford’s concept of “category shifts”: (1) structure shifts (e.g., word order), (2) unit shifts (e.g., word/morpheme), (3) class shift (e.g., adjective/noun), (4) intrasystem shifts (e.g., shift from singular to plural in languages which has a formally corresponding system of number, but in translation a non-corresponding term will be selected in the TL system (1965:73-80). And finally, the term “zamena” (with the same internal logical structure as replacement) is widely used in Russian TS literature (Retsker 1974, Barkhudarov 1975, Vaseva 1980).

The number of grammatical replacements in the process of translation is infinite. In the case of five languages and ten directions, even a quick overview of all grammatical replacements would be impossible. Thus we shall narrow down the scope of our investigation and deal only with those grammatical replacements which (1) frequently occur in the IE-H or H-IE direction, (2) are not entirely determined by systemic differences, but require the application of various strategies on the

part of translators, (3) are not entirely reversible, that is, frequency differences can be detected between the H-IE and IE-H directions in the given replacement.

Subtypes:

- 7.1. Replacements within the category of tense
- 7.2. Replacements within the category of number
- 7.3. Replacements within the category of voice
 - 7.3.1. Activisation
 - 7.3.2. Passivisation
- 7.4. Replacements on the level of parts of speech
 - 7.4.1. Verbalisation
 - 7.4.2. Nominalisation
- 7.5. Replacements on the level of sentence elements
 - 7.5.1. Predicativisation
 - 7.5.2. Depredicativisation
- 7.6. Replacements on the level of text

7.1. Replacements within the category of tense

Grammatical replacements taking place within the basic grammatical categories (number, gender and case in the declension of nouns, tense, mood, person and number in the conjugation of verbs) are generally obligatory transfer operations: the translator does not have the option of choosing among several alternatives. As IE languages have a very complicated system of tenses, while Hungarian has a very simple system of tenses with only three tenses (of which only two are fully used), IE verb forms unavoidably have to be simplified in H-IE translation:

English ST: You **have been touching** some wet paint. (Greene 156)
Hungarian TT: Friss festékhez **ért**. (Borbás 118) (lit.: touched)

German ST: Völlig ausgeschlossen, dass dieser Mann fünfundzwanzig Jahre **nicht Schach gespielt haben soll!** (Zweig 62)
Hungarian TT: Lehetetlen, hogy ez az ember huszonöt éve **nem sakkozott**. (Fónagy 63) (lit.: not played chess)

In translating from IE languages into Hungarian, the relationship between the SL and TL verb forms can be characterised as a “many to few” relationship. In these cases, the **simplification** that takes place automatically is a standard transfer operation. But translating from Hungarian into IE languages, where the relationship is “few to many”, the simplification is undesirable. In the H-IE direction, the translator must create a new system of tenses in the TL text, which requires independent decisions. By “independent” we mean that the choice of the appropriate tense in the TL is not determined by the tense in the SL.

This decision-making process can be traced in the following example, where two different translators applied different strategies in the translation of the Hungarian present tense into German and English. Present tense exists in all the languages under investigation, but because of the substantial differences in the sys-

tems of verbs as a whole, the Hungarian present tense has a number of special functions. The so called “historical present”, for instance, is very intensively used in Hungarian literary works in the description of events of the past. In spite of the existence of a similar “historical present” also in IE languages, translators frequently change it into the past tense. (On a similar phenomenon in French-Russian translation see Gak in Zlateva 1993:37: “ ... the French *présent historique* is often translated by an allomorphous linguistic unit in Russian, namely the past tense”).

In Géza Gárdonyi’s novel *Egri csillagok* (Eclipse of the Crescent Moon, Sterne von Eger), the narration starts in present tense: *A patakban két gyermek fürdik* (lit.: Two children, a boy and a girl, **are bathing** in the stream.). This is followed by two passages in the past tense, telling us how the children got into the stream. Then, talking again about the bathing children, the Hungarian author reverts to the present tense. Neither the English nor the German translator follows this variation. The German translator consistently uses the past tense from the beginning. The English translator starts with the present, but after changing into the past he does not revert to the present tense any more.

Hungarian ST: A patakban két gyermek **fürdik** (Pres): egy fiú, meg egy lány. *Nem illik* (Pres) tán, hogy együtt **fürödnek** (Pres), de ők **ezt nem tudják** (Pres): a fiú alig hét esztendő; a leányka két évvel is fiatalabb.

Az erdőben **jártak**, (Past) patakra **találtak** ... (Past)

Először csak a lábukat **mártogatták bele** ... (Past)

Fürödhetnek, nem látja (Pres) őket senki. A pécsi út odább **van** (Pres), túl a fákon. Az erdőben **nem jár** (Pres) senki ... (Gárdonyi 5)

German TT: Zwei Kinder **badeten** (Past) im Bach, ein Junge und ein Mädchen. Es **schikte sich** wohl **nicht** (Past), dass sie zusammen im Wasser herumplätscherten, aber das **wussten** sie **nicht** (Past). Der Junge **war** (Past) erst sieben Jahre alt, das Mädchen gut zwei Jahre jünger.

Sie **waren** im Walde **umhergestreift** (Past) und an den Bach **geraten**. ... (Past) Zuerst **hatten** sie nur die Füße ins Wasser **getaucht**, ... (Past) Sie **konnten** getrost **baden**, (Past) es **sah** (Past) sie ja niemand. (Schüching 5)

English TT: Two children, a boy and a girl, **are bathing** (Pres) in the stream. Maybe **it’s** (Pres) not right for them to be bathing together, but they **do not know** (Pres) that; the boy **is** (Pres) not quite seven years old, the girl two years younger.

They **were walking** (Past) in the forest and came across the stream... At first they just **dipped** (Past) their feet into it... And they **might** well **bathe** (Past); nobody **could see** (Past) them. The road to Pécs **was** (Past) a long way off and the forest **was** (Past) endless... (Cushing 3)

The frequent change from present into past in H-IE translation can also be influenced by sequence of tenses. Sequence of tenses (*consecutio temporum*) means a strictly regulated “relative” use of tenses in English and French complex sentences. In Hungarian, the relative use of tenses does not exist: tense in the subordinate clause does not depend on tense in the main clause. Since in English and French past tense in the main clause requires past tense in the subordinate clause, it can happen very easily that translators inadvertently “slip” into the past tense in H-IE translation.

7.2. Replacements within the category of number

It is a general observation that in translation into Hungarian, translators frequently use the singular form in lieu of the plural. Translators, editors and instructors usually say that “the Hungarian language prefers the singular to the plural form”. This is again an interesting observation, which in general appears to be correct, although it lumps together a number of different manifestations of the same phenomenon. Some of the singular-plural and plural-singular replacements may be obligatory and automatic, while others are optional, requiring considerable awareness and skill on the part of translators.

We face obligatory and automatic transfer operations in cases when a Hungarian noun in the singular has a dictionary equivalent used only in the plural in IE languages (*pluralia tantum*): e.g., *customs* in English, *archives* in French, *Ferien* in German or *pohoroni* in Russian.

Hungarian ST: Zsuzsannán kívül még Erzsébet testvér töltötte a *szünetet* (SG) az iskolában, az igazgató, Gigus tanárnő, Kalmár és Kőnig. (Szabó 255)

German TT: Außer Zsuzsanna verbrachten noch Schwester Elisabeth, der Direktor, Fräulein Gigus, Kalmár und Kőnig *die Ferien* (PL) im Institut. (Engl 280)

Hungarian ST: Először is ez a százhetvenedik *temetés* (SG), amelyre küldték ... (Örkény 1. 193)

Russian TT: Во pervih, eti bili stosemidesyatie *pohoroni* (PL), na koto-rie yevo poslali. (Voronkina 1. 316)

In the case of **pluralia tantum**, the exchange of the number form is obligatory in both directions. The situation is more complicated with **paired body parts**. In IE languages, paired body parts are always referred to in the plural, while in Hungarian they are usually given in the singular form. Thus translators have no option in H-IE translation: the singular-plural transformation in the translation concerning paired body parts, is an obligatory transfer operation that translators usually perform automatically.

Hungarian ST: – És széles férfias nagy izmos *keze* (SG)! (Csáth 61)

English TT: – And his *hands* (PL) masculine and thick, largish and quite strong. (Kessler 200)

Hungarian ST: És azt a kedves néni a saját **szemével** (SG) látta? (Örkény 1. 151)

German TT: Und das hat die Tante mit eigenen **Augen** (PL) gesehen? (Thies 1. 41)

As in the Hungarian language paired body parts are generally used in the singular, in IE-H translation the opposite replacement, the plural-singular transformation takes place.

English ST: ‘Well, you must not abuse my **legs** (PL),’ said the old man. (James 9)

Hungarian TT: – Te csak ne cseplüld az én **lábamat** (SG), – tiltakozott az öregember. (Balabán 31)

French ST: Quand je l’appelais **des bras** (Pl) et **des lèvres** (PL), elle se retournait ennuyée, murmurant: ... (Maupassant 52)

Hungarian TT: Ha **karommal** (SG) és **ajkammal** (SG) szólítottam, unottan fordult meg, és azt mormolta: ... (Benyhe 53)

German ST: Mir begannen **die Knie** (PL) zu zittern: ... (Zweig 100)

Hungarian TT: **Térdem** (SG) megremegett. (Fónagy 101)

Russian ST: On obhvatil yeyo za **plechi** (PL), prizhal. (A. Tolstoy 134)

Hungarian TT: A férfi átölelte az asszony **vállát** (SG), magához szorította. (Wessely 135)

However, the plural-singular transformation cannot be considered an automatic and obligatory transfer operation in the IE-H translation. The use of the singular for paired body parts is not obligatory in Hungarian. Even the authors of original Hungarian works frequently use plural for the paired body parts: e.g. *szőke haját, szürke szemeit és finom arcocskáját ... már első látásra édesnek találtam.* (Csáth) 180 (lit.: *her blond hair and grey eyes ...*). Sometimes the plural is required by the description of the situation: e.g. *viszi a csontvázat, amelynek kezei, lábai valami különös táncot jártak ...* Csáth 14 (lit.: *carries the skeleton whose hands and feet danced peculiarly*).

The use of the singular with paired body parts is just a tendency in Hungarian, which reflects cognitive differences between IE languages and Hungarian. While in IE languages paired body parts are perceived as separate entities, consisting of two parts, Hungarians regard the paired body parts as one single unit. This cognitive difference is reflected in the singular usage in referring to paired body parts separately: IE languages use *one*, while Hungarian uses *fél* (‘half’), e.g., *blind in one eye* in English is *fél szemére vak* in Hungarian (lit.: *blind on half eye*), *hop on one foot* in English is *fél lábon ugrál* in Hungarian (lit.: *hop on half foot*).

English ST: Harry **threw an arm over** Fred’s suety shoulders. (Vonnegut 127)

Hungarian TT: ... Harry **félkarral átölelte** Fred hájas vállát (Szilágyi 100) (lit.: with *half arm*)

The tendency for the use of the singular is so strong in formal Hungarian usage that translators, following the norm closely, perform the plural-singular transformation even in cases when a logic-based approach to the situation would suggest the plural, as in the following example, where somebody's head is forced between someone else's knees:

English ST: Again somebody took her head and forced *it between her knees* (PL). (Christie 139)

Hungarian TT: Valaki megint megfogta a fejét, és leszorította a *térde közé* (SG). (Szíjgyártó 140) (lit.: between her knee)

The number of plural-singular transformations is increased by two characteristic features of agreement in Hungarian. As distinct from IE languages, the characteristic agreement in Hungarian is “form based” and not “logic based”, i.e. in the case of several subjects in the singular, the predicate will also be in the singular.

German ST: ... worauf es in der Tat Tom und Christian *waren, die ankamen* (PL), zusammen mit den ersten Gästen ... (Mann 3.12)

Hungarian TT: ... mire csakugyan Tom és Christian *érkezett meg* (SG) s velük az első vendégek ... (Lányi 3. 11)

German ST: Meeser schlurfte zu seinen Kollegen hinüber, Brehmockel, Grumpeter und Wollerstein *standen* (PL) dicht beieinander ... (Böll 996)

Hungarian TT: Meeser átszoszogott a kollégáihoz, Brehmockel, Grumpeter és Wollerstein szorosán egymás mellett *állt* (SG) ... (Doromy 170)

Russian ST: Korovyov i Begemot *napravisil'* (PL) pryamo k stiku gastronomicheskovo i konditerskovo otdeleniya. (Bulgakov 280)

Hungarian TT: Korovjov meg a Behemót azonban mindeme kincsekre ügyet sem vetve, *megindult* (SG) a cukrászati és élelmiszerosztály felé. (Szöllősy 421)

The “singular principle” in Hungarian is further strengthened by a second feature of agreement in Hungarian: if several possessors have one possession each, plural is not used for this possession, as in IE languages.

English ST: Their *shoes* (PL) never squeaked. (Greene 553)

Hungarian TT: Az ő *cipőjük* (SG) sosem nyikorgott. (Osztovits 311) (lit.: their shoe)

German ST: ... und er wies auf Tom und Christian, die in blauen *Kitteln* (PL) mit Ledergürteln bei ihm standen ... (Mann 3. 13)

Hungarian TT: ... – Tomra és Christianra mutatott, akik bőróves kék *zubbonyukban* (SG) mellette álltak – ... (Lányi 3. 11) (lit.: in their jacket)

Both kinds of agreement in Hungarian are threatened by the influence of IE languages. As the principle of singularity is only a tendency and not a rule in Hun-

garian, a kind of inconsistency can be observed among the authors of original Hungarian works and also among translators. Hesitation between form-based and logic-based agreement can be detected even within the same work.

German ST: ... worauf es in der Tat Tom und Christian *waren, die ankamen* (PL), zusammen mit den ersten Gästen ... (Mann 3. 12)

Hungarian TT: ... mire csakugyan Tom és Christian *érkezett meg* (SG) s velük az első vendégek ... (Lányi 3. 11) (lit.: Tom and Christian arrived – in SG)

German ST: “Tom und Christian *kommen* (PL) die Johannisstraße herauf ...” (Mann 3. 12)

Hungarian TT: – Tom és Christian *jönnek* (PL) fölfelé a Szentjános utcán ... (Lányi 3, 10).(lit.: Tom and Christian come upward – in PL.)

Finally, we will discuss a plural-singular replacement, which is not automatic and obligatory, and requires deliberate consideration on the part of translators. In certain cases the singular form is more suitable in Hungarian for **general statements**.

English ST: They slunk like *cats* (PL) on padded claws. (Greene 553)

Hungarian TT: Úgy osonnak, mint a *macska* (SG), behúzott karommal. (Osztovits 311)

Russian ST: Odnako *umnye lyudi na to i umni* (PL), chtobi razbirat'sya v zaputannih veshchah. (Bulgakov 159)

Hungarian TT: Ellenben *az okos ember azért okos* (SG), hogy kiismerje magát a legbonyolultabb ügyekben is. (Szöllősy 236)

This **inconsistency** is characteristic only of the IE-H direction. The singular-plural transformation is **always obligatory** in H-IE direction.

1. Singular-plural transformation in H-IE translation in the case of pluralia tantum

Hungarian ST: S ott állt a Kurfürst jobbágya, *haja* (SG) izzadtan tapad homlokára ... (Eszterházy 154)

German TT: Da steht der Leibeigene des Kurfürsten, *die Haare* (PL) kleben schweißnass an der Stirn ... (Paetzke 70)

2. Singular-plural transformation in H-IE translation in the case of paired body parts

Hungarian ST: ... leasett a ... szemüvege, amelyet azért viselt, hogy mások ne lássanak a *szemébe* (SL) ... (Csáth 64)

English TT: ... the magician had lost the dark glasses he wore to keep people from seeing his *eyes* (PL) ... (Kessler 203)

3. Singular-plural transformation in H-IE translation in the case of more than one subject and one predicate

Hungarian ST: A patakban két gyermek *fürdik* (SL): egy fiú, meg egy lány.

English TT: Two children, a boy and a girl, *are bathing* (PL) in the stream.

German TT: Zwei Kinder *badeten* (PL) im Bach, ein Junge und ein Mädchen.

4. Singular-plural transformation in H-IE translation in the case of several possessors and one possessed

Hungarian ST: – Mit csináljak? – mondta V.P., és mélázva nézett a meszesességbe, hét felesége *feje* (SL) fölött. (Örkény 1. 200)

English TT: ‘What can I do?’ P.V. pleaded, looking bemused into the distance over the *heads* (PL) of his wives. (Sollosy 66)

German TT: “Was soll man machen?” sagte P.V., und er blickte verträumt in die Ferne, über *die Köpfe* (PL) seiner sieben Ehefrauen hinweg. (Thies 1. 58)

5. Singular-plural transformation in the case of general statements

Hungarian ST: Szombat *este* (SG), ó az mindig a legszebb.(Csáth)

English TT: Saturday *evenings* (PL) – oh those are always the nicest. (Kessler 59)

On the basis of the above it seems safe to claim that the plural-singular and singular-plural transformations are standard grammatical transfer operations dependent on the language pair and on the direction of translation. While the IE-H direction can be characterised by replacements into the singular, the opposite direction is characterised by replacements into the plural. There is an interesting **operational asymmetry** between the two directions: while the replacement of the singular with the plural is **obligatory** in the H-IE direction, the replacement of the plural with the singular is **not obligatory** in the opposite direction, and beginners often fail to perform it. Using the plural in the case of paired body parts or in the case of agreement may reveal the foreign origin of the Hungarian text, and may give an impression of foreignness.

7.3. Replacements within the category of voice

One of the most conspicuous systemic differences between IE languages and Hungarian is the near-absence of the passive voice in Hungarian. In spite of the great differences inside the IE group concerning the passive forms (see Vinay and Darbelnet about the differences between the English and French passive 1995: 138-141, Komissarov and Korolova about the differences between the English and the Russian passive 1990:96), they seem to be very similar compared to Hun-

garian. The similarities in the form, function and meaning of the passive in IE languages may be summarised as follows: (1) all the four IE languages under investigation have a fully developed system of passive forms, (2) in all the four IE languages passive forms are widely used in different registers, (3) in all the four IE languages passive forms make it possible to describe the action from the point of view of the patient or other non-agentive actors.

In Hungarian, both the forms and the functions of the passive are very much restricted. Passive formants do exist in Hungarian (*-et, -tat, -tet, -ik* e.g., *megvizsgál-tat-ik, elrendel-tet-ik* lit.: to be examined, to be ordered), but they are **not productive** any longer. There are only a few verbs, which have passive forms and they can be only used in official and scientific prose. In literary texts they can be only used in cases when an **archaic** verb form is needed as in the translation of the following example (cf. *anno 1835*).

German ST:... getreu nach dem Katechismus, wie er soeben, *Anno 1835*, unter Genehmigung eines hohen und wohlweisen Senates, *neu revidiert herausgegeben war*. (Mann 3. 5)

Hungarian TT: ... úgy, amint épp akkortájt, *anno 1835*, a magas és igen bölcs szenátus jóváhagyásával *újonnan átnézetvén, kiadatott*. (Lányi 3. 5) (lit.: it was newly revised and published)

Since it is a typical missing category in Hungarian, the forms and functions of the passive in IE languages are widely investigated in contrastive grammars of Hungarian in relation to IE languages: e.g., Kepecs (1986) in English and Hungarian, Kelemen (1988) in French and Hungarian, Juhász (1980) in German and Hungarian, Papp (1984) in Russian and Hungarian. These works are good illustrations of the difference between the approaches of contrastive linguistics and translation studies to the same phenomenon.

In her exemplary article *A contrastive analysis of English passive structures and their Hungarian equivalents*, Kepecs (1986) gives a detailed taxonomy of passive clauses using Svartvik's active-passive scale (1966). At the upper end of the scale are clauses with animate and inanimate by-agents and at the lower end there are non-agentive passive clauses. After examining the expressions of passive meaning in Hungarian, and giving an overview of the Hungarian equivalents of different English subgroups, she formulates predictions regarding the realisation of the English passive structures by Hungarian learners of English.

Translation specific description approaches the same phenomenon from a different angle. First of all, the description in translation studies is based on corpora of existing translations, that is, it is retrospective and not predictive. Secondly, it does not aim to give an exhaustive taxonomy of all the subgroups of the passive in IE languages and their possible Hungarian equivalents.

For translation specific description, passive is first of all a functional category. The passive form is one of the many possibilities existing in all languages to express ideas in an impersonal way, without reference to the agent. The absence of passive forms in Hungarian undoubtedly exerts syntactic pressure forcing the use of active forms in translation, but not at any cost. The lack of the passive voice in Hungarian does not mean that Hungarian scientific or administrative texts are entirely personal: there are various devices used for the expression of impersonality in

Hungarian, such as nominalisation, use of an inanimate agent, use of a general or indefinite subject, etc., and choosing from among the different possibilities often requires conscious decision on the part of translators.

7.3.1. Activisation

Pedominant direction: **from IE** → **into Hungarian**

The lack of passive voice in Hungarian poses quite different problems in translation into Hungarian and from Hungarian, illustrating the **operational asymmetry** between the two directions. When translating from IE languages into Hungarian, it is not only the “one to many” relationship that we have to face, but the total lack of the SL form in the TL. Thus, IE passive forms have to be replaced in the process of translation, and the task of the translator is **to choose** among the different TL possibilities. When translating from H into IE languages, it is not only the “many to one” relationship that translators have to cope with, but as they do not find passive sentences in the Hungarian text at all, they have **to decide** themselves which sentence will be passive in the TL text.

