

Klaudy K. 1996. 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.

## **Concretization and generalization of meaning in translation**

*Kinga Klaudy*

### **1. The operational part of translators' activity**

It was a pleasant surprise for me to discover the question of translation techniques among the suggested topics of the conference program. Investigating the operational part of translators' activity has become a rather neglected field in translation research, either left out altogether, or sometimes even accused of leading us into the wrong direction, and bringing translation research to a dead end.

Some claim that investigation of the translation techniques themselves, takes our attention off meaning. According to them, after having extracted the meaning from the source language form, the translator should immediately forget the SL form, and reformulate the message in his or her target language independently from the source language form. This would mean that the process of translation is nothing but an analysis of the source language followed by synthesis in the target language, or in other words decoding of the source text and encoding the target text, while there is no direct transcoding from the source language form to the target language form. In this interpretation the basis for the transfer is a semantic representation which is independent from languages involved, thus languages do not influence the process of translation at all. (Seleskovitch 1975:5)

Empirical studies of target texts translated from different source languages nevertheless reveal striking differences according to different source languages. Translated TL texts possess quantitatively measurable textual properties that differ from those of original TL texts, moreover these properties differ according to the source language of the translated texts. (Vehmas-Lehto 1989)

## **2. The question of consciousness**

Hence my conviction that linguistic differences between the SL and the TL can not be overlooked in translation studies. The claim that translation is a meaning-based phenomenon, does not make the differences between languages irrelevant. Meaning is a language-specific phenomenon, and translation operations do consist of different transformations of and alterations to the source language meaning, which are introduced by translators consciously or automatically. The conscious or non-conscious character of these operations can be another interesting topic for further research, but this time we are not going to deal with the question of consciousness.

Aversion against terms like "techniques of translation", "transformations in translation" "operations in translation", "solutions in translation" can be explained by the fact, that these terms suggest that transformations, operations, solutions made by translators always consciously, deliberately. They suggest that translators consciously apply some techniques, operations, solutions to transform the SL form into TL form.

## **3. Mental transformations and translational operations**

The statement that in the course of translation the SL form is transformed into the TL form is so common in theoretic literature on translation, that we do not feel any longer its absurdity (Komissarov 1980). Transformation in this sense is nonsense, of course. The translator does not do anything to the SL form. The SL form, the SL text remains unchanged, intact etc. What really happens, could be best described as the birth of a new entity. The TL text is a new entity, but the circumstances of its birth do leave their mark.

A translated TL text, or in other words, a text conceived in a foreign language and an original TL text, that is a text conceived on TL are two, rather different things. The road, leading from the mind to the linguistic form is never direct, never simple even when we formulate our ideas in our mother tongues. But if the thought takes its origin in an another language the road 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, 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 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 undisputable, I think. The question is whether these mental transformations, mental operations 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 include at the same time a certain kind of transcoding as well, or in other words, if it is conceivable that there exist more or less direct roads as well, that lead from the SL form to