In this chapter we shall discuss the passive-active replacement we call “activisation”, taking place in IE-H translation. First we shall analyse those cases where there is no reason to preserve the impersonal tone of the original, and the passive-active transformation is justified. The main problem of activisation is that it involves a large-scale **redistribution of the functional roles in the sentence**: the grammatical subject of the SL (transformed into the object) cannot fulfil the function of the grammatical subject in the TL sentence, and translators have to find a new grammatical subject. From the translators’ point of view finding a subject is the essence of passive-active transformation.

Finding a suitable subject is very easy in the case of the so called “agentive passive”, when the original IE sentence has a logical subject in the form of an animate *by*-agent, which, in the process of translation, may be changed into a grammatical subject.

English ST: The theatre had been built in 1920 *by an optimist* who thought ... (Greene 413)

Hungarian TT: A színházat 1920-ban építette *egy optimista*, aki azt hitte ... (Borbás 227) (the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *egy optimista* ‘an optimist’)

German ST: Wir wurden *von der Regierung* als Beamte in Alpendörfer geschickt. (Mann 6) (lit.: by the government)

Hungarian TT: A *kormány* tisztviselőkként alpesi falvakba küldött bennünket. (Szolcsányi 6) (the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *a kormány* ‘the government’)

French ST: Je t’assure que c’est très amusant d’être aimée *par un domestique*. (Maupassant 112)

Hungarian TT: Mondhatom neked, hogy igen érdekes az, ha *egy szolga* szereti az embert. (Pór 113) (the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *egy szolga* ‘a servant’)

If there is no animate *by*-agent in the IE sentences, translators have to identify other parts of the sentence that can function as a grammatical subject in the Hungarian sentence. It may be either the inanimate *by*-agent, or any other sentence complement, because there are no rules in Hungarian preventing objects, things, phenomena, etc. from functioning as grammatical subjects.

English ST: But the Marquesa, deeply moved *by the first two acts* of the comedy ... (Wilder 40)

Hungarian TT: De a márkiné, akit a darab *első két felvonása* mélységesen megindított ... (Kosztolányi 41)

(the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *első két felvonása* ‘the first two acts’)

English ST: His rather hairy hands were scattered *with grave marks*. (Greene 282)

Hungarian TT: Meglehetősen szőrös kezét *májfoltok* borították. (Török 58)

(the new subject in the Hungarian sentence : *májfoltok* ‘grave marks’)

German ST: Ein wenig wurde der Fall *durch den Teppich* abgeschwächt. (Kafka 96)

Hungarian TT: Kissé felfogta az esést *a szőnyeg*. (Györffy 97)

(the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *a szőnyeg* ‘the carpet’)

French ST: Tout m’était expliqué *par ce souvenir* à demi rêvé. (Nerval 28)

Hungarian TT: Ez a félálomban felvillanó *emlék* egyszeriben mindent megvilágosított. (Brodsky 29)

(the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *az emlék* ‘the souvenir’)

Russian ST: Tak uzh na svyatoy Rusi vsyo zarazheno *podrazhaniyem* ... (Gogol 152)

Hungarian TT: Szent Oroszországban annyira megfertőzött mindenkit *a nagyzási hóbort* ... (Makai 33)

(the new subject in the Hungarian sentence: *a nagyzási hóbort* ‘delusion of grandeur’)

If there is no **explicit logical subject** in the passive IE sentences (they do not contain either animate or inanimate *by*-agents) and no other part of the sentence is capable of functioning as the subject, translators have to find an **implicit logical subject** in the SL text to transform it into an **explicit grammatical subject**. This type of “contextual” subject forms an entirely new lexical unit in the TT, which has no correspondent lexical unit in the ST. The creation of a new grammatical subject on the basis of the context or situation is an operation performed routinely by professionals.

English ST: ... which, when the flat was built, had probably been intended to hold bookshelves. (Orwell 8)

Hungarian TT: A benyílot **a lakás tervezői** bizonyára könyvespolcok elhelyezésére szánták. (Szjgyártó 12)
(the new “contextual subject” in the Hungarian sentence: **a lakás tervezői** ‘the designers of the flat’)

German ST: ... schließlich wurde eine Simultanpartie vorgeschlagen ... (Zweig 16)

Hungarian TT: Végül a **városbeliek** szimultán partit javasoltak. (Fónagy 17)
(the new “contextual subject” in the Hungarian sentence: **városbeliek** ‘the inhabitants of the town’)

Russian ST: Kucher, uslishavshi golos, kotoriy proiznosit'sya obiknovenno v reshitel'nie minuti ... (Gogol 160)

Hungarian TT: A kocsis miután meghallotta ezt a hangot, amelyet a **gazdája** csak a legkritikusabb pillanatokban szokott hallatni ... (Makai 43)
(the new “contextual subject” in the Hungarian sentence: **gazdája** ‘his master’)

Let us now turn to the cases where the impersonal tone of the text must be preserved, and thus activation may not be desirable. In these cases choice among the different devices used to express impersonality in Hungarian requires conscious decisions by translators. When translating scientific, technical, legal and administrative texts, translators may use empty verbs (*kerül, nyer, talál, történik* – with deverbal nouns suffixed with *-ás, -és*, e.g., *kiadásra kerül* ‘to be published’, *megoldást nyer* ‘to be solved’, *gondoskodás történik* ‘to be looked after’). As these structures are constantly blamed for their “foreignness” in Hungarian literature on proper usage (‘good Hungarian’), they are of limited use.

The use of passive structures in IE languages is not limited to the scientific, technical, legal and administrative register, they are also widely used in literary texts when the agent is unknown or unimportant or the author does not want to name them. In these cases translators have two options if they want to **preserve the impersonal** character of the sentence in Hungarian: (1) indefinite subject (*it was written* – *ír+ták* = ‘write’ in third person plural), (2) general subject (*it was emphasised* – *hangsúlyoz+tuk* = ‘emphasise’ in first person plural).

English ST: The letter **was written** – typewritten – on pale blue note-paper. (Salinger 4)

Hungarian TT: A levelet halványkék levélpapírra **írták**, kézírással. (Elbert 8)
(lit.: [they] wrote)

French ST: Le matin, Dargelos **a été appelé** chez le proviseur. (Cocteau 33)

Hungarian TT: Dargelos-t reggel **behívták** az igazgatói irodába. (Gyergyai 184) (lit.: [they] called him into)

German ST: Der Haushalt wurde immer mehr eingeschränkt; das Dienstmädchen **wurde nun doch entlassen** ... (Kafka 180)

Hungarian TT: A háztartás egyre jobban összezsugorodott; a cselédlány **mégis elbocsátották** ... (Györffy 181) (lit.: [they] fired her)

Russian ST: Prikazniya prokuratora **bili ispolneni** bistro i tochno. (Bulgakov 31)

Hungarian TT: Parancsát gyorsan, pontosan **teljesítették**. (Szöllősy 38) (lit.: [they] fulfilled his order)

As we can see, the inflectional properties of the Hungarian verb make it possible to use active forms without the specification of the agent. However, in these cases the active structures in Hungarian cannot be regarded as parallels to the IE passive structures, as the passive-active transformation is often accompanied by an undesirable restructuring of the functional perspective of the sentence, the avoidance of which again requires special care. (See text level replacements later in this chapter [GR 7.6].)

7.3.2. Passivisation

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE languages**

As mentioned in GR 7.3.1, the same systemic difference (the lack of passive in Hungarian) poses quite different problems for translators translating from Hungarian. It is an interesting question that, if a grammatical category is missing from the SL, how and by what means is it going to surface in the TL? The lack or lower frequency of passive sentences in Russian and English texts translated from Hungarian is one of the manifestations of the so called “quasi-correctness” which was described by Papp (1972, 1984), and Klauudy (1987) in the Hungarian-Russian relation, by É. Kiss (1980) in the Hungarian-English relation, and by Vehmas-Lehto (1989) in the Finnish-Russian relation.

The question is what types of Hungarian sentences will undergo the active-passive transformation. Replacement of all active sentences by passive ones would obviously also lead to “quasi-correct” texts, since IE texts obviously do not consist exclusively of passive sentences. On the basis of our corpora of translations from H into IE languages, translators must answer the following questions, intuitively or consciously, before performing the active-passive replacement.

- (1) Is there an explicit grammatical subject in the H sentence?
- (2) Is the explicit grammatical subject animate or inanimate?
- (3) Is the explicit grammatical subject in focus-position or not?
- (4) Is there a subject change in the H sentence?

If the answer to the first question is negative, i.e. the H sentence contains no explicit grammatical subject, only a general subject (indicated by finite verb in first person plural) or indefinite subject (indicated by finite verb in third person plural), then passivisation will probably take place.

Hungarian ST: Valóban **hozták** már a fedelet. (Csáth 64)

English TT: The cover **was carried** in. (Kessler 204)

Hungarian ST: A párbajt délután **tartják meg** a kaszárnyában. (Krúdy 546)

English TT: The duel **was to be held** that afternoon in the barracks. (Bozsó 41)

German TT: Das duell **sollte** am Nachmittag in der Kaserne **stattfinden** ... (Weissling 87)

French TT: Le duel **se déroulera** cet après midi à la caserne ... (Komoly 58)

If there is an explicit grammatical subject in the Hungarian sentence but it is inanimate, passivisation will most likely take place. The ‘fragrance of flowers’ or ‘black silence’ or ‘doubt’ will hardly fulfil subject-function in the IE sentences.

Hungarian ST: **Kábító virágillat** csapott meg. (Csáth 42)

English TT: I was struck **by the heavy fragrance of flowers**. (Kessler 34)

Hungarian ST: **A fekete csönd** pedig beborította kis házunkat nedves, undok szárnyaival. (Csáth 58)

English TT: And our little home was shrouded **by the repulsive, wet wings of the black silence**. (Kessler 139)

Hungarian ST: Itt ötlött fel bennem először a **gyaní**, nincs-e az irányjelző táblák elrendezésében egy kis hiba. (Örkény 2. 131)

French TT: C’est alors que **je fus traversé**, pour la première fois, **par le doute**: l’implantation et l’orientation des poteaux et panneaux indicateurs ne présentaient-elles pas après tout quelques défauts. (Tardos 3. 13)

The third question is related to the functional perspective of the sentence. If the subject of the H sentence is in focus position, passivisation serves the retention of the focus position in IE sentences as well.

Hungarian ST: ... porcelántányért tesz elébe **egy felgyúrt ingujjú le-gény** ... (Krúdy 548)

English TT: ... over a coarse plate that has been placed before him **by a young man with rolled-up sleeves** ... (Bozsó 44)

French TT: ... ainsi qu’une assiette en porcelaine y sont posés **par un garçon à manchés retroussées** ... (Komoly 60)

The fourth question is whether there is a subject change in the H sentence? In a Hungarian compound sentence consisting of several clauses all the clauses may have different subjects: explicit or implicit, general or indefinite subjects may change from clause to clause, because reference is made clear by the inflectional properties of the Hungarian verb. In translating from H into IE, change of subject can be avoided by taking advantage of the possibilities granted by IE passive structures.

Hungarian ST: three grammatical subjects:

- (1) én 'I',
- (2) ideszállították 'they',
- (3) orvosnövendékek 'medical students',

Most *én* (1) utánanéztem a dolgoknak, és tegnap megtudtam, hogy ide, az anatómiai intézetbe *szállították* (2) a hulláját, hogy rajta az *orvosnövendékek* (3) gyakoroljanak. (Csáth 11)

English TT: two grammatical subjects:

- (1) I,
- (2) he

I (1) have checked up and learned yesterday that *he* (2) was delivered here to the institute to be used for study by the medical students. (Kessler 183)

7.4. Replacements on the level of parts of speech

We shall not go to discuss in detail all the replacements within the category of parts of speech (verb, noun, adjective, adverb, numbers, pronouns, article, postpositions, conjunctions) for two reasons: (1) most replacements of parts of speech are obligatory transfer operations which are needed to form grammatically correct TL sentences and are thus performed by translators automatically (for example, replacement of prepositions in IE by postpositions in Hungarian (e.g. *under* the table → *az asztal alatt*), (2) it is self-evident that in the process of translation any part of speech in the SL may be changed into any other part of speech in the TL, so an exhaustive taxonomy of replacements would be impossible.

Instead of “parts of speech”, Vinay and Darbelnet suggest the concept of word-classes, e.g., word-class of nominals comprising the noun and the pronoun, word-class of modifiers comprising adjectives and adverbs, word-class of relational words comprising prepositions and conjunctions. “Speaking of word classes, rather than parts of speech, implies that in the encounter of two languages the same meaning can be conveyed by different word classes” (1995:94). In the third chapter of their book, they give a detailed description of the word class changes taking place in the English-French and French-English direction: Adverb → Verb, Verb → Noun, Noun → Past participle, Verb → Preposition, Adverb → Noun, Past participle → Noun, Adjective → Noun, Prepositional expression → Adjective/Adverb, Adjective → Verb (1995: 94–97).

Hervey and Higgins deal with the following word-class changes in the process of French-English translation: transposition from noun to adverb, from noun to adjective, from noun to verb, from adjective to adverb, from noun to adverb (1992: 203–225). Similar enumerations can be found in all language pair related descriptions of the translation process (Barkhudarov 1975, Retsker 1974, Vaseva 1980). These taxonomies are never exhaustive, the number of examples can be multiplied indefinitely.

In the following we shall concentrate on the two most frequent word-class replacements: the replacement of nouns with verbs in IE-H translation, referred to here as “verbalisation”, and replacement of verbs with nouns in H-IE translation, referred to here as “nominalisation”.

7.4.1. Verbalisation

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The most frequent part of speech (word-class) replacement in the IE-H translation is the transformation of IE nouns or nominal phrases into verbs in Hungarian. We shall refer to this operation as “verbalisation”. It should be noted that while “nominalisation” is widely used in the literature, the term “verbalisation” seems to be deliberately avoided, probably because verbalisation has another meaning within linguistics, and can therefore be misleading. Nevertheless, we shall use this term for the transfer operation whereby a noun in the ST is rendered by a verb in the TT.

Lumping IE languages together into one category and contrasting them with Hungarian on the basis of their nominal or verbal character may seem an oversimplification, as there are significant differences within the IE group concerning the predominance of nominal or verbal character. Hervey and Higgins believe that “French tends very readily to use nominal expressions where English would not” (1992: 204). In their system, the English-French direction is characterised by nominalisation.

The nominal character of French in contrast with English is also emphasised by Vinay and Darbelnet. In the chapter of their book *Predominance of the French noun* they argue that “... French can express itself verbally but nominal expression seems to be more natural, whereas in English the opposite is true” (1995: 101). Bally emphasised the nominal nature of French in contrast to German (1944: 591, in Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 100). Komissarov regards the noun-verb replacement as one of the most characteristic replacements in the English-Russian direction (1990: 181).

In spite of these differences within the IE group, all four IE languages under investigation seem more “nominal”, “static” and “abstract” than Hungarian, which is new evidence for our basic assumption that the joint functioning of languages in the process of translation can reveal their hidden peculiarities.

In the daily experience of translators, working from IE languages into Hungarian, verbalisation is one of the most common transfer operations. Translators, editors and instructors often say that Hungarian is rather “more fond of verbs” than Indo-European languages. The most important advice given by professionals to novice translators is “to use as many verbs in your Hungarian text as possible.” As in the previous chapters, we shall again make an attempt to identify the linguistic background for this intuitive advice.

The reasons for verbalisation are manifold. Most of them were mentioned in previous chapters. Thus, in the chapter on lexical operations **different perception** of the world was referred to. As has already been demonstrated, a different approach to the same situation requires different exchanges of meaning in the process of translation: exchange of the action with result, place, object, etc. and vice versa (LEX 7). We have stated that translators in IE-H translation tend to describe the same situation in more dynamic terms, and generally use verbs instead of nouns. Hungarians would never call a young father who is good at mixing baby food, a *brilliant feed mixer*, or a person who does not talk too much *not much of a talker*. Even in those cases when the situation is obviously static, as in the first example (*there was a pause*), Hungarians would prefer a verb *hallgattak* (lit: [they] ‘silenced’).

English ST: There was a **pause**. (Dahl 74)

Hungarian TT: **Hallgattak**. (Borbás 75)

English ST: I suppose it is simply because *you are a brilliant feed mixer*. (Dahl 210)

Hungarian TT: Talán, mert olyan **ügyesen kevered a tápszert**. (Borbás 211) (lit.: you mix babyfood cleverly)

French ST: Il y souffrirait de **dépaysement**, au moins. (Camus 8)

Hungarian TT: Sehogy sem **találná a helyét**, annyi szent. (Szávai 327) (lit.: he would not find his place)

German ST: Kein **Wort des Tadels** für Schrit, keins **des Lobes** für Hochbret ... (Böll 892)

Hungarian TT: Egyetlen szóval sem **ítélte el** Schritet, egyetlen szóval sem **dicsérte** Hochbretet ... (Doromby 13) (lit.: he did not condemn ... did not praise ...)

Russian ST: Oni muchili menya **do stida**, ... (Dostoevskiy I.402)

Hungarian TT: Annyira gyötörtek, hogy szinte **szégyelltem**. (Makai 1. 51) (lit.: I 'shamed myself')

In the previous chapters (LEX 1 and 3) two other lexical operations were mentioned that make Hungarian texts seemingly more “verbal” than the IE texts: the **specification** of IE verbs with general meanings in the IE-H translation (LEX 1.4), and the **merger** of semantically poor IE verbs with nouns in the IE-H translation (LEX 3.6). In these cases, there is no word-class change but the lexical density of verbs increases in the Hungarian translation.

The other reason for verbalisation can be found in the different function of verbs in the organisation of the sentence structure.

Paradoxically, the predominance of verbs over nouns in Hungarian texts can be explained by the **limited complementability** of Hungarian noun phrases. As we had mentioned earlier, in IE languages nominal phrases can be modified both prepositively and postpositively while in Hungarian only prepositively. The possibility of postpositional modification results in long right-branching nominal structures in IE languages, especially towards the end of the sentence (cf. “end weight principle” in English, Quirk et al. 1973: 143).

Translating them into Hungarian by left-positioning of all modifiers results in long left-branching structures which are perfectly possible in Hungarian, but are rarely used by authors of original Hungarian works for two reasons: (1) too long left-branching structures tax the decoding capacity of the readers, (2) there is less place **inside** the sentence than **at the end** of the sentence.

Both problems are solved if translators “verbalise” the head noun of the noun phrase. As verbs in Hungarian (similarly to nouns in IE languages) can be complemented both prepositively and postpositively, it is easier to arrange the complements around the Hungarian **verb** than around the Hungarian **noun**. Let us return to a previous example (GR 2. 3) to illustrate this operation.

English ST: A people's capacity to govern itself democratically is thus proportionate to the degree *of its understanding of the structure of the functioning of the whole social body*. (Koestler 136)

Hungarian TT: A népek demokratikus öngazgatási képessége tehát egyes arányban áll azzal, hogy az illető nép milyen mértékben *értette meg a maga társadalma szerkezetét, és e szerkezet működésének törvényeit*. (Bart 194)

As we can see, verbalisation, that is, the replacement of the English noun *understanding* by the Hungarian verb *értette meg* (lit.: understood) helps to avoid the radical restructuring of the sentence. All the complements placed after the English noun, that is, towards the end of the sentence, may **retain their end position** after the Hungarian verb.

At this point we may make a brief comment on the question of the usefulness of such generalisations for practicing translators. We think that it is not useless for translators to recognise that verbalisation in IE-H translation does not constitute impermissible deviation from the original: on the contrary, this is the way they can manage to retain the original structure of information packaging.

The verbal character of Hungarian sentences is also influenced by the peculiarities of information packaging in Hungarian, where the increase of information per sentence is made possible by accumulating **independent sentence units** containing finite verb forms. As we have demonstrated in chapter GR 2, the transformation of IE participial, infinitival and nominal phrases into Hungarian clauses results in the creation of new independent sentence-level units, with finite verbs in predicative function. Thus grammatical elevation in IE-H translation often ends in verbalisation.

As elevation was discussed in detail in chapter GR 2, and we will return to it later in this chapter in connection with predicativisation (GR 6.5), this time we shall offer only one illustrative example in which the number of sentence units has been increased from three to five, involving two verbalisations: *E: death* → *H: meghalt* (lit.: died) and *E: imprisonment* → *H: bebörtönözték* (lit.: [they] – implied general subject – imprisoned him).

English ST: (1) He had closely followed the scandal surrounding her name and (2) had begun to reason (3) that the *death* of her lover Stanford White and the *imprisonment* of her husband Harry K. Thaw left her in need of the attentions of a genteel middle-class young man with no money. (Doctorow 13)

Hungarian TT: (1) Figyelemmel kísérte az asszony nevét övező botrányt, (2) s elhítette magával, (3) hogy miután szeretője, Stanford White *meghalt*, (4) s a férjét, Harry K. Thaw-t, *becsukták*, (5) Evelyn Nesbit egy pénztelen, ám gyöngéd lelkű középosztálybeli fiatalember figyelmére szorul. (Göncz 11)

And finally, analysis of our corpora shows that there are cases of verbalisation in IE-H translation without any apparent reason, too. Verbalisation seems to be such a strong tendency in IE-H translation that if Hungarian translators are given a choice between two synonymous grammatical structures they will choose the

more verbal one. Illustrations of this “**unforced verbalisation**” can be found in GR 2.2; here we would like to illustrate the universal tendency for verbalisation by two different translations of the same French sentence. The two translations are quite different, but verbalisation of the French noun is performed by both translators: *dérangement* → (1) *kizökkenünk a hétköznapiokból* (lit.: to be knocked out of the weekdays), (2) *kizökkenek a megszokottságból* (lit.: to be knocked out of the daily routine).

French ST: – Il est vrai, répondit Emma; mais le *dérangement* m’amuse toujours: j’aime à changer de place. (Flaubert 84)

First translation:

Hungarian TT: – Nem mondom – felelte Emma –, de hát olyan mulatságos, ha *kizökkenünk a hétköznapiokból*; szeretek mindig máshol lenni. (Gyergyai 101) (lit.: to be knocked out of the weekdays)

Second translation:

Hungarian TT: – Csakugyan – felelte Emma. – De engem mulattat, ha *kizökkenek a megszokottságból*; mindig örülök, ha máshová mehetek. (Pór 90) (lit: to be knocked out of the daily routine)

7.4.2. Nominalisation

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

When translating from Hungarian into IE languages, the word-class change described in the previous chapter takes place in the opposite direction: Hungarian verbs are often transformed into nouns in IE languages. The reasons for the nominalisation in H-IE translation are the same as were for verbalisation in the IE-H direction: (1) cognitive differences between languages in describing reality, (2) different possibilities of complementation in noun phrases, and (3) different ways of information packaging in the sentence.

Reason (1): The different approach to reality is described by Vinay and Darbelnet in relation to French and English. They regard French more nominal than English.

In these cases French can express itself verbally, but the nominal expression seems to be more natural, whereas in English the opposite is usually true. A literal translation of “*après son retour*” is possible, but “*after he comes back*” seems more natural than “*after his return*” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 101).

As mentioned above, Komissarov regards English more nominal than Russian (1990:81). So it seems that French is more nominal than English, English more nominal than Russian, and we can add that Russian is more nominal than Hungarian. Obviously, the nominal character of a language is not an absolute category, and the nominal or verbal character of languages is manifested only in comparison with other languages. In comparison with Hungarian all the four IE languages seem to be more nominal than Hungarian, so verb-noun replacement frequently occurs even in the translation of the simple sentences, i.e. independently of phrase level and sentence level considerations.

Hungarian ST: – Fölösleges – mondta a bíró. – Én csak mint magánember *érdeklődöm* ... (Örkény 1.198) (lit.: I 'interest myself')
English TT: 'That won't be necessary,' the judge explained. '*My interest is purely personal*'. (Sollosy 65)

Reason (2): As we mentioned in chapter GR 7.4.1, the complementation possibilities of noun phrases in IE languages are more favourable than in Hungarian, and if translators do not want to produce quasi-correct IE texts, they have to make use of the possibilities of postpositive complementation i.e. to produce right-branching nominal structures from Hungarian verbal structures.

Reason (3): One of the main reasons for nominalisation in H-IE translation is the typical way of information packaging in IE languages: to increase the amount of information per sentence IE languages use **syntactic compression** rather than an accumulation of independent clauses. When Hungarian clauses are transformed into nominal and infinitival phrases in H-IE translation, the number of finite verbs decreases.

Hungarian ST: – Végignézett a feleségein és elkezdte sorolni, *melyikük mit tud nyújtani*. (Örkény 1. 198) (lit: what they can offer)
English TT: As he took stock of his wives, he began to list *their various advantages*. (Sollosy 65)

The preference of Hungarian for verbal and of IE languages for nominal expressions can be well illustrated by different IE translations of the same Hungarian text: all translators use a nominal phrase instead of the Hungarian verbal phrase.

Hungarian ST: – Milyen szépen mondta! – szólt elgondolkozva a bíró. Maga tulajdonképpen *költőnek született*. (Örkény 1. 201) (lit.: you were born to be a poet)
German TT: "Wie schön er das gesagt hat!" meinte der Richter nachdenklich. "Eigentlich sind Sie der *geborene Dichter*." (Thies 1. 58)
English TT: 'How beautifully spoken!' said the judge pensively. 'You are a *true poet*'. (Sollosy 67)

7.5. Replacements on the level of the sentence elements

The next type of grammatical replacement takes place on the level of sentence elements: e.g., replacement of subject by predicate, replacement of object by adverbial, replacement of adverbial with modifier, etc. As in the process of translation any part of sentence in the ST can be transformed into any other part of sentence in the TT, we do not undertake to review all types of replacements on the level of sentence elements, but will concentrate on two of them, the replacement of adverbials or modifiers by predicates, called "predicativisation", and the replacement of predicates by adverbials or modifiers, called "depredicativisation".

7.5.1. Predicativisation

Predominant direction: **from IE → into Hungarian**

The replacement of an adverbial or modifier with a predicate was demonstrated earlier in chapter GR 2, in discussing the replacement of phrases with clauses in IE-H translation, called “elevation”. Elevation means that IE nominal and participial expressions functioning as modifiers or adverbial complements become independent sentence units in Hungarian with their own predicates. Transforming adverbs and modifiers into predicates is one of the most common replacements of sentence elements in translating into Hungarian.

English ST: But here Mrs. Baines was already busy, **pulling down** the curtains, **covering** the chairs in dustsheets. (Greene 457)

Hungarian TT: ... de itt már Mrs. Baines szorgoskodott, **eregette lefelé** a függönyöket, huzattal **vonta be** a székeket. (Szobotka 280) (lit.: she pulled down, she covered)

It should be noted that very often the same operation, seen from different angles, is found behind the concept of predicativisation: cf. verbalisation, i.e. the replacement of nouns with verbs (GR 7.4.1) and elevation of certain elements to the level of sentence (GR 2.2).

7.5.2. Depredicativisation

Predominant direction: **from Hungarian → into IE**

The replacement of a predicate with an adverbial or a modifier was discussed earlier, in chapter GR 3.2. The replacement of clauses with phrases in H-IE translation we called “lowering”. Lowering means that independent sentence units having their own predicate become nominal and participial phrases functioning in the sentence as adverbial complements or modifiers. Transforming predicates into modifiers and adverbials is one of the most common replacements of sentence elements in translating from Hungarian into IE languages.

Hungarian ST: Richard véres tajtéket **köpött** a szájából és bömbölt. (Csáth 57) (lit.: he spat)

English TT: Richard **roared** back, **spitting** bloody froth. (Kessler 139)

It should be noted again that very often the same operation, seen from different angles, is found behind the concept of depredicativisation: cf. nominalisation, i.e. replacement of verbs with nouns (GR 7.4.2) or lowering certain elements below the level of sentence (GR 3.2).

These operations, nevertheless, are not entirely identical in both directions: an interesting **operational asymmetry** can be observed between the two sets of related operations. Verbalisation, predicativisation and elevation from IE into Hungarian take place more frequently than nominalisation or depredicativisation and lowering in the opposite direction. The first set of operations (verbalisation, predicativisation and elevation results in looser, more explicit TT structures, while the second set of operations (nominalisation, depredicativisation and lowering)

results in more reduced, more concise structures. In the light of data drawn from our bidirectional corpora, translators prefer the more extended, more explicit forms to the more reduced, more implicit forms, and often fail to perform implicitation. The asymmetry hypothesis, if confirmed, would underpin the hypothesis that explicitation is a universal strategy of translation, independent of language pairs and directions of translation.

7.6. Replacements on the level of text

All the grammatical replacements discussed in the previous chapters make their effects felt **on the text level**, but two of them, activation and passivisation radically influence the functional perspective of the sentence: active-passive replacement in H-IE translation is an extremely important factor in creating or maintaining the cohesion in the TL text. As mentioned above, the passive voice is used in IE languages not only to avoid the reference to unknown or unimportant subjects, but it plays an important role in the organisation of paragraphs and longer textual units as well.

As the previous section (GR 7.3.2) shows, passivisation in H-IE translation is used to **eliminate subject changes** in the IE sentences. The passive forms in IE languages make it possible to maintain the same subject in several clauses.

Hungarian ST: Pár pillanat múlva már *mind a ketten aludtak*. Reggel a *takarítónő* ébresztette fel őket. (Csáth 90)

English TT: ... in a few minutes *both* were fast asleep. In the morning *they* were awakened by the cleaning woman. (Kessler 172)

As mentioned before, subject transformation may be caused by text-structure reasons, e.g., if the translator wishes to **make the subjects uniform** within one paragraph. In the Hungarian sentence below, there are three subjects (*mi*, *a fiúk és én*) while in the English translation there are only two (*We* and *I*), and the second sentence lost its independence.

Hungarian ST: Azután *megkerültük* (Subj 1 = we) a templomot. A *fiúk* (Subj 2 = boys) egy vak utcába vezettek, amelyről eddig semmit sem *tudtam*. (Subj 3 = I) (Csáth 42)

English TT: *We* (Subj 1 = we) went round back of the church, and *I* (Subj 2 = I) followed them into a dead-end street *I'd* (Subj 3 = I) never noticed before. (Kessler 33)

Summary comments on grammatical replacements

Grammatical replacements caused by systemic structural differences are seemingly obligatory and automatic transfer operations. But in fact they are not. The fact that the source language grammatical form does not have a direct equivalent in the target language means no more to the translator than that "this path is impassable", but does not specify what other path he should take. The only instruction

he/she is given by the text is to deviate from the source language form. The target language offers a broad spectrum of possibilities. Choosing from among them requires that the translator should take into consideration several points of view simultaneously and consciously. Grammatical replacements can frequently be justified at the sentence level, but their effect becomes apparent at the text level. A Hungarian translator who generally favours the singular over the plural, verbal structures over the nominal ones, or active sentences over passive ones, will eventually produce a text that is more in keeping with the Hungarian readers' intuitive ideas about a well-formed Hungarian text and with standards of proper Hungarian usage, i.e. TL norms, than a translator who follows IE patterns in the above instances. The restriction "eventually" should be emphasised, because following IE patterns may not be noticed in a single sentence, but when done consistently, the entire text will sound strange and have a distinct flavour of being a translation (cf. quasi correctness or translationese).

Appendix

References

- Adab, B. 1993. *Annotated Texts for Translation (French-English)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Adab, B. 1996. *Annotated Texts for Translation (English-French)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Adams, P. (ed). 1972. *Language in Thinking*. London: Penguin Books.
- Aijmer, K., Altenberg, B. (eds.) 1991. *English Corpus Linguistics. Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik*. London: Longman.
- Albert, S. 1988. *Az ekvivalencia mint fordításelméleti kategória*. (Equivalence as a Category of Translation Theory.) Unpublished PhD dissertation. Szeged. (in Hungarian)
- Albert, S. 1993. The Traps of Formal Correspondence. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* Vol. 1. N. 1. 11–21.
- Albert, S. 1996. Some Aspects of Philosophy of Literary Translation. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., and Sohár, A. 53–60.
- Arany, J. (1862) 1975. *Arany János Válogatott Művei III. Próza Művek*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words*. London - New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. 1993. Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies. Implications and Applications. In: Baker, M., Francis, G. and Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds.) *Text and Technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 233–250.
- Baker, M. 1995. Corpora in Translation Studies. An Overview and Suggestions for Future Research. *Target* Vol. 7. N. 2. 223–245.
- Baker, M. 1996. Linguistics and Cultural Studies. Complementary or Competing Paradigms in Translation Studies. In: Lauer, A. et al. (eds.) *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch. Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss zum 70 Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Narr. 9–19.
- Baker, M. 1998. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bakos, F. 1974. *Idegen szavak és kifejezések szótára*. (Dictionary of foreign words and expressions.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (in Hungarian)
- Balázs, G. 1997. *The Story of Hungarian. A Guide to Language*. Budapest: Corvina.
- Ballester, A. 1993. The Politics of Dubbing. Spain. A Case Study. In: Jansen, P. (ed.) 159–183.
- Barkhudarov, L. S. 1975a. *Yazik i perevod*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Barkhudarov, L. S. 1975b. Teoriya perevoda kak sopostavitelnaya lingvistika teksta. In: *Teoriya perevoda i nauchnie osnovi podgotovki perevodchikov. Materiali vsesoyuznoy nauchnoy konferentsii*. Moscow: MGPIYA. 6–8.
- Barchudarov, L. 1979. *Sprache und Übersetzung. Probleme der allgemeinen und speziellen Übersetzungstheorie*. Moskau/Leipzig: Verlag Progreß.
- Bart, I., Rákos, S. (eds.) 1981. *A műfordítás ma*. (Literary Translation Today.) Budapest: Gondolat. (in Hungarian)
- Bart, I., Klaudy, K. 1996. Translation, Translators and the Study of Translation in Hungary. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, S., and Sohár, A. 26–39.
- Bart, I, Klaudy, K., and Szöllősy, J. 1996. *Angol-magyar fordítóiskola. Fordítás angolról magyarra és magyarról angolra*. (School for a Translation from English to Hungarian and from Hungarian to English.) Budapest: Corvina.
- Bassnett-McGuire, S. 1980. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.
- Bassnett, S., Lefevere, A. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Routledge.

- Bassnett, S. 1991. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bárczi, G. 1975. A magyar nyelv jelleme. (The nature of Hungarian.) *Magyar Nyelv* LXX1. 3. 257–268. (in Hungarian)
- Bell, R.T. 1992. *Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Belyaevskaya, E.G. et al. 1973. Opornie punkti i formirovanie gipotezi u perevodchika. *Tetradí perevodchika* Vol. 10. 70–78.
- Bendik, J. 1987. *A konferenciabeszéd prozódiaja az angol, a magyar és az orosz nyelvben*. (The Prosody of Conference Speech in English, Hungarian and Russian.) Unpublished PhD dissertation. Budapest. (in Hungarian)
- Bendik, J. 1996. On Suprasegmentals in Simultaneous Interpreting. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., and Sohár, A. (eds.) 176–191.
- Bendik, J. 1997. Packaging Sells the Product. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 207–213.
- Bergenholtz, H., Tarp, S. 1995. *Manual of Specialised Lexicography: The preparation of specialized dictionaries*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Beylard-Ozeroff, A., Králová J., and Moser-Mercer, B. (eds.) 1998. *Translators' Strategies and Creativity. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Blonskiy, P.P. 1935. *Pamyat' i mislenie*. Moscow-Leningrad: OGIZ.
- Bloomfield, L. 1935. *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In: House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) 17–37.
- Bowen, G., Bowen, M. (eds.) 1990. *Interpreting – Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. ATA Scholarly Monograph Series IV. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Börsch, S. 1986. Introspective Methods in Research on Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. In: House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) 195–211.
- Brassai, S. 1861. Még is valami a fordításról. (Something about translation.) *Szépirodalmi Figyelő* Vol. 1. N. 50. 786. (in Hungarian)
- Broadbent, D. 1952. Speaking and Listening Simultaneously. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* Vol. 43.N. 4.
- Brower, R.A. (ed.) *On Translation*. New York: OUP.
- Brown, R., Gilman, A. 1960. The Pronouns of Solidarity and Power. In: Sebeok, T.A. (ed.) *Style in Language*. New York: Wiley. 253–276.
- Brown, R., Ford, M. 1961. Address in American English. *Abnorm Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 49. 454–462.
- Bruce, D. 1956. Effects of Context upon the Intelligibility of Heard Speech. In: Cherry, C. (ed.) *Information Theory*. London: Butterworths. 245–252.
- Bush, P., Malmkjaer, K. (eds.) 1997. *Rimbaud's Rainbow. Literary Translation in Higher Education*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bühler, K. 1934. *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fisher. New edition: 1965.
- Canos, R.A. 1993. The Colloquial Register and Dubbing. In: Jansen, P. (ed.) 183–201.
- Carr, S., Roberts, R. (eds.) 1996. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community. Papers from the 1st international conference on interpreting in legal, health and social service settings. Geneva Park, Canada 1.4 June 1995*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cary, E. 1956. *La traduction dans le monde*. Geneva.
- Cary, E. 1957. Théories soviétiques de la traduction. *Babel* Vol.3. 27–31.
- Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: OUP.
- Chernyahovskaya, L. A. 1976. *Perevod i smislovaya struktura*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Chernyahovskaya, L. A. 1977. Sinnstruktur und syntaktische Umformung bei Übersetzen. In: Kade, O. (ed.) *Vermittelte Kommunikation, Sprachmittlung, Translation*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie. 86–92.

- Chernyahovskaya, L. A. 1993. Sense and its Expression through Language. In: Zlateva (ed.) 110–122.
- Chernov, G. V., Zimnyaya, I. A., 1970. K voprosu o roli veroyatnostnogo prognozirovaniya v protsesse sinhronnogo perevoda. In: *Voprosi teorii i metodiki prepodavaniya perevoda*. Moscow: MGPIYA.
- Chernov, G. V., Zimnyaya, I. A., 1973. Veroyatnostnoe prognozirovanie v protsesse sinhronnogo perevoda. In: *Predvaritelnie materialy experimentalnoy issledovaniy po psiholingvistike*. Moscow: izd. Akademii Nauk.
- Chernov, G.V. 1978. *Teoriya i praktika sinhronnogo perevoda*. Izd. Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Chernov, G. V. 1988. Kontekstno-svobodnaya i kontekstno-svyazannaya implikativnost i problemi perevoda, In: Shveitser, A.D. (ed.) *Tekst i perevod*, Moscow: Nauka. 51–63.
- Chernov, G.V. 1994. Message Redundancy and Message Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpretation. In: Lambert, S., Moser-Mercer, B. (eds.) 139–153.
- Chesterman, A. 1993. From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies. *Target* Vol. 5. N. 1. 1–21.
- Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T.Press.
- Cohen, A.D. 1984. Studying Second-language Learning Strategies: How Do We Get the Information? *Applied Linguistics* Vol. 5. 101–112.
- Corder, S. P. 1973. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. London: Penguin.
- de Groot, A. M. 1997. The Cognitive Study of Translation and Interpretation: Three Approaches. In: Danks, J.H. et al. (eds.) *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 25–56.
- Delabastita, D. 1991. A False Opposition in Translation Studies: Theoretical versus/historical Approaches. *Target* Vol. 3. N. 2. 115–119.
- Delisle, J., Woodsworth, J. 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Deme, L. 1971. *Mondatszerkezeti sajátosságok gyakorisági vizsgálata*. (Frequency Distributions in the Sentence Structure.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (in Hungarian)
- Dezső, L. 1980. Word Order, Theme and Rheme in Hungarian, and the Problems of Word Order Acquisition. In: Dezső L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 245–298.
- Dezső L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 1980. *Studies in English and Hungarian Contrastive Linguistics*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Dezső L. (ed.) 1982a. *Contrastive Studies. Hungarian–English*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Dezső, L. 1982b. *Studies in Syntactic Typology and Contrastive Grammar*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton Publishers.
- Dijk, van, T. A. 1975. *Issues in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Diósy-Stephanides, É. 1980. A Preliminary Study for a Contrastive Analysis of the English Gerund and its Hungarian Equivalents. In: Dezső, L., Nemser W. (eds.) 15–63.
- Dodds, J., Gran, L. (eds.) 1988–1993. *The Interpreter's Newsletter*. Trieste: SSLMIT.
- Doherty, M. 1987. Text Connectors – a Reading Aid. *Babel* Vol. 33. N.4. 212–217.
- Doherty, M. 1992. Relativity of Sentence Boundary. *Babel* Vol. 38. N.2. 72–79.
- Dollerup, C., Loddegaard, A. (eds.). 1992. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 1., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dollerup, C. 1994. Systematic Feedback in Teaching Translation. In: Dollerup, C., Lindegaard, A. 122–132.
- Dollerup, C., Lindegaard, A. eds. 1994. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 2., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Dollerup, C., Appel, V. (eds.) 1996. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 3., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dressler, W. 1973. *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Dugonics A. 1807. *Cserei, egy honvári herceg*. (Hungarian translation of Zadig by Voltaire.) Republished in 1975 in the series "Old Hungarian Literary Translations". Budapest: Magyar Helikon.
- Duff, A. 1989. *Translation*. Oxford: OUP.
- Durham, M. 1996. Temporal Characteristics of Simultaneous Interpreting. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., and Sohár, A. (eds.) 165–176.
- Edwards, A.B. 1995. *The Practice of Court Interpreting*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- EHD = English–Hungarian Dictionary 1969. ed. by Országh, L. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 1st edition.
- É. Kiss, K. 1980. English participles and their Hungarian equivalents. In: Dezső L., Nemeser, W. (eds.) 63–93.
- É. Kiss, K. 1982. Hungarian and English: a Topic-Focus Prominent and a Subject Prominent Language. In: Dezső, L. (ed.) 39–61.
- É. Kiss, K. 1987. Configurationality in Hungarian. *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- É. Kiss, K. 1994. Sentence Structure and Word Order. In: Kiefer F., É.Kiss., K. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. New York: Academic Press. 1–84.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. 1993. Semantic Change in Translation – A Cognitive Perspective. In: Gambier, Y., Tommola, J. (eds.) *Translation and Knowledge*. Turku: University of Turku. 285–297.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. 1995 Omissions in Consecutive Interpretation: Evidence of a Decision Component. In: *Professor Anders Sjöberg in memoriam*. Stockholm: Institute of Slavonic and Baltic Languages, Stockholm University.
- Erdei, Gy. 1979. *Fordításelmélet – Fordításoktatás*. (Theory of Translation – Teaching of Translation.) Budapest: TIT. (in Hungarian)
- Erwin-Tripp, S. M. 1969. Sociolinguistics. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 4. 91–165.
- Fawcett, P. 1997. *Translation and Language. Linguistic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Fawcett, P. 1998. Linguistic Approaches. In: Baker, M. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 120–125.
- Fedorov, A.V. 1953. *Vvedenie v teoriyu perevoda*. Moscow: Izd. literaturi na inostrannih yazikah.
- Fedorov, A.V. 1958. *Vvedenyije v teoriyu perevoda*. *Lingvisticheskie problemi*. Moscow: Izd. literaturi na inostrannih yazikah.
- Fedorov, A.V. 1968. *Osnovi obshchey teorii perevoda Lingvisticheskij ocherk*. Moscow: Visshaya skola.
- Fedorov, A.V. 1983. *Osnovi obshchey teorii perevoda. Lingvisticheskie problemi*. izd. IV. perebotannoye i dopolnennoye. Moscow: Visshaya skola.
- Ferenczy, Gy. 1973. *A többtagú nominális szerkezetek szintagmatikája az orosz nyelvben*. (Syntaxmatics of Nominal Constructions in Russian) Unpublished PhD Thesis. Budapest. (in Hungarian)
- Ferguson, Ch. A. 1971. *Language Structure and Language Use*. Stanford: SUP.
- FHD = French-Hungarian Dictionary I–II. 1973. ed. by Eckhardt, S. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 3rd edition.
- Fishman, J. (ed.) 1971. *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Flotow, L. 1997. *Translation and Gender. Translating in the "Era of Feminism"*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

- Fodor, J.A., Katz, J.J. (eds.) 1964. *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Fónagy, I. 1982. *Situation et signification*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fraser, J. 1996. Mapping the Process of Translation. *Meta* Vol. 41.N.1. Special Issue: Translation Processes. ed. by Königs, F. G. 84–96.
- Gaddis Rose, M. (ed.) 1987. *Translation Excellence*. ATA Scholarly Monograph Series I. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gaddis Rose, M. 1997. *Translation and Literary Criticism. Translation as Analysis*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Gak, V. G., L'vin, Ju. I. 1970. *Kurs perevoda. Frantsuzskiy yazik*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Gak, V. G. 1977. *Sravnitel'naya tipologiya frantsuzskovo i russkovo yazikov*. Leningrad: Prosvetshchenie.
- Gak, V. G. 1977. Interlanguage Asymmetry and the Prognostication of Transformations in Translation. In: Zlateva (ed.) 32–39.
- Gambier, Y., Gile, D., Taylor, Ch. 1997. *Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research. Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What do we know and how?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gellerstam, M. 1986. Translationese in Swedish Novels Translated from English. In: Wollin, L., Lindquist, H. (eds.) *Translation Studies in Scandinavia*. 88–95. Malmö: Liber Vorlag.
- Gentzler, E. 1993. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- GHD = *German–Hungarian Dictionary*. I–II. 1976. ed. by Halász, E. 5th edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó
- Giglioli, P. P. (ed.) 1972. *Language and Social Context*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gile, D. 1994. The Process-Oriented Approach in Translation Training. In: Dollerup, C., Lindegaard, A. (eds.) 122–132.
- Gile, D. 1995. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goris, O. 1993. The Question of French Dubbing: Towards a Frame for Systematic Investigation. *Target* Vol.5., N. 2. 169–191.
- Gran, L. Id. Dodds, J.
- Greenberg, J. H. (ed.) 1963. *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Greene, J. 1972. *Psycholinguistics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P. and Morgan, J.L. (eds.) *Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press. 41–58.
- Hadrovics, L. 1969. *A funkcionális magyar mondattan alapjai*. (Foundations of a Functional Hungarian Grammar.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (in Hungarian)
- Hall, E.T. 1976. *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Hall, E.T., Hall, M.R. 1990. *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Halle, M., Stevens, K. 1962. Speech Recognition: A Model and a Program for Research. *IRE Trans. Infor. Theory* 155–159.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hammond, D. L. (ed.) *Professional Issues for Translators and Interpreters*. ATA Scholarly Monograph Series VII. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Harris, B. 1977. Toward a Science of Translation. *Meta*. 22:1. 90–92.
- Harris, B. 1990. Norms and Interpretation. *Target* Vol. 2., N.1. 115–119.
- Hartman, R. R. K. 1981. Contrastive Textology and Translation. In: Kühlwein, W. et al. (eds.) 200–209.
- Harvey, K. 1998. Compensation. In: Baker, M. (ed.) 37–40.
- Harweg, R. 1968. *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Hatim, B., Mason, J. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

- Hatim, B. 1997. *Communication Across Cultures. Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Haugen, E. 1953. Bilingual child. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*. 52. 392–397.
- HED = *Hungarian–English Dictionary I–II*. 1977. ed. by Országh, L. 5th edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Heltai, P. 1988. Contrastive Analysis of Terminological Systems and Bilingual Technical Dictionaries. *Interenational Journal of Lexicography*. 1. 32–40.
- Heltai, P. 1990. Hierarchical Lexical Relations in English and Hungarian. In: *Budalex'88. Proceedings*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 288–293.
- Heltai, P. 1992. *Angol–magyar lexikai kontrasztok*. (English–Hungarian Lexical Contrasts.) Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Budapest. (in Hungarian)
- Heltai, P. 1993. Lexical Equivalence on Collocational Level. In: Kohn, J. et al. 211–217.
- Hell, Gy. 1980a. Object and Subject **that** Clauses in English and Corresponding **hogy** Clauses in Hungarian. In: Dezső L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 145–177.
- Hell, Gy. 1980b. Compound Sentences in English and Hungarian. In: Dezső L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 351–375.
- Hell, Gy. 1989. Indefinite and General Subject in English and Hungarian. In Stephanides, É. (ed.) 71–93.
- Hermans, T. 1991. Translational Norms and Correct Translation. In: van Leuven-Zwart, K. M., Naaijkens, T. (eds.) *Translation Studies: The State of Art*. Proceedings of the First James S. Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 155–169.
- Hermans, T. 1995. Toury's Empiricism Version One: Review of Gideon Toury's *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. *The Translator* Vol. 1. N. 2. 215–225.
- Herring, S.C. (ed.) 1996. *Computer-Mediated Communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hervey, S., Higgins, J. 1992. *Thinking Translation. A Course in Translation Method: French to English*. London: Routledge.
- Hervey, S., Higgins, J. and Loughridge, M. 1995. *Thinking German Translation. A Course in Translation Method: German to English*. London: Routledge.
- Hervey, S., Higgins, J. and Haywood, L. 1996. *Thinking Spanish Translation. A Course in Translation Method: Spanish to English*. London: Routledge.
- Hewson, L., Martin, J. 1991. *Redefining Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- HFD = *Hungarian–French Dictionary I–II*. 1973. ed. by Eckhardt, S. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 3rd edition.
- HGD = *Hungarian–German Dictionary I–II*. 1976. ed. by Halász, E. 5th edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó
- HRD = *Hungarian–Russian Dictionary I–II*. 1969. ed. by Hadrovics L., Gáldi L. 3rd edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Hoey, M. 1998. Contrastive Analysis and Translation. In: Baker, M. (ed.) 45–50.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences on Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Holmes, J. (ed.) 1970. *The Nature of Translation*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Holmes, J. 1972. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. 1st ed: *APPTS Series of the Translation Studies Section, Dept. of General Literary Studies*. Amsterdam: University Press. 2nd ed. In: Holmes 1988. 67–80.
- Holmes, J. 1988. *Translated!* Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holz-Mänttári, J. 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- House, J. 1977. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) 1986. *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- Hrdlička, M., Čeňkova, I. (eds.) 1995. *Czech and Slovak Bibliography on Translation Studies*. Prague: JTP.
- Isacenko, A. V. 1965. Kontextbedingte Ellipse und Pronominalisierung im Deutschen. *Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Volkskunde und Literaturforschung*. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften. 163–174.
- Jäger, G. 1975. *Translation und Translationslinguistik*. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Jakobovits, L. A. 1969. Second Language Learning and Transfer Theory: a Theoretical Assessment. *Language Learning* Vol. 19. N. 1–2. 55–86.
- Jakobson, R. 1959, 1966. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In: R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation*. New York: OUP. 232–239.
- James, C. 1980. *Contrastive Analysis*. London and New York: Longman.
- Jansen, P. (ed) 1992–1993. *Translation and the Manipulation of Discourse. Selected Papers of the CERA Research Seminars in Translation Studies 1992–1993*. Leuven: CETRA.
- Jääskeläinen, R. 1998. Think-Aloud Protocols. In: Baker 1998. 265–269.
- Jääskeläinen, R. 1999. *Tapping the Process: an Explorative Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Jettmarová, Z. 1997. The Initiator and the Initial Norm in Advertisement Translation. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. 161–167.
- Jones, R. 1988. *Conference Interpreting Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Juhász, J. 1970. *Probleme der Interferenz*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Juhász, J. ed. 1980. *Kontrastive Studien Ungarisch–Deutsch*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Jumpelt, R.W. 1961. *Die Übersetzung naturwissenschaftlicher und technischer Literatur*. Berlin-Schöneberg: Langenscheidt.
- Kade, O. 1968. Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung. *Beiheft II. zur Zeitschrift "Fremdsprachen"*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Kade, O. (ed.) 1977. *Vermittelte Kommunikation, Sprachmittlung, Translation*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopaedie.
- Kelemen, J. 1988. De la langue au style. *Éléments de linguistique contrastive français-hongrois*. Budapest.
- Kelly, L. G. 1979. *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation. Theory and Practice in the West*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Kenesei, I. 1980. Sentence Embedding in English and Hungarian. In: Dezsó L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 177–207.
- Kepecs, Á. 1986. A Contrastive Analysis of English Passive Structures and their Hungarian Equivalents. In: Stephanides É. (ed.) 23–88.
- Kiefer, F. (ed.) 1969. *Studies in Syntax and Semantics*. Dordrecht: Riedel.
- Kiefer, F. (ed.) 1973. *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Riedel.
- Kiefer, F. (ed.) 1974. *Machine Translation and Applied Linguistics. Soviet Papers in Linguistics*. Stockholm: Scriptor.
- Kingscott, G. 1995. *International Who's Who in Translation and Terminology*. Nottingham: Praetorius Limited.
- Kingscott, G. 1996. *Transférer n'est pas traduire... Second International Conference 1996. Language International*. Vol.8. N. 5. 14–15.
- Kiraly, D.C. 1995. *Pathways to Translation. Pedagogy and Process*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D.C. 1997. Students Take the Floor. In Search of Alternative Approaches in Classroom Interaction. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 383–388.
- Kiraly, D.C. 1997. Think-aloud Protocols and the Construction of a Professional Translator Self-Concept. In: Danks, J.H. et al. (eds.) *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 137–160.
- Klaudy, K. 1977. Alternativi v postroenii uchebnovo materiala na perevodcheskih kursah. *Slavica* XV. 19–23.

- Klaudy, K., Bart, I. (eds.) 1980. *Fordításelméleti Szöveggyűjtemény*. (A Reader in the Theory of Translation.) Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. (in Hungarian).
- Klaudy, K. 1981a. Quasi Correctness – an Experimental and Statistical Approach. In: Kopczynski, A. et al. (eds.) *The Mission of the Translator Today and Tomorrow. Proceedings of the IX-th World Congress of the International Federation of Translators*. Warsaw:FIT. 481–484.
- Klaudy, K. 1981b. Fordítás és aktuális tagolás. (Translation and Topic-Comment Structure.) Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Budapest. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 1981c. Kvizipravilnost' perevoda i perevodcheskiy yazik. In: *Hudozhestvenniy perevod. Voprosi teorii i praktiki*. Toper, P. M., Mkrchtan, L. M. (eds.) Yerevan-Moscow: izd. Yerevanskovo Universiteta. 131–136.
- Klaudy, K. 1984. Original Hungarian Text vs. Text Translated from Russian into Hungarian. In: Papp, F. (ed.) *Contrastive Studies Hungarian–Russian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 127–139.
- Klaudy, K., Bart, I. (eds.) 1986. *A fordítás tudománya. Válogatás a fordításelmélet irodalmából*. (The Science of Translation. Selected Papers from the Literature on Translation Theory.) Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 1986. Az idéző mondategység ígéről. (On the Reporting Verbs.) *Magyar Nyelvőr* 110. évf. 2. 214–223. (in Hungarian).
- Klaudy, K. 1987. Fordítás és aktuális tagolás. (Translation and Topic-Comment Structure.) *Nyelvtudományi értekezések* 123. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 136 pp. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 1988. Foreignness, Foreign Flavour, Quasi Correctness. In: Jäger, G., Neubert A. (eds.) *Semantik, Kognition und Äquivalenz*. Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge 11. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopaedie. 165–171.
- Klaudy, K. 1989. Kosvonnaja interferentsiya pri perevode s inostrannovo yazika na rodnoy yazik. In: Schmidt, H. (ed.) *Interferenz in der Translation*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopedie. 81–88.
- Klaudy, K. 1991a. *Átváltási műveletek a fordításban*. (Transfer Operations in Translation.) Budapest: Külkereskedelmi Főiskola. 166 pp. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 1991b. Topic, Comment and Translation. In: Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (ed.) 165–171.
- Klaudy, K. 1993a. On Explicitation Hypothesis. In: Kohn, J. et al. (eds.) *Transfere necesse est ... Current Issues of Translation Theory. In honour of György Radó on his 80th birthday*. Szombathely: Dániel Berzsenyi College.
- Klaudy, K. 1993b. Optional Additions in Translation. Two Translations of the Yeltsin-Papers. In: *Translation the Vital Link*. Proceedings of the XIII. FIT World Congress. Volume 2. 373–381. London: ITI.
- Klaudy, K. 1994. (1st) 1994. (2nd) 1995. (3rd) *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítástechnikai példatárral* (The Theory and Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, French, German and Russian); 1997 I–II. (4th) 1999 I–II. (5th) *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe* (Introduction to the Theory of Translation) and *Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába* (Introduction to the Practice of Translation). Budapest: Scholastica. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 1995. Lexical Operations in Translation. Segmentation and Integration of Meaning. In: Krawutschke, P. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*. Nashville. Tennessee: ATA. 181–190.
- Klaudy, K. 1996a. Quality Assessment in School Translation and in Professional Translation. In: Dollerup, C., Appel, V. (eds.) 198–204.
- Klaudy, K. 1996b. Concretization and Generalization of Meaning in Translation. In: Thelen, M. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 2nd International Maastricht-Lodz Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning"*. Maastricht: EUROTERM. 141–151.
- Klaudy, K. 1996c. Back Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., Sohár, A. (eds.) 99–114.

- Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., Sohár, A. (eds.) 1996. *Translation Studies in Hungary*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Klaudy, K., Bart, I. 1996. Translation and Translators in Hungary. Introduction. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., Sohár, A. (eds.) *Translation Studies in Hungary*. Budapest: Scholastica. 26–39.
- Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 1997. *Transfere Necesse Est 2. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting (5–7 September, 1996. Budapest, Hungary)*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Klaudy, K. 1998a. Explication. In: Baker, M. (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 80–85.
- Klaudy, K. 1998b. Empirical Research in Translation Studies. In: Hrala, M. (ed.) *Translatologica Pragensia*. VI. 19–25.
- Klaudy, K. 1999a. Translational Behaviour of Languages. In: Lúgris, A.A., Ocampo, A.F. (eds.) *Anovar/Anosar. Estudios de Traducción e interpretación. Proceedings of the Vigo Conference*. Vigo: University of Vigo. Vol. 1. 53–65.
- Klaudy, K. 1999b. Az explicitációs hipotézisről. (On the Explication Hypothesis.) *Fordítás-tudomány* Vol. I. N. 2. 5–21. (in Hungarian)
- Klaudy, K. 2001. *The Asymmetry Hypothesis*. Lecture held at the 3rd International EST (European Society for Translation Studies) Conference, 30 August – 4 September 2001, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Kohn, J. et al (ed.) 1993. “*Transfere necesse est ...*” *Current Issues of Translation Theory*. Proceedings of the Symposium in honour of György Radó on his 80th birthday. Szombathely: BDTF.
- Kohn, J. 1996. What Can (Corpus) Linguistics do for Translation. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J. and Sohár, A. (eds.) 39–53.
- Koller, W. 1979. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle und Meyer.
- Komissarov, V. N. 1969. Eksplitsirovanie kak problema perevoda. In: *Problemi prikladnoy lingvistiki*. Moscow: TDVK.
- Komissarov, V. N. 1972. Lingvisticheskie modeli processa perevoda. *Tetradj perevodchika*. 9. 3–14.
- Komissarov, V.N. 1973. *Slovo o perevode*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Komissarov, V.N. 1980. *Lingvistika perevoda*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Komissarov, V.N. 1990. *Teoriya perevoda. Lingvistyicseszije aszpekti*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- Komissarov, V.N., Koralova, A.L. 1990. *A Manual of Translation from English into Russian*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- Königs, F.G. 1987. Was beim Übersetzen passiert. Theoretische Aspekte empirische Befunde und praktische Konsequenzen. *Die Neueren Sparchen* Vol. 86. N.2. 162–185.
- Krings, H. 1986. *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Krings, H. 1987. The Use of Introspective Data in Translation. In: Faerch, C., Kasper, G. (eds.) *Introspection in Second Language Research*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 159–176.
- Kühlwein, W., Thome, G. and Wilss, W. (eds.) 1981. *Kontrastive Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Kussmaul, P. 1995. *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Labov, W. 1970. The Study of Language in its Social Setting. *Studium Generale* Vol. 23. N.1. 30–87.
- Lambert, J. 1993. The Cultural Component Reconsidered. In: Snell-Hornby, M. et al. (eds.) 17–26.
- Lambert, J. 1996. Translation and/as Research for Societies. In: Klaudy K., Lambert, J., and Sohár, A. (eds.) 11–26.

- Lambert, S., Moser-Mercer, B. (eds.) 1994. *Bridging the Gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Láng, Zs. 1996. Information Processing During Interpreting and Some Teaching Implications. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., and Sohár, A. (eds.) 191–197.
- Láng, Zs. 1997. Interpreting As Intercultural Mediation. In: Polyák, I. (ed.) *A hetedik országos alkalmazott nyelvészeti konferencia előadásai*. 126–129. Budapest: Külkereskedelmi Főiskola. (in Hungarian)
- Larson, M. 1984. *A Meaning-Based Translation: a Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Larham: University Press of America.
- Larson, M. 1991. *Translation: Theory and Practice, Tension and Interdependence*. ATA Scholarly Monograph Series V. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Latisev, L. K. 1988. *Perevod: problemi, teorii, praktiki i metodiki prepodavaniya*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
- Laviosa 1998. Universals of Translation. In: Baker, M. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 288–295.
- Lefevere, A. 1977. *Translating Literature: the German Tradition. From Luther to Rosenzweig*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Lefevere, A. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame*. London: Routledge.
- Lendvai, E. 1986. *A "lefördíthatatlan elem" megfeleltetési lehetőségei*. (How to Translate the "Untranslatable"). Unpublished PhD dissertation. Pécs: JPTE. (in Hungarian)
- Lendvai, E. 1996. Types of Untranslatable Jokes. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J. and Sohár, A. (eds.) 89–99.
- Lengyel, Zs., Navracsics, J. 1996. The Ontogenesis of Translation. Klaudy, K, Lambert, J. and Sohár, A. (eds.) 60–71.
- Leont'yev, A.A. 1969. *Psiholingvisticheskie edinitsi i porozhdenie rechevovo viskazivaniya*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Levitskaya, T. R., Fiterman, A. 1971. Pochemu nuzhni grammaticheskie transformatsii pri perevode. *Tetradí perevodchika* Vol. 8. 12–22.
- Levitskaya, T. R., Fiterman, A. 1973. *Posobie po perevodu s angliyskovo na russkiy*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- Li, Ch., Thompson, S. 1976. Subject and Topic. A New Typology of Language. In: Li, Ch. (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press. 457–489.
- Lörschner, W. 1991. Thinking-Aloud as a Method for Collecting Data on Translation Processes. In: Tirkkonen-Condit ed. 1991. 67–77.
- Lörschner, W. 1996. A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Translation Processes. *Meta* Vol. 41.N.1. Special Issue: Translation Processes. ed. by Königs, F. G. 26–32.
- Lvovskaya, Z. D. 1985. *Teoreticheskie problemi perevoda*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- Makai, I. 1981. *Solohov*. In: Bart, I., Rákos, S. (eds.) 566–581. (in Hungarian)
- Malblanc, A. 1944. *Stilistique comparée du français et de l'allemand*. (new.ed.1963.5th ed. 1968.) Paris: Didier.
- Melby, A., Warner, T. 1995. *The Possibility of Language. A Discussion of the Nature of Language with Implications for Human and Machine Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Melchuk, I. 1973. Towards a Linguistic "Meaning-Text" Model. In: Kiefer, F. (ed.) *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*. 33–57.
- Melchuk, I., Zholkovsky, A. 1984. *Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian*. Wien: Wiener Slavistischer Almanach.
- Melchuk, I. 1997. *Vers une linguistique sens-texte*. Leçon inaugurale faite le Vendredi 10 janvier 1997. Collège de France, Chaire Internationale. 1–78.
- Miller, G.A. 1965. The Psycholinguists. In: Osgood, Ch.E., Sebeok, A.T. (eds.) *Psycholinguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mounin, G. 1963. *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.

- Mossop, B. 1994. Goals of a Revision Course. In: Dollerup, C., Lindegaard, A. 81–90.
- Nádasdy, Á. 1982. Relative Pronouns in English and Hungarian. In: Dezső, L. (ed.) 75–89.
- Neubert, A. 1968. Pragmatische Aspekte der Übersetzung: *Beiheft II. zur Zeitschrift "Fremdsprachen"*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Neubert, A. 1985. *Text and Translation*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Neubert, A., Shreve, G.M. 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Newmark, P. 1982. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Newmark, P. 1991. *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Newmark, P. 1993. *Paragraphs on Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Newmark, P. 1998. *Further Paragraphs on Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Newton, J. (ed.) 1992. *Computers in Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Néray, J. 1980. A Contrastive Study of the Word-Order of Attributes in Noun Phrases in English and Hungarian. In: Dezső, L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 319–351.
- Nida, E. A. 1952. *God's Word in Man's Language*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Nida, E. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E. A., Taber, Ch. R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E. A. 1976. A Framework for the Analysis and Evaluation of Theories of Translation. In: Brislin, R.W. (ed.) *Translation: Application and Research*. New York: Gardner Press.
- Nida, E. A. 1996. *The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication*. Brussels: Editions du Hazard.
- Nord, Ch. 1991. Skopos, Loyalty and Translation Conventions. *Target* Vol. 3. N.1. 91–109.
- Nord, Ch. 1996. Text Type and Translation Method: Review of Reiss's Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. *The Translator* Vol. 2. N. 2. 81–89.
- Nord, Ch. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- OID = The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary. 1975. Oxford: OUP.
- Orero, P., Sager, J. (eds) 1997. *The Translator's Dialogue. Giovanni Pontiero*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ortutay, P. 1993. *Az amerikai szleng fordításának problémái*. (Problems of Translation of the American Slang). Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Budapest. (in Hungarian)
- Pagano, A. 1994. Decentering Translation in the Classroom: an Experiment. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology*. 2. 213–219.
- Pajzs, J. 1990. Creating a Historical Dictionary of Hungarian with the Aid of Computer. In: Magay, T., Zigány, J. (eds.) BUDALEX' 88. Proceedings. 559–563.
- Pajzs, J. 1997. Synthesis of Results about Analysis of Corpora in Hungarian. *Linguistic Investigations*. XXI/2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 249–259.
- PAKS-Arbeitsbericht Nr.1. 1968, Nr.2 1969, Kiel: Englisch Seminar der Universität Kiel; Nr. 3–4. 1969, Nr.5 1970, Nr. 6. 1970. Stuttgart: Institut für Literatur und Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Stuttgart.
- Papp, F. 1979. *Könyv az orosz nyelvről*. (Book on the Russian Language) Budapest: Gondolat. (in Hungarian)
- Papp, F. 1984. The Russian of Hungarian People whose Russian is First-Rate. In: Papp, F. (ed.) 127–139. (English translation of the author's paper originally written in Russian and published in 1972.)
- Papp, F. (ed.) 1984. *Contrastive Studies Hungarian–Russian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Patterson, G. B. 1981. The Problems Arising from the Multilingualism of the European Community. *Lebende Sprachen* XXVI. 1. 7–12.
- Pennington, M., Stevens, V. 1994. *Computers in Applied Linguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pollard, D. E. (ed.) 1997. *Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840–1918*.

- Popović, A. 1975. *Teória umeleckého prekladu* (Theory in Literary Translation). Bratislava: Tatran.
- Poulton, E.C. 1955. Simultaneous and Alternative Listening and Speaking. *JASA* Vol. 27. N. 6.
- Poyatos, F. (ed.) 1997. *Nonverbal Communication in Translation. New Perspectives and Challenges in Literature, Interpretation and Media*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Puurtinen, T. 1992. *Towards a Definition of Acceptability in Translation: A Comparison of Two Finnish Translations of The Wizard of Oz*. Licentiate Thesis. Savonlinna.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. 1973. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Radó, Gy. 1979. Outline of a Systematic Translatology. *Babel* Vol. 25. N.4. 186–197.
- Radó, Gy. 1998. Hungarian Tradition. In: Baker, M. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 448–456.
- Reiss, K. 1971. *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*. München: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Reiss, K., Vermeer, J. H. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie. Linguistische Arbeiten* 147. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Reményi, A. A. 1994. Influences and Values: A Sociolinguistic Study in the Hungarian System of Address. In: Hunyadi, L. (ed.) *Studies in Applied Linguistics*. I. 86–109. Debrecen: University of Debrecen.
- Remael, A. 1992. Film Adaptation as Translation and the Case of the Screenplay. In: Jansen, P. (ed.) 125–133.
- Retsker, Ya. I. 1950. O zakonomernih szootvetsztviyah pri perevogn na rodnoj jazik. In: *Voprosi teorii i metodiki ucbebnovo perevoda*. Moscow: Izd. Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk.
- Retsker, Ya. I. 1974. *Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Retsker, J. 1993. The Theory and Practice of Translation. In: Zlateva (ed.) 18–32.
- Rey, A. 1995. *Essays on Terminology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Revzin, I. I., Rozentsveig V. Yu. 1964. *Osnovi obshchevo i mashinovo perevoda*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- RHD = *Russian-Hungarian Dictionary*. I–II. 1971. ed. by Hadrovics L., Gáldi L. 4th edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Riabtseva, N. K. 1980. *Informatsionnie Protssesi i Mashinnyy Perevod. Lingvisticheskiy aspekt*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Robinson, D. 1997. *Translation and Empire. Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Roganova, Z. E. 1971. *Perevod s russkovo na nemetskiy*. Moscow: Visshaya shkola.
- Rot, S. 1994. Hungarian: its Origins and Originality. Budapest: Korona Publishing House.
- Rozentsveig, V. Yu. 1964 see. Revzin.
- Rozentsveig, V. Yu. 1964a. *Perevod i tranzformatsija*. In: Rozentsveig, V. Yu. (ed.) *Transformatsionnyy metod v stukturnoy lingvistike*. Moscow: Nauka. 88–98.
- Russo, M. 1997. Morphosyntactical Asymmetries between Spanish and Italian and their Effect during Simultaneous Interpreting. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 268–273.
- Sager, J. 1990. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sager, J. 1994. *Language Engineering and Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sager, J. 1995. The Dawn of a Modern Theory of Translation: Review of Georges Mounin's *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. *The Translator* Vol 1. 1. 87–93.
- Sainz, M. J. 1992. Developing Translation Skills. In: Dollerup & Loddegaard. 69–73.
- Sallai, J. 1985. A tolmácsolás pszichológiai megközelítése. (The Psychology of Interpreting) *Fordításelméleti Füzetek*. 5. 15–25. (in Hungarian)

- Sapir, E. 1956. *Selected Writings in Culture, Language and Personality*. Mandelbaum, D. G. (ed.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Savory, T. H. 1957. *The Art of Translation*. 2nd. edition 1968. Boston: The Writer Inc.
- Schäffner, Ch., Wiesmann U. 1998. *Annotated texts for Translation. English → German*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Schjoldager, A. 1995. An Exploratory Study of Translational Norms in Simultaneous Interpreting: Methodological Reflections. In: Jansen, P. (ed.) *Selected Papers of the CERA Research Seminars in Translation Studies 1992–1993*. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit. 227–245.
- Schmidt, H. (ed.) 1989. Interferenz in der Translation. *Überwissenschaftliche Beiträge*. 12. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Schmitt, P. A. 1997. A New Approach to Technical Translation Teaching. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 127–134.
- Seguinot, C. 1988. Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis. *TTR. Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*. 106–110.
- Seguinot, C. 1989. Understanding why Translators Make Mistakes. *TTR. Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*. 2. 2. 73–83.
- Seleskovitch, D. 1968. *L'interprète dans les conférences internationales*. Paris: Lettres Modernes.
- Seleskovitch, D. 1978. *Interpreting for International Conferences*. Washington D.C.: Pen and Booth.
- Seleskovitch, D., Lederer, M. 1986. *La traduction simultanée, expérience et théorie*. Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Seleskovitch, D., Lederer, M. 1989. *Pédagogie raisonnée de l'interprétation*. Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Seleskovitch, D., Lederer, M. 1995. *A Systematic Approach to Teaching Interpretation*. Translated by Jacolyn Hammer. The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.
- Selinker, L. 1969. *Language Transfer. General Linguistics*. The Pennsylvania State University. 9. 2. 67–92.
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *IRAL* Vol. 10. N. 3. 209–220.
- Selinker, L. 1992. *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Shlesinger, M. 1991. Interpreter Latitude vs. Due Process. Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpretation in Multilingual Trials. In: Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (ed.) Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 147–157.
- Shiryayev, A.F. 1973. *Sinhronnost' sinhronnovo perevoda*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shveitser, A. D. 1966. K voprosu o naibolee ratsionalnoy skheme sinhronnovo perevoda. *Tetradi perevodchika*. 4. 82–86.
- Shveitser, A. D. 1973. *Perevod i lingvistika*. Moscow: Voennoye Izdatelstvo.
- Shveitser, A.D. 1988a. *Teoriya perevoda*. Status, problemi i aspekti. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shveitser, A.D. 1988b (ed.) *Tekst i perevod*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shuttleworth, M., Cowie, M. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sladkovskaya, E. 1971. Prognozirovaniya na urovne tseli viskazivaniya. *Tetradi perevodchika*. 8. 61–64.
- Smith, A. H. (ed.) 1958. *Aspects of Translation*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1988. *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M. et al. (eds.) 1993. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline. Papers from the Vienna Congress, Sept. 1992*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M., Jettmarová, Z. and Kaindl, K. (eds) 1996. *Translation as Intercultural Communication. Selected papers from the EST Congress – Prague 1995*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Snelling, D. 1992. *Strategies for Simultaneous Interpreting*. Campanotto: Udine. Sokolov, A.N. 1968. *Vnutrennaya rech i mislenie*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.

- Somers, H. 1996. *Terminology, LSP and Translation. Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Steier, B. 1975. O mehanizme sihronnovo perevoda. *Tetradi perevodchika*. 12. 101–111.
- Steiner, G. 1975. *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: OUP.
- Stephanides, É. 1980. A Contrastive Study of the English and the Hungarian Infinitive. In: Dezső, L., Nemser, W. (eds.) 93–145.
- Stephanides, É. H. (ed.) 1986. *Contrasting English with Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Stephanides, É. (ed.) 1989. *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestiensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominante. Sectio Linguistica. Tomus XX*. Budapest: ELTE.
- Störig, H. J. 1969. *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. (Wege der Forschung 8); reprint: 1973.
- Straniero Sergio, F. 1998. Transfer Competence in Simultaneous Interpretation from Russian into Italian: A Contrastive Approach. in: Klaudy K., Kohn J. (eds.) 242–247.
- Svartvik, J. 1966. On Voice in the English Verb. The Hague: Mouton.
- Szabari, K. 1996. Problems in Translating Legal Texts (with German-Hungarian Examples). In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J., Sohár, A. (eds.) 115–125.
- Szépe, Gy., Andor, J. 1986. Training of Mother Tongue Teachers who Will Be at the Same Time Applied Linguists. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* (Thessaloniki) 1–2 106–17.
- Szépe, Gy. 1994. Language Policies in Transition (with special reference to Hungary). In: *Current Issues in Language and Society* Vol.1, No. 1, 41–64 Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. 1985. *Argumentative Text Structure and Translation*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. 1986. Text Type Markers and Translation Equivalence. In: House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) 95–115.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. 1986. Readers Impressions and Textlinguistic Priorities in Translation Quality Assessment. In: Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (ed.) 49–73.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (ed.) 1991. *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Telematics Programme 1991–1994. Area:6. *Linguistic Research and Engineering*. Luxembourg.
- Toury, G. 1978. The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation. In: Holmes, J.S., Lambert, J. et al (eds.) *Literature and Translation*. Leuven: ACCO.
- Toury, G. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel-Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, G. 1981. Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies. Towards a Tripartite Model. In: Kühlwein, W. et al. (ed.) 251–262.
- Toury, G. 1986. Monitoring Discourse Transfer: A Test-Case for a Developmental Model of Translation. In: House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) 79–95.
- Toury, G. 1991. Experimentation in Translation Studies: Achievements, Prospects and Some Pitfalls. In: Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (ed.) 45–66.
- Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Trosborg, A. 1997. (ed.) *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Trudgill, P. 1974. *Sociolinguistics. An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Penguin Books.
- Vannikov, Yu. V. 1987. Nauchno-tehnicheskij perevod kak osobiy vid deyatel'nosti. In: Marchuk, Yu. N. (red.) *Nauchno-tehnicheskij perevod*. 32–55. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vaseva, I. 1980. *Teoriya i praktika perevoda*. Sophia: Nauka i isskustvo.
- Vehmas-Lehto, I. 1989. *Quasi-Correctness. A Critical Study of Finnish Translations of Russian Journalistic Texts*. Helsinki: Neuvostoliittoinstituutti.
- Vermeer, H. J. 1978. Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie. *Lebende Sprachen*. XXXIII. 2. 99–102.

- Vermeer, H. J. 1984., 1991. cf. Reiss, K.
- Vermeer, H. J. 1998. Didactics of Translation. In: Baker, M. (ed.) 60–63.
- Vienne, J. 1994. Towards a Pedagogy of 'Translation in Situation'. In: *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*. 1. 51–61.
- Vinay, J. P., Darbelnet, J. 1958. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. London-Toronto-Paris: Didier.
- Vinay, J. P., Darbelnet, J. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Translated by Juan C. Sager and M.J. Hamel.
- Vlakhov, S., Florin S. 1980. *Neperevodimoye v perevode*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya.
- Wandruszka, M. 1969. *Sprachen – vergleichbar und unvergleichlich*. München: Piper Verlag.
- Wadensjö, C. 1992. *Interpreting as Interaction. On Dialogue-Interpreting in Immigration Hearings and Medical Encounters*. Linköping: University of Linköping.
- Weinreich, U. 1966. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Weinrich, H. 1971. The Textual Function of the French Article. In: Chatman, S. (ed.) *Literary Style*. 221–234. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weizman, E. 1986. An Interlingual Study of Discourse Structures: Implications for the Theory of Translation. In: House, J., Blum-Kulka, S. 115–129.
- Weizman, E., Blum-Kulka, S. 1987. Identifying and Interpreting Translated Texts. *Indian Journal of Applied linguistics*. 13. 62–73.
- Whorf, B. L. 1956. *Language, Thought and Reality. Selected Writings of Benjamin L. Whorf*. Carroll, J. B. (ed.) Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wilss, W. 1977. *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden*. Stuttgart: Klett Verlag.
- Wilss, W. (ed.) 1980. *Semiotik und Übersetzen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Wilss, W. 1982. *The Science of Translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Wilss, W. 1996. *Knowledge and Skills in Translator Behaviour*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wills, W. 1998. Decision Making in Translation. In: Baker, M. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 57–60.
- Witte, H. 1996. Contrastive Culture Learning in Translator Training. In: Dollerup, C., Appel, V. (eds.) 73–81.
- Wright, S. E., Wright, L. (eds.) 1993. *Scientific and Technical Translation*. ATA Scholarly Monograph Series VI. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wright, S. E., Budin, G. 1994. *Handbook of Terminology Management*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Yermolovich, V. I. 1978. K voprosu ob odnovermennosti slushaniya i govoreniya v protsesse sinhronnovo perevoda. *Tetradi perevodchika* Vol. 15. 82–93.
- Yermolovich, D. 1997. Informational Approach to Translation Courses/Textbooks. In: Klaudy, K., Kohn, J. (eds.) 398–405.
- Zalán, P. 1990. Zur Problematik von Normen und Übersetzen. In: Arntz, R., Thome, G. (hrsg.) *Übersetzungswissenschaft, Ergebnisse und Perspektiven: Festschrift für Wolfram Wills zum 65 Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Narr. 55–58.
- Zalán, P. 1997. *Német fordítóiskola*. (School for German Translation.) Budapest: Corvina.
- Zimnyaya, I. 1993. A Psychological Analysis of Translation as a Type of Speech Activity. In: Zlateva (ed.) 87–101.
- Zlateva, P. (ed., tr.) 1993. *Translation as Social Action. Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Sources

English–Hungarian (1–50)*

- Austen, J. 1985. *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Austen, J. 1975. *Büszkeség és balítélet*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szenczi Miklós.
- Barth, J. 1969. *The End of the Road*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Barth, J. 1977. *Az út vége*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Tellér Gyula.
- Brontë, Ch. 1991. *Jane Eyre*. London: Tiger Books International.
- Brontë, Ch. 1984. *Jane Eyre*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Ruzitska Mária.
- Brontë, E. 1988. *Wuthering Heights*. OUP.
- Brontë, E. 1975. *Üvöltő szelek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Sótér István.
- Brontë, E. 1993. *Üvöltő szelek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Borbás Mária.
- Carroll, L. 1954. *Alice in Wonderland*. London: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd.
- Carroll, L. 1974. *Alice csodaországban*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Kosztolányi Dezső.
- Carroll, L. 1963. *Through the Looking Glass*. London: Penguin Books.
- Carroll, L. 1974. *Alice tükörországban*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Révbíró Tamás.
- Christie, A. 1976. *Ten Little Niggers*. London: Fontana Books.
- Christie, A. 1968. *Tíz kicsi néger*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szigyártó László.
- Christie, A. 1988. *Philomel Cottage*. Bp: Európa.
- Christie, A. 1988. *Fülemüle-villa*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Borbás Mária.
- Dahl, R. 1961. *Parson's Pleasure*. Short Stories. Bp: Corvina.
- Dahl, R. 1961. *Jámbor örömök*. Elbeszélések. Bp.: Corvina. Translated by Borbás Mária.
- Dickens, Ch. 1975. *A Christmas Carol*. Bp: Corvina.
- Dickens, Ch. 1975. *Karácsonyi ének*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Benedek Marcell.
- Dickens, Ch. 1992. *Oliver Twist*. London: Wordsworth Classics.
- Dickens, Ch. 1975. *Twist Oliver*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Bálint György.
- Doctorow, E.L. 1985. *Ragtime*. London: Picador (Pan Books).
- Doctorow, E.L. 1985. *Ragtime*. Bp: Árkádia. Translated by Göncz Árpád.
- Durrell, G. 1963. *My Family and Other Animals*. London: Penguin Books.
- Durrell, G. 1966. *Családom és egyéb állatfajták*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Sárközi Györgyné.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. 1986. *The Great Gatsby*. Penguin Books.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. 1985. *A nagy Gatsby*. Amerikai elbeszélők. Bp: Európa. Translated by Máthé Elek.
- Greene, G. 1972. *Collected Stories*. London: The Bodley Head.
- Greene, G. 1974. *Az utolsó lehetőség*. Válogatott elbeszélések. Bp: Európa. Translated by Borbás Mária, Halápy Lili, Kéry László, Osztoivits Levente, Örkény István, Prekop Gabriella, Sükösd Mihály, Szobotka Tibor, Takács Ferenc, Török Gábor.
- Greene, G. 1979. *The Human Factor*. New York: Avon Books.
- Greene, G. 1980. *Az emberi tényező*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Ungvári Tamás.
- Greene, G. 1968. *A Gun for Sale*. London: Penguin Books.

* In the IE → Hungarian direction the names of Hungarian translators will be given according to the Hungarian word order: family name will precede the given name.

- Greene, G. 1982. *Regények (Merénylet, Utazások nagynénemmel, A tiszteletbeli konzul.)* Bp: Európa. Translated by Birkás Endre, Udvarhelyi Hanna, Ungvári Tamás.
- Heller, J. 1964. *Catch 22*. London: Corgi Books.
- Heller, J. 1977. *A 22-es csapdája*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Papp Zoltán.
- Hemingway, E. 1987. *The End of Something. Selected stories*. Bp: Európa.
- Hemingway, E. 1987. *Válami véget ér. Válogatott elbeszélések*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szász Imre, Róna Ilona, Réz Ádám, Ottlik Géza.
- Hughes, L. 1958. *On Friday Morning*. Bp: Terra.
- Hughes, L. 1958. *Egy péntek délelőtt*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Máthé Elek.
- James, H. 1963. *The Portrait of a Lady*. New York: The New American Library Inc.
- James, H. 1972. *Egy hölgy arcképe*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Balabán Péter.
- Joyce, J. 1992. *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics.
- Joyce, J. 1977. *Ifjúkori önarckép*. Bukarest: Kritérion. Translated by Szobotka Tibor.
- Kerouac, J. 1955. *On the Road*. London: Penguin Books.
- Kerouac, J. 1983. *Úton*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bartos Tibor.
- Kerouac, J. 1970. *Úton*. Bukarest: Kritérion. Translated by Déry György.
- Koestler, A. 1940. *Darkness at Noon*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Koestler, A. 1988. *Sötétség délben*. Bp: Európa-Reform. Translated by Bart István.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1933. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Paris: Pegazus.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1983. *Lady Chatterley szeretője*. Budapest: Magvető. Translated by Falvay Mihály.
- Lawrence, D.H. 1957. *Sons and Lovers*. London: Duckworth and Co.
- Lawrence, D.H. 1968. *Szülők és szeretők*. Bp: Árkádia. Translated by Róna Ilona.
- Malamud, B. 1971. *The Assistant*. London: Penguin Book Ltd.
- Malamud, B. 1981. *A segéd*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Balassa Klára.
- McCarthy, M. 1954. *The Group*. New York: Penguin Books.
- McCarthy, M. 1975. *A csoport*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Dezsényi Katalin.
- McCullers, C. 1978. *The Ballad of the Sad Café*. Bp: Európa.
- McCullers, C. 1978. *A Szomorú Kávéház balladája*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szász Imre.
- Milne, A. A. 1983. *Winnie the Pooh. The House at Pooh Corner*. Moscow: Raduga Publishers.
- Milne, A. A. 1973. *Micimackó. Micimackó kuckója*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Karinthy Frigyes.
- Orwell, G. 1950. *Animal Farm. A Fairy Story*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Orwell, G. 1989. *Állatfarm*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Sziogyártó László.
- Osborne, J. 1990. *Look Back in Anger*. Bp: Európa.
- Osborne, J. 1990. *Dühöngő ifjúság*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Ottlik Géza.
- Rushdie, S. 1981. *Midnight's Children*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Rushdie, S. 1987. *Az éjjél gyermekei*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Falvay Mihály.
- Salinger, J.D. 1951. *The Catcher in the Rye*. London: Hamilton.
- Salinger, J.D. 1964. *Zabhegyező*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gyepes Judit.
- Salinger, J.D. 1991. *Franny and Zooey*. London: Penguin Books.
- Salinger, J.D. 1986. *Franny és Zooey*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Elbert János, Tandori Dezső.
- Swift, J. 1844. *Gulliver's Travels*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz.
- Swift, J. 1974. *Gulliver utazásai Lilliputban*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Karinthy Frigyes.
- Swift, J. 1979. *Gulliver utazásai*. Bp: Magyar Helikon. Translated by Szentkuthy Miklós.
- Thackeray, W. M. 1992. *Vanity Fair*. London: Wordsworth Classics.
- Thackeray, W. M. 1970. *Hüség vására*. Bukarest: Kritérion. Translated by Vas István.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. 1983. *The Lord of the Rings*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. 1990. *A gyűrűk ura*. Bp: Árkádia. Translated by Göncz Árpád.
- Townsend, S. 1982. *The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole aged 13 3/4*. London: Methuen.
- Townsend, S. 1986. *A 13 és 3/4 éves Adrian Mole titkos naplója*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Békés Pál.

- Twain, M. 1958. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Twain, M. 1982. *Huckleberry Finn kalandjai*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Koroknay István and Karinthy Frigyes.
- Updike, J. (1) 1972. *Rabbit Redux*. London: Penguin Books.
- Updike, J. (1) 1988. *Nyúlketrec*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Göncz Árpád.
- Updike, J. (2) 1986. *Roger's Version*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Updike, J. (2) 1989. *Igy látja Roger*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Göncz Árpád.
- Vonnegut, K. 1978. *Slapstick or Lonesome no More!* London: Granada Publishing (Panther Books).
- Vonnegut, K. 1981. *Börleszk, avagy nincs többé magány*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Borbás Mária.
- Vonnegut, K. 1965. *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*. London: Triad and Panther Books.
- Vonnegut, K. 1978. *Áldja meg az isten, Mr. Rosewater*. Bp: Európa. F: Szilágyi Tibor.
- Wilde, O. 1954. *The Happy Prince. Lord Arthur Savile's Crime and Other Stories*. London: Penguin Books.
- Wilde, O. 1987. *A boldog herceg. Dorian Gray arképe*. Mesék, elbeszélések. Bp: Európa. Translated by Lengyel Balázs.
- Wilde, O. 1980. *The Canterville Ghost*. London: Octopus Books.
- Wilde, O. 1987. *A Canterville-i kísértet*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Timár Judit.
- Wilder, Th. 1927. *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*. New York: Time Incorporated.
- Wilder, Th. 1977. *Szent Lajos király hídjá*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kosztolányi Dezső.
- West, N. 1983. *Miss Lonelyhearts. The Day of the Locust and other novels*. London: Heinemann.
- West, N. 1963. *Törtszívű kisasszony*. Mai amerikai elbeszélők. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bartos Tibor.
- Wolfe, T. 1988. *The Bonfire of the Vanities*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Wolfe, T. 1991. *Hiúságok máglyája*. Bp: Magvető Könyvkiadó. Translated by Fencsik Flóra.

Hungarian-English (1-25)

- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Történelmi séták*. Bp: Corvina.
- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. A City Set in Time*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Gerard Gorman.
- Csáth Géza 1973. *Apa és fii*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Csáth Géza 1983. *Opium and Other Stories*. New York: Penguin Books. Translated by Jascha Kessler, Charlotte Rogers.
- Déry Tibor 1975. *Szerelem*. Theokritosz Újpesten. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Déry Tibor 1992. *Love*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by E. Birney.
- Esterházy Péter 1983. *Fuhasok*. Bp: Magvető.
- Esterházy Péter 1991. *The Transporters. A Hungarian Quartet, Four Contemporary Short Novels*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Ferenc Takács.
- Esterházy Péter 1990. *Hrabal könyve*. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.
- Esterházy Péter 1993. *The Book of Hrabal*. London: Quartet Books. Translated by Sollosy Judy.
- Eszterházy Péter 1985. *A szív segédigéi*. Bp: Magvető Kiadó.
- Eszterházy Péter 1985. *Helping Verbs of the Heart*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Michael Henry Heim.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1944. *Egri Csillagok*. Bp: Dante Könyvkiadó.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1991. *Eclipse of the Crescent Moon*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by George F. Cushing.
- Karinthy Frigyes 1977. *Utazás a koponyám körül*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Karinthy Frigyes 1992. *A Journey Round My Skull*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Vernon Duckworth Barker.

- Kosztolányi Dezső 1942. *Nero a véres költő*. Bp: Révai.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1990. *Darker Muses*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Clifton P. Fadiman, revised by George Szirtes.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1985. *Omelette à Woburn*. Válogatott novellák és karmolatok. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1993. *Omelette à Woburn. The Kiss*. 20th Century Hungarian Short Stories. 80–87. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Zsuzsanna Horn.
- Krúdy Gyula 1994. *Szindbád őszi útja*. A magyar próza klasszikusai. Bp: Unikornis.
- Krúdy Gyula 1993. *Sindbad's Autumn Journey*. Bp: Kossuth. Translated by E. Molnár.
- Krúdy Gyula 1977. *Utolsó szivar az Arabszürkénél*. In: Magyar Elbeszélők. 20. század. I. 546–569. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1979. *The Last Cigar at the Grey Arab*. In: 44 Hungarian Short Stories. 41–68. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Patricia Bozsó.
- Lengyel József 1966. *Hidépítők*. Lengyel József Összegyűjtött Munkái. II. kötet. 545–749. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Lengyel József 1971. *The Bridge Builders*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Judit Házi.
- Mándy Iván 1967. *Apával moziban. Régi idők mozija*. Bp: Magvető.
- Mándy Iván 1993. *At the Movies with Father*. In: The Kiss. 20th Century Hungarian Short Stories. 193–210. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Albert Tezla.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1957. *Beszterce ostroma*. Bp: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1982. *The Siege of Beszterce*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Dick Sturges.
- Moldova György 1971. *Sötét angyal*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Moldova György 1967. *Dark Angel*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by U. McLean.
- Molnár Ferenc 1987. *A Pál utcai fiúk*. Bp: Móra.
- Molnár Ferenc 1994. *The Paul Street Boys*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by L. Rittenberg.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1977. *Válogatott elbeszélések*. Bp: Móra.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1988. *Seven Pennies and other short stories*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by George F. Cushing.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1974. *Barbárok*. Elbeszélések III. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1979. *Brutes*. In: 44 Hungarian Short Stories. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Gyula Gulyás.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1966. *Rokonok*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1997. *Relations*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Bernard Adams.
- Németh László 1961. *Bűn*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Németh László 1966. *Guilt*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Gyula Gulyás.
- Örkény István (1) 1968. *Egyperces novellák*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (2) 1967. *Nászutasok a légyapíron. Tóték*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (3) 1968. *Jeruzsálem hercegnője*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Örkény István (1) 1994. *One-minute Stories*. Bp: Kossuth. Translated by László, András T. R. C. Erickson.
- Örkény István (2) 1994. *One Minute Stories*. Sydney: Brandl and Schlesinger. Translated by Sollosy Judy.
- Polcz Alaine 1991. *Asszony a fronton*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Polcz Alaine 1998. *A Wartime Memoir*. Hungary 1944–1945. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Albert Tezla.
- Rejtő Jenő (P. Howard) 1989. *A tizennégy karátos autó*. Bp: Magvető.
- Howard, P. 1967. *The 14 Carat Roadster*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Patricia Bozsó.
- Sarkadi Imre 1966. *A szökevény*. Drámák, Kisregények I–II. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Sarkadi Imre 1967. *The Coward and Other Stories*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Barbara I. Scott, József Hatvany, András Feldmár.

French-Hungarian (1–50)

- Ajar, É. 1975. *La vie devant soi*. Paris: Mercure de France.
- Ajar, É. 1980. *Előttem az élet*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bognár Róbert.
- Balzac, H. 1989. *Eugénie Grandet*. Paris: Presses Pocket.
- Balzac, H. 1976. *Eugénie Grandet*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bognár Róbert and Szávai Nándor.
- Barthes, R. 1972 (1953) *Le degré zéro de l'écriture*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Barthes, R. Az írás null foka. In: *A szöveg öröme*. Bp: Osiris. Translated by Romhányi Török Gábor.
- Boulanger, D. 1973. *Service dangereux*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Boulanger, D. 1973. *Vészélyes szívesség*. Bp: Széphalom Könyvműhely. Translated by Bárdos Miklós.
- Camus, A. 1987. *La chute*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Camus, A. 1962. *A bukás*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Szávai Nándor.
- Camus, A. 1947. *La peste*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Camus, A. 1983. *A pestis*. Regények és elbeszélések. Bp: Európa. Translated by Győri János.
- Camus, A. 1957. *L'exil et le royaume*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Camus, A. 1969. *A száműzetés és az ország*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Antal László, Benyhe János, Szávai Nándor.
- Céline, L-F. 1982. *Voyage au bout de la nuit*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Céline, L-F. 1977. *Utazás az éjszaka mélyére*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Szávai János.
- Charrière, H. 1969. *Papillon*. Paris: Laffont.
- Charrière, H. 1993. *Pillangó*. Bp: Háttér Kiadó. Translated by Kamocsay Ildikó.
- Cocteau, J. 1989. *Les enfants terribles*. Paris: Bernard Grasset.
- Cocteau, J. 1985. *Vásott kölykök*. Bp: Európa: Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Cocteau, J. 1996. *Les enfants terribles*. Bp: Noran.
- Cocteau, J. 1996. *Vásott kölykök*. Bp: Noran. Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Cocteau, J. 1923. *Le grand écart*. Paris: Éditions Stock
- Cocteau, J. 1991. *A nagy mutatvány*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Pór Judit.
- Diderot, D. 1975-1977. *Oeuvres complètes*. XI. Paris: Éd. Hermann.
- Diderot, D. 1984. *Fecsegő csecsebecsék. Az apáca*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Máthé Klára.
- Dumas, A. 1995. *Les Trois Mousquetaires*. Série "Le livre Poche" Paris: Librairie Générale Française.
- Dumas, A. 1969. *A három testőr*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Csatlós János.
- Duras, M. 1987. *L'amant*. Paris: France Loisirs.
- Duras, M. 1987. *A szerető*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Ádám Péter.
- Duras, M. 1967. *L'Amante anglaise*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Duras, M. 1969. *Oroszlánszáj*. Bp: Európa Translated by Farkas Márta.
- Flaubert, G. 1930: *Madame Bovary*. Paris: Fasquelle Éditeurs.
- Flaubert, G. 1984. *Bovaryné*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Flaubert, G. 1993. *Bovaryné*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Pór Judit.
- Flaubert, G. 1983. *L'Éducation sentimentale*. Paris: Librairie Générale Française.
- Flaubert, G. 1960. *Érzelmek iskolája*. Bp: Magyar Helikon. Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Gide, A. 1925. *Les faux-monnayeurs*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Gide, A. 1966. *A pénzhamisítók*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Réz Pál.
- Makine, A. 1995. *Le testament français*. Paris: Mercure de France.
- Makine, A. 1996. *Francia hagyaték*. Bp: Ab Ovo. Translated by Szoboszlai Margit.
- Malraux, A. 1947. *La condition humaine*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Malraux, A. 1969. *Az ember sorsa*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Réz Pál.
- Maupassant, G. de 1904. *Les Soeurs Rondoli*. Oeuvres complètes illustrées. Paris: Société d'éditions littéraires et artistiques.

- Maupassant, G. de 1980. *A Rondoli nővérek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Illés Endre.
- Maupassant, G. de 1984. *Boule de suif*. Paris: Livre de poche.
- Maupassant, G. de 1979. *Gömböc*. Elbeszélések I–IV. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kosztolányi Dezső.
- Maupassant, G. de 1975. *Histoire Corse*. Bp: Európa.
- Maupassant, G. de 1975. *Korszakai történet*. Bp: Európa. T: Benyhe János és Pór Judit.
- Maupassant, G. de 1996. *Une aventure parisienne*. Bp: Noran.
- Maupassant, G. de 1996. *Párizsi kaland*. Bp: Noran. Translated by Illés Endre, Lányi Viktor and Tóth Árpád.
- Maupassant, G. de 1958. *Pierre et Jean*. Bp: Corvina.
- Maupassant, G. de 1958. *Péter és János*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Justus Pál.
- Mauriac, F. 1970. *Le sagouin*. Paris: Edition Plon.
- Mauriac, F. 1970. *A kis idélen*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Pór Judit.
- Mauriac, F. 1933. *Le noeud de vipères*. Montrouge: Bernard Grasset.
- Mauriac, F. 1965. *Víperafészek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Benedek Marcell.
- Mauriac, F. 1989. *Thérèse Desqueyroux*. Paris: Éditions Livre de Poche.
- Mauriac, F. 1976. *Thérèse Desqueyroux*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Brodszky Erzsébet.
- Merle, R. 1949. *Week-end à Zuydcoote*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Merke, R. 1975. *Két nap az élet*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gera György.
- Mérimée, P. 1976. *Le vase étrusque*. Bp: Európa.
- Mérimée, P. 1976. *Az etruszk váza*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Réz Ádám.
- Nerval, G. 1980. *Sylvie*. Bp: Európa.
- Nerval, G. 1980. *Sylvie*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Brodszky Erzsébet.
- Proust, M. 1954. *À la recherche du temps perdu. I. Du cote de chez Swann*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Proust, M. 1983. *Az eltűnt idő nyomában. I. Swann*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Queneau, R. 1947. *Exercices de style*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Queneau, R. 1998. *Stílusgyakorlatok*. Bp: Noran. Translated by Bognár Róbert.
- Romains, J. 1959. *La charge des autobus*. Bp: Terra.
- Romains, J. 1959. *Az autóbuszok rohama*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Justus Pál.
- Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de 1946. *Le petit prince*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de 1973. *A kis herceg*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Rónay György.
- Schwarz-Bart, A. 1959. *Le dernier des justes*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil.
- Schwarz-Bart, A. 1994. *Igazak ivadéka*. Bp: Dunakönyv Kiadó. Translated by Justus Pál.
- Semprun, J. 1966. *La guerre est finie*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Semprun, J. 1969. *A háborúnak vége*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Rayman Katalin.
- Semprun, J. 1965. *Le grand voyage*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Semprun, J. 1974. *A nagy utazás*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Réz Pál.
- Standhal 1959. *La chartreuse de Parme*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Standhal 1976. *A páрмаi kolostor*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Illés Endre.
- Tournier, M. 1980. *Gaspard, Melchior & Balthasar*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Tournier, M. 1989. *Gáspár, Menyhért, Boldozsár*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Szabolcs Katalin.
- Vercors 1951. *Le silence de la mer et autres récits*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Vercors 1980. *A tenger csendje és más kisregények*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Rubin Péter.
- Vercors 1958. *L'Impuissance*. Bp: Terra.
- Vercors 1958. *Tehetelenség*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Balázs György.
- Vercors 1958. *Ce jour-là*. Bp: Terra.
- Vercors 1958. *Azon a napon*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Balázs György.
- Verne, J. 1982. *Le Château des Carpathes*. Paris. Librairie Générale Française.
- Verne, J. 1974. *Várkastély a Kárpátokban*. Bp: Móra. Translated by Gellért György.
- Vian, B. 1963. *L'écume des jours*. Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert.

- Vian, B. 1969. *Tajtékos napok*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bajomi Lázár Endre.
- Voltaire, F. 1940. *Candide ou l'optimisme*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Voltaire, F. 1997. *Candide vagy az optimizmus*. Bp: Noran. Translated by Gyergyai Albert.
- Weil, S. 1962. *Pensées sans ordre concernant l'amour de Dieu*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Weil, S. 1998. *Rendszertelen gondolatok Isten szeretetéről*. Bp: Vigilia. Translated by Pilinszky János.
- Zola, E. 1993. *Germinal*. Paris: Booking International.
- Zola, E. 1959. *Germinal*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bartócz Ilona.
- Zola, E. 1994. *Au Bonheur des Dames*. Paris: Maxi-Poche.
- Zola, E. 1978. *Hölgyek öröme*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Benedek Marcell.

Hungarian–French (1–25)

- Babits Mihály n.a. *Gólyakalifa*. Bp: Athanaeum.
- Babits, Mihály 1992. *Calife-cigogne*. Ozoir-la-Ferriere: Éditions In Fine. Translated by Laurence Leully and Tamás Szende.
- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Történelmi séták*. Bp: Corvina.
- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Promenade dans le temps*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Judit Chéhádé.
- Bodor Ádám 1993. *A részleg*. Jelenkor Antológia. Pécs: Jelenkor.
- Bodor Ádám 1996. *La section*. In: Szende T. (ed.) *Auteurs hongrois d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Éditions In Fine and Bp: Corvina. Translated by Émilie Molnos.
- Déry Tibor 1967. *Szerelem*. In: Thekritosz Újpesten. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó. 282–295.
- Déry Tibor 1996. *Amour*. In: *Amour. Nouvelles Hongroises du XXe siècle*. Bp: Corvina. 124–137. Translated by Imre Kelemen.
- Esterházy Péter 1990. *Hrabal könyve*. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.
- Esterházy Péter 1994. *Le livre de Hrabal*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard. Translated by Agnès Kahane.
- Gelléri Andor Endre 1932. *Nagymosás*. Bp: Nyugat.
- Gelléri Andor Endre 1963. *La Grande Blanchisserie*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by George Kassai.
- Karinthy Frigyes 1967. *Tanár úr kérem*. Följelentem az emberiséget. I. kötet 21–87. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Karinthy Frigyes 1992. *M'sieur*. Collection Domaine Hongrois. Ozoir-la-Ferriere: Éditions In Fine. Translated by Françoise Gal.
- Karinthy Ferenc 1982. *Budapesti ősz*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Karinthy Ferenc 1992. *Automne à Budapest*. Collection Domaine Hongrois. Ozoir-la-Ferriere: Éditions In Fine. Translated by Judit Karinthy.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1973. *Esti Kornél*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1976. *Le Double*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Péter Komoly, revised by Roger Richard.
- Krúdy Gyula 1973. *Szindbád titka*. *Szindbád*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1986. *Pirouette*. *Roman suivi de deux récits courts*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by François Gachot.
- Krúdy Gyula. 1973. *Aranykéz utcai szép napok*. Bp: Magyar Helikon.
- Krúdy Gyula *Les beaux jours de la rue de la Main-d'Or*. Paris: Éditions In Fine. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Natalie Zarembo-Huzsvai and Charles Zarembo.
- Krúdy Gyula 1959. *Az útitárs*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1986. *Pirouette*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Francois Gachot.
- Krúdy Gyula 1977. *Utolsó szivar az Arabs Szürkénél*. In: Magyar Elbeszélők. 20. század. I. 546–569. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.

- Krúdy Gyula 1996. *Le dernier cigare au Coursier Arabe*. In: Amour. Nouvelles Hongroises du XXe siècle. Bp: Corvina. 58–79. Translated by Péter Komoly.
- Madách Imre. 1960. Az ember tragédiája. Magyar Helikon.
- Madách Imre 1966. *La tragédie de l'homme*. Bp: Corvina Translated by Jean Rousselot.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1975. *Különös házasság*. Magyar Remekírók. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Mikszáth, Kálmán 1967. *Un étrange mariage*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Hubert Montarier.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1979. *A Noszty fiú esete Tóth Marival*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1977. *L'histoire du jeune Noszty avec la Marie Toth*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by József Körössy (revue par Anne-Marie de Backer).
- Móricz Zsigmond 1982. *Légy jó mindhalálig*. Bp: Móra.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1993. *Sois bon jusqu'à la mort*. Collection Domaine Hongrois. Ozoir-la-Ferriere: Éditions In Fine. Bp: Corvina. Translated by László Gara and Jean Rousselot.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1976. *Rokonok*. In: Móricz Zsigmond művei. Regények I–VII. III. kötet. Bp. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Móricz Zsigmond s.a. *La famille* Paris: Éditions Pierre Horay, Bp: Corvina. Translated by Georges Kassai.
- Németh László 1961. *A gyász*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Németh László 1993. *Le destin de Sophie Kurátor*. Collection Domaine Hongrois. Ozoir-la-Ferriere: Éditions In Fine. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Chantal Philippe.
- Ottlik Géza 1988. *Iskola a határon*. Bp: Móra.
- Ottlik Géza 1964. *Une école à la frontière*. Paris: Édition du Seuil. Translated by László Gara, Georges Kassai and Georges Spitzer revised by Paul de Rotalier.
- Örkény István (1) 1968. *Egyperces novellák*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (2) 1967. *Nászutasok a légyapíron. Tóték*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (3) 1968. *Jeruzsálem hercegnője*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Örkény István (4) 1997. *Minimythosok. Válogatott egypercesek*. Bp: Palatinus.
- Örkény István (1) 1970. *Minimythos*. Textes choisis et adaptés du hongrois par Tibor Tardos. Paris: Édition Gallimard.
- Örkény István (2) 1997. *Minimythos. Textes choisis*. Bp: Palatinus. Translated by Tibor Tardos.
- Örkény István (3) 2001. *Minimythos. Textes choisis et adaptés du hongrois par Tibor Tardos*. Bp: Corvina.
- Örkény István 1978. *La famille Tót*. Paris-Bp: Domaine Hongrois/Éditions In Fine-Corvina. Translated by Natalie Zarembo-Huzsvai, Charles Zarembo.
- Papp Károly 1937. *Azarel*. Bp: Nyugat.
- Papp Károly 1974. *L'enfant Azarel*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Frédérique Kaczander and Agnès Kahane.
- Sarkadi Imre 1966. *A gyáva*. In: A szökevény I-II/ I. Drámák, Kisregények. Bp. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Sarkadi Imre 1966. *Lâcheté et autre recits*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by László Gara and Françoise Perdoux.

German–Hungarian (1–50)

- Bachman, I. 1961. *Alles. Erzählungen*. München: Piper Verlag.
- Bachman, I. 1983. *Mindent*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Lukács Katalin.
- Böll, H. 1965. *Die Waage der Baleks*. Als der Krieg ausbrach. Erzählungen. München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag.
- Böll, H. 1965. *A Balke-család mérlege*. Doktor Murke összegyűjtött hallgatásai. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Rayman Katalin.
- Böll, H. 1967. *Wanderer, kommst du nach Spa...* Erzählungen. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

- Böll, H. 1986. *És lön este reggel*. Válogatott elbeszélések. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bor Ambrus, Raymann Katalin.
- Böll, H. 1967. *Ansichten eines Clowns. Und sagte kein einziges Wort*. Zwei Romane. Köln: Verlag Kiepenheuer und Witsch.
- Böll, H. 1980. *És száját nem nyitotta szóra*. Kisregények. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gergely Erzsébet.
- Böll, H. 1974. *Billiard um halb zehn*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Böll, H. 1987. *Biliárd fél tízkor*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Doromby Károly.
- Brecht, B. 1967. *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Gesammelte Werke 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Brecht, B. 1985. *Koldusopera*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Vas István.
- Canetti, E. 1985. *Die Blendung*. München-Wien: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Canetti, E. 1985. *Káprázat*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Sárközy Elga.
- Dürrenmatt, F. 1971. *Der Richter und sein Henker*. Leipzig: Verlag Philip Reclam jun.
- Dürrenmatt, F. 1979. *A bíró és a hóhér. Az ígétet*. Három kisregény. Bp: Európa. Translated by Ungvári Tamás.
- Frank, A. 1986. *Das Tagebuch der Anne Frank*. Berlin: Kinderbuch Verlag.
- Frank, A. 1962. *Anna Frank Naplója*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Solti Erzsébet, Sebők Éva.
- Freud, S. 1905. *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten*. In: Gesammelte Werke VI. London: Imago.
- Freud, S. 1982. *A vicc és viszonya a tudattalanhoz*. In: Sigmund Freud esszék. Bp: Gondolat. Translated by Bart István.
- Frisch, M. 1961. *Andorra*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Frisch, M. 1978. *Drámák*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Rónay György
- Feuchtwanger, L. 1982. *Die Häßliche Herzogin Margarete*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Feuchtwanger, L. 1967. *A csúnya hercegnő*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Dormándy László.
- Fühmann, F. 1974. *Zweiundzwanzig Tage oder die Hälfte des Lebens*. Rostock: Hinstorff Verlag.
- Fühmann, F. 1976. *Huszonkét nap, vagy az élet útjának fele*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kálász Márton.
- Goethe, J.W. 1959. *Die Wette*. Bp: Terra.
- Goethe, J.W. 1959. *A fogadás*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Thurzó Gábor.
- Goethe, J.W. 1954. *Faust. I. Gesamtausgabe*. Leipzig: Insel Verlag.
- Goethe, J.W. 1979. *Faust. Első rész*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Jékely Zoltán.
- Grass, G. 1999. *Hundejahre*. München: Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Grass, G. 2001. *Kutyaévek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Schein Gábor, Magyar István.
- Grimm J. und W. 1988. *Berühmte Märchen*. Hamburg: Cecilie Dressler Verlag.
- Grimm J. und W. 1996. *Híres mesék*. Bp: Noran. Translated by Kincses Edit.
- Grün von der, M. 1981. *Flächenbrand*. Berlin-Weimar: Aufbau Verlag.
- Grün von der, M. 1983. *Kísértetek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bognár József.
- Hesse, H. 1975. *Siddhartha. Eine indische Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Hesse, H. 1994. *Sziddhárta. Hindu rege*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kászonyi Ágota.
- Hesse, H. 1972. *Der Steppenwolf: und unbekannte Texte aus dem Umkreis des „Steppenwolf“*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hesse, H. 1987. *A pusztai farkas*. Bp: Balassi. Translated by Horváth Géza.
- Hesse, H. 1975. *Narziss und Goldmund*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Hesse, H. 1996. *Narziss és Goldmund*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gáli József.
- Hochmuth, R. 1983. *Eine Liebe in Deutschland*. Hamburg: Rohwolt Verlag.
- Hochmuth, R. 1985. *Egy szerelem Németországban*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Jávör Ottó.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1957. *Rat Krespel*. Bp: Terra.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1957. *Krespel tanácsos*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Karig Sára.

- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1969. *Das Fräulein von Scuderi*. Stuttgart: Verlag Philipp Reclam jun.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1987. *Scuderi kisasszony*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó. Translated by Gergely Erzsébet.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1958. *Ritter Gluck*. Bp: Terra.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. 1958. *Gluck lovag*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Keresztúry Dezső.
- Hoffmannstahl, H. von 1979. Lucidor, Figuren zu einer unbeschriebenen Komödie. In: *Erzählungen, erfundene Gespräche und Briefe, Reisen*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag.
- Hoffmannstahl, H. von 1990. Lucidor, alakok egy megíratlan komédiához. In: *Német elbeszélők 1900–1945*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kurdi Imre.
- Kafka, F. 1952. *In der Strafkolonie*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei KG.
- Kafka, F. 1970. *A fegyencgyarmaton*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Györfly Miklós.
- Kafka, F. 1960. *Der Prozess*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei KG.
- Kafka, F. 1986. *A per*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szabó Ede.
- Kafka, F. 1979. *Der Hungerkünstler*. Erzählungen. Leipzig: Verlag Philipp Reclam jun.
- Kafka, F. 1973. *Az éhezőművész*. Elbeszélések. Bp: Európa. Translated by Tandori Dezső.
- Kafka, F. 1990. *Der Heizer*. Bp: Európa.
- Kafka, F. 1990. *A fűtő*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Tandori Dezső.
- Kafka, F. 1990. *Die Verwandlung*. Bp: Európa.
- Kafka, F. 1990. *Az átváltozás*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Györfly Miklós.
- Kant, H. 1965. *Die Aula*. Berlin: Rütten und Loening.
- Kant, H. 1979. *Az aula*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Mátrai Erika.
- Kästner, E. 1980. *Drei Männer im Schnee*. Zürich: Rascher Verlag.
- Kästner, E. 1984. *Három ember a hóban*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Horváth Zoltán.
- Keller, G. 1947. *Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.
- Keller, G. 1956. *Falusi Rómeo és Júlia és más elbeszélések*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó. Translated by Orlík Géza.
- Kleist, H. von 1958. *Das Erdbeben in Chili*. Bp: Terra.
- Kleist, H. von 1958. *A chilei földrengés*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Szabó Ede.
- Lenz, S. 1981. *Der Verlust*. Hamburg: Deutschen Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Lenz, S. 1983. *A veszteség*. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó. Translated by Bor Ambrus.
- Mann, H. 1958. *Fulvia*. Bp: Terra.
- Mann, H. 1958. *Fulvia*. Bp: Terra. Translated by Szolcsányi Ferenc.
- Mann, T. (1) 1975. *Tonio Kröger*. Bp: Európa.
- Mann, T. (1) 1975. *Tonio Kröger*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Lányi Viktor.
- Mann, T. (2) 1954. *Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull*. Fischer Verlag.
- Mann, T. (2) 1973. *Egy szélhámos vallomásai*. Bucharest: Kriterion. Translated by Lányi Viktor.
- Mann, T. (3) 1974. *Buddenbrooks. Verfall einer Familie*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag.
- Mann, T. (3) 1975. *A Buddenbrook ház*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Lányi Viktor.
- Mann, T: 1962. *Mario und der Zauberer*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag
- Mann, T: 1990. *Márió és a varázsló*. Német elbeszélők. Bp: Európa. Translated by Sárközi György.
- Mann, T: 1977. *Doktor Faustus*. Das Leben des deutschen Tonsetzers Adrian Leverkühn, erzählt von einem Freunde. Frankfurt am Main: Deutsche Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Mann, T: 1977. *Doktor Faustus*. Adrian Leverkühn német zenszerző élete, elmondja egy barátja. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szöllősy Klára.
- Mörike, E. 1979. *Mozart auf der Reise nach Prag*. Bp: Európa.
- Mörike, E. 1979. *Mozart prágai utazása*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Lengyel Balázs.
- Roth, J. 1986. *Radetzky-marsch*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Roth, J. 1982. *Radetzky-induló*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Boldizsár Iván.
- Schiller, F. 1981. *Werke in fünf Bänden*. Berlin und Weimar: Aufbau Verlag.

- Schiller, F. Drámák. *Ármány és szerelem*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Vas István.
- Seghers, A. 1958. *Aufstand der Fischer von St. Barbara*. Bp: Corvina.
- Seghers, A. 1958. *A Sankt Barbarai halászok felkelése*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Horváth Zoltán.
- Seghers, A. 1970. *Das siebte Kreuz*. Leipzig: Verlag Philip Reclam jun.
- Seghers, A. 1979. *A hetedik kereszt*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Thury Zsuzsa.
- Simmel, J.M. 1960. *Es muss nicht immer Kaviar sein*. Zürich: Schweizer Druck-und Verlagshaus.
- Simmel, J.M. 1993. *Nem kell mindig kaviár*. Bp: Magyar Könyvklub. Translated by Horváth Géza.
- Süskind, P. 1985. *Das Parfüm – Geschichte eines Mörders*. Zürich: Diogenés Verlag.
- Süskind, P. 1988. *A parfüm – egy gyilkos története*. Bp: Árkádia. Translated by Farkas Tünde.
- Zweig, S. 1976. *Schachnovelle*. Bp: Európa.
- Zweig, S. 1976. *Sakknovella*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Fónagy Iván.

Hungarian–German (1–25)

- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Történelmi séták*. Bp: Corvina.
- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Die Stadt im Spiegel der Zeit*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Liane Dira.
- Bodor Ádám 1993. *A részleg*. Jelenkor Antológia. Pécs: Jelenkor.
- Bodor Ádám 1993. *Die Aussenstelle*. Anthologie der Zeitschrift Jelenkor. Pécs: Jelenkor. Translated by Hans Skirecki.
- Déry Tibor 1979. *Szerelem*. In: Niki és más történetek. Bp: Móra.
- Déry Tibor 1967. *Liebe*. Bp: Kossuth. Translated by Ivan Nagel.
- Eszterházy Péter 1982. *Ki szavatol a lady biztonságáért?* Bp: Magvető.
- Eszterházy Péter 1989. *Wer haftet für die Sicherheit der Lady?* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag. Translated by Hans-Henning Paetzke.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1940. *Egri Csillagok*. Bp: Dante Könyvkiadó.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1967. *Sterne von Eger*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Mirza Schüching.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1993. *A láthatatlan ember*. Bp: Pán Könyvkiadó.
- Gárdonyi Géza 1987. *Ich war den Hunnen untertan*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Heinrich Weissling.
- Háy János 1996. *Dzsigerdülen. A szív gyönyörűsége*. Bp: Pesti Szalon Könyvkiadó.
- Háy János 1999. *Dschigerdülen. Die Schönheit des Herzens*. Bp: Palatinus Verlag. Translated by Verena Seidler.
- Jókai Mór 1981. *Az arany ember*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Jókai Mór 1964. *Ein Goldmensch*. Translated by Károly Kertbeny, revised by Henriette Schade-Engl.
- Konrád György 1995. *A látogató*. Budapest: Pesti Szalon Könyvkiadó.
- Konrád György 1991. *Der Besucher*. Hamburg-Zürich: Luchterhand Literaturverlag. Translated by Mario Szenessy.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1981. *Esti Kornél*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1986. *Kornél Esti. Schachmatt*. Novellen. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Dorothea Koriath, Jörg Buschmann.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1942. *Nero a véres költő*. Bp: Révai.
- Kosztolányi Dezső 1979. *Nero. Historischer Roman aus der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin: Verlag der Nation. Translated by Stefan J. Klein.
- Krúdy Gyula 1991. *Szindbád őszi útja*. Bp: Unikornis Kiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1993. *Sindbads Herbstreise*. Bp: Kossuth (Holibri). Translated by Franz Meyer.
- Krúdy Gyula 1992. *A vörös postakocsi*. Bp: Editorg Kiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1989. *Die rote Postkutsche*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by György Sebestyén.

- Krúdy Gyula 1977. *Utolsó szivar az Arabs Szürkénél*. In: Magyar Elbeszélők. 20. század. I. 546–569. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Krúdy Gyula 1993. *Die letzte Zigarre im „Arabischen Schimmel“*. In: Liebe. Ungarische Kurzprosa aus dem 20. Jahrhundert. 87–109. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Heinrich Weissling.
- Mándy Iván 1983. *Temetők. Aikelés*. Elbeszélések. Bp: Magvető.
- Mándy Iván 1993. *Friedhöfe*. In: Liebe. Ungarische Kurzprosa aus dem 20. Jahrhundert. Bp: Corvina. 260–273. Translated by Dorothea Koriath.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1957. *Beszterce ostroma*. Bp: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1968. *Der Graf und die Zirkusreiterin*. Berlin: Rütten und Loening. Translated by Mirza Schüching, Géza Engl.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1983. *A beszélő köntös*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1967. *Der sprechende Kaftan*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Erzsébet Székács.
- Moldova György 1971. *Sötét angyal*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Moldova György 1967. *Der dunkle Engel*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Irene Kolbe.
- Molnár Ferenc 1987. *A Pál utcai fiúk*. Bp: Móra.
- Molnár Ferenc 2002. *Die Jungen der Paulstrasse*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Edmund Alkalay.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1973. *Égi madár*. Elbeszélések II. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1993. *Himmelvogel*. In: Liebe. Ungarische Kurzprosa aus dem 20. Jahrhundert. 31–73. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Géza Engl.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1935. *Erdély – Tündérkert*. Bp: Atheneum.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1972. *Zaubergarten*. Berlin: Verlag der Nation. Translated by Käthe Gáspár.
- Örkény István (1) 1968. *Egyperces novellák*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (2) 1967. *Nászutasok a légyapáron. Tóték*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (3) 1968. *Az utolsó vonat*. In: Jeruzsálem hercegnője. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Örkény István (1) 1979 (1984). *Gedanken im Keller. Mini-Novellen*. Berlin: Eulenspiegel Verlag. Translated by Vera Thies.
- Örkény István (2) 1992. *Minuten Novellen*. Bp: Kossuth. Translated by Vera Thies.
- Örkény István (3) 1973. *Der letzte Zug*. Erzählungen. Berlin: Verlag Volk und Welt. Translated by Vera Thies.
- Palotai Boris 1968. *Zöld dió*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Palotai Boris 1972. *Liebe, Lüge und ein Prozess*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Liane Dira.
- Sütő András 1989. *Anyám könnyű álmot ígér*. Bp: Népszava.
- Sütő András 1980. *Mutter verspricht guten Schlaf*. Berlin: Volk und Welt. Translated by Helga Reiter.
- Szabó Magda 1983. *Az öz*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Szabó Magda 1985. *Eszter und Angela*. Berlin-Veimar: Aufbau Verlag. Translated by Vera Thies.
- Szabó Magda 1970. *Abigél*. Bp: Móra.
- Szabó Magda 1978. *Abigail*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Henriette and Géza Engl.

Russian–Hungarian (1–50)

- Aytmatov, Ch. 1981. *I bolshe veka dlitsya den'*. Frunze: Kirgizistan.
- Aytmatov, Ch. 1986. *Az évszázadnál hosszabb ez a nap*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Rab Zsuzsa.
- Babel', I. 1957. *Konarmiya*. Izbrannoe. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Babel, I. 1976. *Lovashadsereg*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Wessely László.
- Baklanov, G. 1981. *Menyshiy sredi brat'ev*. Druzhba Narodov 1981/6.
- Baklanov, G. 1984. *A legkisebb fiú*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kallós Lilla Imola.

- Bikov, V. 1983. *Znak bedi*. Druzhba Narodov. 1983/4.
- Bikov, V. 1986. *Baljós jel*. Bp: Zrínyi. Translated by Soproni András.
- Bogomolov, V. 1974. *V avguste sorok chetvertovo*. Noviy Mir 1974/10–11–12.
- Bogomolov, V. 1976. *Negyvennégy augusztusában*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Fazekas István.
- Bulgakov, M. 1982. *Master i Margarita*. Izbrannoe. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Bulgakov, M. 1970. *Mester és Margarita*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szöllősy Klára.
- Bulgakov, M. 1982. *Morfij. Hanskij ogon'*. Izbrannoye. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Bulgakov, 1981. *Morfium. A kán tüze*. Elbeszélések, tárcák, karcolatok. Bp: Európa. Translated by Elbert János, Sándor László.
- Bulgakov, M. 1988. *Vyuga*. Izbrannoye. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Bulgakov, M. 1989. *Hóvihar*. Kakasmintás törülköző. Elbeszélések, kisregények. Bucharest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó. Translated by Soproni András.
- Bulichov, K. 1975. *Lyudi kak lyudi*. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya.
- Bulicsov, K. 1983. *Kettészakított élet*. Bp: Kozmosz. Translated by Téri Sarolta, Balogh Éva, Solt Lajos, Sölch Ágoston.
- Bunyin, I.A. 1973. *Mitina lyubov'*. Povesti i rasskazi. Petrozavodsk: izd. Kareliya.
- Bunyin, I.A. 1973. *A szerelem szentsége*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gellért György.
- Chekhov, A. P. 1977. *Smert' chinovnika*. Bp: Európa.
- Csehov, A. P. 1977. *A csinovnyik halála*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Rab Zsuzsa.
- Chekhov, A. P. 1971. *Poprigunya. Moya zhizn'. Tri goda. Nevesta*. In: Izbrannie proizvedenie v treh tomah. 2. 127–151., 506–589., 329–412., 3. 229–249. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Csehov, A. P. 1970. *A léha asszony. Életem. Három év. A menyasszony*. Csehov Művei. III. 290–316., 822–919., 637–721., 1213–1232. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szöllősy Klára, Devecseriné Guthy Erzsébet, Lányi Sarolta.
- Dostoyevskiy, F. M. (1) 1982. *Zapiski iz podpolya*. Moscow: Pravda.
- Dosztoyevszkij, F. M. (1) 1975. *Feljegyzések az egérlyukból*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Makai Imre.
- Dostoyevskiy, F. M. *Idiot* (2) 1973. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Dosztoyevszkij, F. M. (2) 1973. *Félkegyelmű*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Makai Imre.
- Dostoyevskiy, F. M. 1983. *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Dosztoyevszkij, F. M. 1964. *Bűn és bűnhődés*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Görög Imre and G. Beke Margit.
- Dostoyevszkij, F. M. 1985. *Belie noch*. Povesti. Lvov: Kamenyar.
- Dosztoyevszkij, F. M. 1965. *Fehér éjszakák*. Elbeszélések és kisregények. 483–543. Bp: Európa. Translated by Devecseriné Guthy Erzsébet.
- Dudintsev, V. 1987. *Belie halati*. Neva 1987/1–4.
- Dugyincev, V. 1988. *Fehérruhások*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Soproni András.
- Erenburg, I. 1964. *Rvach*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Ehrenburg, I. 1972. *A harácsoló*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Elbert János.
- Gogol', N. V. 1989. *Povesti*. Moscow: Pravda.
- Gogol, N. V. 1989. *A köpönyeg*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Makai Imre.
- Gogol, N. V. 1976. *A köpönyeg*. In: „Old Hungarian Literary Translations”. Bp: Magyar Helikon. Translated by Arany János.
- Gorbovskiy, G. 1984. *Pod muziku dozhdy*. Zvezda 1984/8–9.
- Gorbovskij, G. 1987. *Az eső dallamára*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kovács Péter.
- Gor'kiy, M. 1952. *Delo Artamonovih*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Gorkij, M. 1976. *Az Artamonovok*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gellért Hugó.
- Il'f, I., Petrov, Ye. 1986. *Dvenaditsat' stul'ev*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Ilf, I., Petrov, J. 1986. *Tizenkét szék*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Gellért Hugó.
- Il'f, I., Petrov, Ye. 1961. *Zolotoy telenok*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Ilf, I., Petrov, J. 1977. *Az aranybortó*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Fóthy János, Wessely László.

- Kataev, V. 1966. *Svyatoy kolodets*. Novij Mir 1966/5.
- Katajev, V. 1977. *Szentkút*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Radványi Ervin.
- Kazakevich, E. 1961. *Sinyaya terad'*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Kazakevics, E. 1978. *A két füzet*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Nikodémusz Elli.
- Kozhevnikova, N. 1982. *Yelena Prekrasnaya*. Novij mir 1982/9.
- Kozsevnyikova, N. 1984. *Szép Heléna*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Nikodémusz Elli.
- Okudzhava, B. 1969. *Bednij Avrosimov*. Druzhba Narodov. 1969/4.5.6.
- Okudzava, B. 1972. *Szegény Avroszimov*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Makai Imre.
- Pasternak, B. 1990. *Doktor Zhivago*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Paszternak, B. 1988. *Zsivago doktor*. Bp: Árkádia. Translated by Pór Judit.
- Piln'nyak, B. 1976. *Golyj god*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Pilnyak, B. 1979. *Meztelen év*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Kántor Péter.
- Piln'nyak, B. 1976. *O'key*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Pilnyak, B. 1983. *OKÉ*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Soproni András.
- Popov, V. 1981. *Zizn' udalas'*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'.
- Popov, V. 1985. *Mégis összejött*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Bratka László.
- Rasputin, V. 1987. *Rudolfio. Chto peredat' vorone. Uroki frantsuzskovo. Povesti i rasskazi*. 387–401, 147–169. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Raszputyin, V. 1984. *Rudolfio, Mit mondjak a hollónak*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Galvács Adél, Harsányi Éva.
- Rasputin, V. 1974. *Zhivi i pomni*. Nas Sovremnnik 1974/10–11.
- Raszputyin, V. 1976. *Élj és emlékezz*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Harsányi Éva.
- Ribakov, A. 1987. *Deti Arbata*. Druzhba Narodov 1987/4–5–6.
- Ribakov, A. 1988. *Az Arbát gyermekei*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Nikodémusz Elli.
- Sholokhov, M. 1960. *Tihyj Don*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Solohov, M. 1949. *Csendes Don*. I–IV. Bp: Európa. Translated by Makai Imre.
- Solzhenitsin, A. 1990. *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha*. Moscow: Sovetskaya Rossiya.
- Szolzenyicin, A. 1989. *Ivan Gyenyiszovics egy napja*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Wessely László.
- Shukshin, V. 1977. *Krasnaya kalina*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'.
- Suksin, V. 1980. *Vörös káryafa*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Galvács Adél.
- Shukshin, V. 1974. *Ya prishol dat' vam volyu*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'.
- Suksin, V. 1980. *Jöttem, hogy szabadságot hozzak*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Vihar Judit.
- Tendryakov, V. 1982. *Rasplata*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'.
- Tyendryakov, V. 1983. *Leszámolás*. Bp: Kossuth Könyvkiadó. Translated by Soproni András.
- Tinyanov, Yu. N. 1956. *Podporuchik Kizhe*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Tinyanov, J. N. 1958. *Tetik hadnagy*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Apostol András.
- Tolstoy, A. 1980. *Pod vodoy. Lyubov'. Drevniy put'*. Bp: Európa.
- Tolsztoj, A. 1980. *Víz alatt, Szerelem, Az ősi út*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Brodsky Erzsébet, Wessely László.
- Tolstoy, L.N. 1977. *Vöskresenie*. Moscow: Sovremennik.
- Tolsztoj, L.N. 1962. *Feltámadás*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szöllösy Klára.
- Tolstoy, L.N. 1946. *Anna Karenina*. Leningrad: Lengiz.
- Tolsztoj, L.N. 1988. *Anna Karenina*. Bucharest: Kriterion. Translated by Németh László.
- Tolstoy, L. N. 1978. *Detstvo, otrochestvo, yunost'*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tolsztoj, L. N. 1964. *Gyermekkor, serdülőkor, ifjúság*. Lev Tolszj művei 1–10/1. Translated by Németh László.
- Trifonov, Yu. 1986. *Dom na naberezhnoy*. Sobranie sochineniya. 2. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Trifonov, Ju. 1983. *Ház a rakparton*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szabó Mária.
- Trifonov, Yu. 1976. *Drugaya zizn'*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'.
- Trifonov, Ju. 1977. *A másik élet*. Bp: Magvető. Translated by Szabó Mária.
- Trifonov, Yu. 1987. *Ischeznovaniye*. Druzhba Narodov. 1987/1.
- Trifonov, Ju. 1988. *Eltűnések*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Szabó Mária.

- Turgenyev, I. S. 1983. *Rudin*. Lvov: izd. Kamenyar.
 Turgenyev, I. Sz. 1969. *Rugyin*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Áprily Lajos.
 Turgenyev, I. S. 1976. *Pevtsi*. Bp: Európa.
 Turgenyev, I. Sz. 1976. *Az énekesek*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Áprily Lajos.
 Zoshchenko, M. 1990. *Golubaya kniga*. Kishinov: Kartya Moldovenyanskiye.
 Zosczenko, M. 1970. *Kék könyv*. Bp: Európa. Translated by Rab Zsuzsa.

Hungarian–Russian (1–25)

- Bart István 1993. *Budapest. Történelmi séták*. Bp: Corvina.
 Bart, I. 1993. *Budapest. Progulka v glub vekov*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by T. Voronkina.
 Bart István 1984. *A boldogtalan sorsú Rudolf trónörökös*. Bp: Helikon.
 Bart, I. 1988. *Nezadachlivaya sud'ba kronprintsa Rudolfa*. Moscow: Raduga. Translated by T. Voronkina.
 Bitó László 1998. *Ábrahám és Izsák*. Bp: Magyar Könyvklub.
 Bito, L. 1998. *Abraam i Isaak*. Moscow: Phantom Press. Translated by T. Voronkina.
 Illyés Gyula 1975. *Hét meg hét magyar népmese*. Bp: Móra.
 Iyes, D. 1994. *Sem' da sem' vekov*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by T. Voronkina.
 Jókai Mór 1984. *Egy hírhedett kalandor a XVII századból*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Yokay, M. 1987. *Pohozhdeniya avantyurista Gugo fon Xabenihta*. Bp: Corvina I. Aleksandrov, T. Voronkina.
 Jókai Mór 1962–1963. *Fekete gyémántok*. In: Jókai Mór Összes Művei. Bp: Akadémiai Kiadó.
 Yokay, M. 1981. *Chernie almazi*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by E. Tumarkina, T. Voronkina.
 Jókai Mór 1962–1963. *Szegény gazdagok*. In: Jókai Mór Összes Művei. Bp: Akadémiai Kiadó.
 Yokay, M. 1981. *Bednie bogachi*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by M. Pogány.
 Kaffka Margit 1977. *Csendes válságok*. In: Magyar elbeszélők. 20. század. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Kafka, M. 1983. *Tihie trevoneniya*. In: 44 Vengerskih rasskaza. 62–84. Bp: Corvina. Translated by V. Smirnov.
 Kosztolányi Dezső 1985. *Omelette à Woburn*. Válogatott novellák és karcolatok. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Kostolani, D. 1983. *Omlét po voburnski*. In: 44 Vengerskih rasskaza. 112–120. Bp: Corvina. Translated by J. Malihina.
 Krúdy Gyula 1977. *Utolsó szivar az Arabs Szürkénél*. In: Magyar Elbeszélők. 20. század. I. 546–569. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Krudi D. 1983. *Poslednyaya cigara v „Arabskom Serom”*. In: 44 Vengerskih rasskaza. 15–37. Bp: Corvina. Translated by J. Malihina.
 Mikszáth Kálmán 1975. *A Noszty fiú esete Tóth Marival*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Miksat, K. 1986. *Istoriya Nosti-mladshevo i Marii Tot*. Izbrannoe. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
 Mikszáth Kálmán 1957. *Bessterce ostroma*. Bp: Akadémiai Kiadó.
 Miksat, K. 1962. *Osada Bestertse*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by G. Leybutin.
 Mikszáth Kálmán 1991. *A hályogkovács és más elbeszélések*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
 Miksat, K. 1966. *Rasskazi i povesti*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by I. Salimon et al.
 Mikszáth Kálmán 1956. *Szent Péter esernyője*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.

- Miksat, K. 1986. *Zont Svyatovo Petra*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by J. Ternovskaya, J. Tumarkina.
- Mikszáth Kálmán 1987. *Különös házasság*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Miksat, K. 1966–1967. *Stranniy brak*. In: *Sobranie sochineniy I–IV*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by G. Gromov, G. Leybutin.
- Molnár Ferenc 1987. *A Pál utcai fiúk*. Bp: Móra.
- Mol'nar, F. 1986. *Mal'chishki s ulitsi Pala*. Moscow: Detskaya literatura. Translated by O. Rossiyanov.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1974. *Barbárok. Elbeszélések III*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Moric, Zh. 1983. *Varvari*. In: 44 *Vengerskih rasskaza*. 48–62. Bp: Corvina. Translated by Á. Kun.
- Móricz Zsigmond 1966. *Rokonok*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Moric, Zh. 1958. *Rodstvenniki*. In: *Izbrannoye*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by O. Gromov, I. Salimon.
- Örkény István (1) 1968. *Egyperces novellák*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (2) 1967. *Nászutasok a légyapíron. Tótiék*. Bp: Magvető.
- Örkény István (3) 1968. *Jeruzsálem hercegnője*. Bp: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Erken' I. (1) 1981. *Izbrannoye*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. Translated by T. Voronkina.
- Erken' I. (2) 1984. *Put' k grotesku*. Moscow: Izvestiya. Translated by T. Voronkina.
- Erken' I. (3) 2000. *Povesti, rasskazi, rasskazi-minutki*. Moscow: Raduga.
- Rejtő Jenő (P. Howard) 1989. *A tizennégy karátos autó*. Bp: Magvető.
- Reyte, Ye. 1984. *Zolotoy avtomobil'*. Bp: Corvina. Translated by I. Aleksandrov.
- Reyte, Ye. 1999. *Zolotoy romeo*. Moscow: Phantom Press. Translated by T. Voronkina.
- Rejtő Jenő (P. Howard) 1989. *A szőke ciklon*. Bp: Magvető.
- Reyte, Ye. 1999. *Ciklon „blondínka”*. Moscow: Phantom Press. Translated by T. Voronkina.
- Sarkadi Imre. 1966. *A szőkevény*. Drámák, Kisregények I–II. Bp. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Sarkadi, I. 1983. *Dezertir*. In: 44 *Vengerskih rasskaza*. 236–245. Bp: Corvina. Translated by L. Vasil'eva.
- Sarkadi Imre 1966. *A gyáva*. Drámák, Kisregények I–II. Bp. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Sarkadi, I. 1977. *Sovremennie vengerskie povesti*. Moscow: Progress. Translated by N. Podzemskaya.

Author's index

- Adab, B. 131,178
 Adams, P. 45
 Aijmer, K. 106
 Albert, S. 18, 80, 81, 94, 112, 114
 Alexieva, B. 110
 Arany, J. 24, 25, 38

 Baker, M. 19, 38, 37, 100, 102, 105, 106,
 107, 111, 112, 166, 170, 174, 188, 201,
 213, 215, 223, 249
 Bakos, F. 40
 Balázs, G. 187, 305
 Ballester, A. 110
 Bally, Ch. 426
 Barkhudarov, L. S. 15, 30, 37, 56, 81, 85,
 86, 118, 154, 165, 183, 187, 201, 236,
 249, 319, 377, 413, 427
 Bart, I. 15, 18, 112, 114, 131, 138, 139,
 147
 Bartos, T. 147
 Bassnett (McGuire), S. 36, 37, 93, 95, 96,
 119
 Beaugrande, R. 99
 Bárczi, G. 176, 178, 235
 Bell, R.T. 111
 Bendik, J. 52, 112, 114
 Benedek, M. 143
 Benyhe, J. 143, 147
 Bergenholz, H. 99
 Beylard-Ozeroff, A. 96, 99
 Blonskiy, P.P. 47
 Bloomfield, L. 46
 Blum-Kulka, S. 62, 63, 64, 170, 172, 173,
 174
 Bodnár, I. 18
 Boronkay-Roe, Zs. 18
 Bowen, G. 97, 111
 Bowen, M. 97, 111
 Börsch, S. 53, 105
 Brassai, S. 24
 Brändle, M. 110
 Brisset, A. 97
 Broadbent, D. A. 48
 Brown, R. 42

 Bruce, D. 48
 Budin, G. 112
 Bush, P. 99
 Bühler, K. 58

 Canos, R. A. 110
 Carr, S. 99
 Cary, E. 35, 36
 Catford, J. C. 15, 35, 36, 41, 81, 153, 155,
 165, 183, 319, 413
 Čeňkova, I. 96
 Chesterman, A. 96, 99, 171
 Chomsky, N. 36, 70, 71
 Claparède, E. 105
 Cohen, A. P. 105
 Corder, P. 29
 Chernov, G. 49, 50
 Chernyahovskaya, L. A. 18, 37, 56, 57, 86
 Cs. Jónás, E. 18, 112, 114

 Darbelnet, J. see Vinay, J.
 Dániel, A. 112
 Delabastita, D. 171
 Delisle, J. 97, 98
 Deme, L. 333, 351
 Dezső, L. 29, 176, 178, 179, 235, 394
 Dijk van, T. 57
 Diósy-Stephanides, É. 340, 356
 Dobos, Cs. 18
 Dodds, J. 96, 97, 111
 Doherty, M. 178, 334, 340, 346, 351, 356,
 372, 375
 Dollerup, C. 19, 97, 99, 111, 135, 140, 141
 Dressler, W. 55
 Dugonics, A. 38
 Duff, A. 133
 Durham, M. 52

 Edwards, A. B. 99
 Englund Dimitrova, B. 172
 Erdei, Gy. 67
 Erwin-Tripp, S. M. 42
 É. Kiss, K. 176, 339, 341, 342, 346, 394,
 395, 400, 425

- Fawcett, P. 99, 319
 Ferenczy, Gy. 18, 176
 Ferguson, Ch. 38
 Fishman, J. 38
 Fityerman, A. 37, 55
 Fedorov, A. V. 35, 55, 58, 81, 86
 Florin, Sz. 37, 205, 208
 Flotow, L. 99
 Fodor, J. 73
 Fónagy, I. 280, 294
 Fraser, J. 53
- Gaddis-Rose, M. 96, 99
 Gak, V. G. 30, 37, 55, 154, 178, 187, 361, 377, 415
 Gambier, Y. 95, 99
 Gárdus, J. 18, 143
 Gellerstam, M. 64
 Gentzler, E. 35, 36
 Geher, I. 147
 Giglioli, P. P. 38
 Gile, D. 99, 111, 114, 135
 Goris, O. 110
 Gran, L. 96, 97, 111
 Greene, J. 45
 Greenberg, J. H. 178, 394
 Grice, H. P. 170
 Groot de, A. M. 53
 Györfy, M. 143, 147
- Hall, E. T. 108
 Halle, M. 47
 Halliday, M. A. K. 57, 378
 Harris, B. 171
 Hartmann, R. R. K. 56, 119
 Harvey, K. 301
 Harweg, R. 57
 Hatim, B. 65, 111, 119
 Haugen, E. 46
 Haywood, L. 131
 Heltai, P. 18, 19, 112, 114, 178
 Hell, Gy. 18, 339
 Hermans, T. 98, 171
 Herring, S. C. 112
 Hervey, S. 130, 131, 178, 217, 301, 427, 428
 Hewson, L. 111, 174
 Higgins, J. 130, 130, 178, 217, 301, 427, 428
 Hofstede, G. 108
 Holmes, J. 36, 93, 100, 114, 117, 118
 House, J. 37
- Hrdlička, M. 96
 Isacenko, A. V. 57
 Izard, N. 110
 Jäger, G. 37, 81, 85, 86
 Jakobovits, L. A. 29
 Jakobson, R. 35, 69, 322
 James, C. 29
 Jansen, P. 96
 Jääskeläinen, R. 53, 105
 Jettmarová, Z. 96, 109, 110
 Jones, R. 99
 Juhász, J. 29, 178, 421
 Jumpelt, R. W. 35
- Kade, O. 15, 36, 85
 Kelly, L. G. 32
 Katz, J. 73
 Károly, K. 19
 Kelemen, J. 421
 Kenesei, I. 346
 Kepecs, Á. 421
 Kingscott, G. 19, 110, 134, 137
 Kiraly, D. 53, 111, 121, 134
 Kiss, I. 147
 Klaudy, K. 63, 64, 91, 101, 102, 105, 110, 112, 113, 114, 120, 126, 131, 137, 138, 139, 153, 155, 170, 176, 187, 195, 201, 214, 215, 223, 355, 378, 394, 425
- Kohn, J. 18, 107, 110, 113, 114
 Koller, W. 37, 86
 Komissarov, V. N. 15, 18, 37, 67, 74, 76, 81, 87, 89, 111, 118, 154, 155, 156, 166, 171, 178, 183, 319, 377, 420, 428
 Koralova, A. L. 178, 420
 Kornfeld, T. J. de 19
 Königs, F. G. 53, 105
 Kurián, Á. 18
 Krings, H. 53, 15, 174
 Kussmaul, P. 99, 111
 Kühlwein, W. 118
- Labov, W. 38
 Lambert, J. 19, 44, 95, 107, 111, 113, 114
 Lambert, S. 99, 111
 Larson, M. 111, 183
 Lator, L. 143, 147
 Latishev, L. K. 111
 Laviosa, S. 188, 201, 213, 215, 223, 249
 Láng, Zs. 18, 108, 114
 Lederer, M. 119
 Lefevere, A. 32, 95, 119

- Lendvai, E. 18, 40, 112, 114
 Lengyel, Zs. 114
 Levy, J. 96, 225
 Leontev, A. A. 46
 Levitskaya, T. R. 37, 55
 Li, Ch. 394, 396, 400
 Loughridge, M. 131
 Lörschner, W. 53, 105, 111, 174
 Lvovskaya, Z. D. 68, 111, 154
- Makai, I. 39, 311
 Malblanc, A. 178
 Martin, J. 111, 174
 Mason, J. 65, 111
 Melby, A. 99
 Melchuk, I. A. 74, 76, 86
 Miller, G. A. 45, 47, 49
 Mounin, G. 15, 35, 41, 58, 98
 Moser-Mercer, B. 99, 111
 Mossop, B. 137
- Navracsecs, J. 114
 Nádasdy, Á. 339
 Nemser, W. 29, 178
 Neubert, A. 15, 36, 62, 95, 108, 111
 Newmark, P. 37, 64, 86, 96, 111, 114, 154,
 165, 183, 319
 Newton, J. 112
 Néray, J. 389, 393
 Nida, E. A. 15, 35, 36, 55, 56, 66, 70, 71,
 73, 74, 76, 83, 84, 86, 100, 101, 113,
 114, 129, 154, 155, 172, 183, 319, 321,
 361, 377, 378, 388, 413
 Nord, Ch. 98, 99, 171
- Orero, P. 99
 Orzutay, P. 314
 Osers, E. 113
- Pagano, A. 134
 Pajzs, J. 106
 Papp, A. 147
 Papp, F. 18, 29, 40, 102, 122, 178, 421,
 425
 Patterson, G. B. 95
 Pearl, S. 110
 Pennington, M. 112
 Pollard, D. E. 99
 Pongrácz, J. 112
 Popovics, A. 81, 96
 Poulton, E. C. 48, 49
 Poyatos, F. 99
- Puurtinen, T. 101
 Pym, A. 95, 113
- Quirk, R. 428
- Radó, A. 24
 Radó, Gy. 24, 36, 38, 100, 113
 Reiss, K. 15, 37, 56, 58, 62, 81, 98, 109,
 111, 127
 Retsker, Ja. I. 15, 37, 54, 55, 81, 183, 187,
 201, 236, 249, 262, 319, 377, 413, 427
 Remael, A. 110
 Reményi, A. 42
 Revzin, I. I. 15, 35, 67, 71, 81, 86, 171
 Rey, A. 99
 Riabtseva, N. K. 111
 Roberts, R. 99
 Robyns, C. 96
 Roganova, Z. E. 55
 Rozentsveig, V. Ju. 15, 18, 35, 67, 71, 81,
 86, 122, 171
 Russo, M. 187
- Sager, J. 98, 99, 112
 Sainz, M. J. 135
 Salánki, Á. 18
 Sallai, J. 52, 53
 Sapir, E. 41
 Savory, T. H. 35
 S. Fenyő, S. 18
 Schleiermacher, F. 36
 Schmidt, H. 64
 Schmitt, P. A. 128, 134
 Schjoldager, A. 172, 174
 Seguinot, C. 136, 172, 173, 174
 Seleskovitch, D. 50, 119, 123
 Selinker, L. 29, 119, 121
 Shlesinger, M. 43, 44
 Shuttleworth, M. 94, 100, 319
 Shiryayev, A. F. 47
 Shveitser, A. D. 15, 18, 29, 36, 46, 52, 55,
 56, 64, 108, 111, 118, 154, 172, 183,
 319
 Sladkovskaya, E. 50
 Smith, A. H. 35
 Snelling, D. 112
 Snell-Hornby, M. 65, 91, 95, 99, 111, 114
 Sohár, A. 18, 113, 114, 147
 Sokolov, A. N. 48
 Somers, H. 99
 Soproni, A. 147
 Steier, B. 51

KINGA KLAUDY
LANGUAGES IN TRANSLATION

**LECTURES ON THE
THEORY, TEACHING AND PRACTICE OF TRANSLATION**

With illustrations in English, French, German, Russian and Hungarian

PART I.

THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION

PART II.

THE TEACHING OF TRANSLATION

PART III.

TRANSFER OPERATIONS IN TRANSLATION

PART IV.

LEXICAL TRANSFER OPERATIONS

PART V.

GRAMMATICAL TRANSFER OPERATIONS

KINGA KLAUDY is a professor of linguistics and translation studies at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest (ELTE) and University of Miskolc, head of the Translation Department at ELTE, vice president of the Hungarian Association of Applied Linguists and editor in chief of two academic journals:
Fordítástudomány (Translation Studies),
Across Languages and Cultures (A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies)

Orders to:

Libra Books, Hungary, H-1085 Budapest Kölcsey u. 2.

Ph: 00 36 1 4830659, Fax: 00 36 1 4830660, Ph/Fax: 00 36 1 2675777

E-mail: libra@mail.datanet.hu – Homepage: www.librabooks.hu



Scholastica

ISBN 963 206 839 4

PL KINGGAGKADY: LANGGUDAGS INTRANSITION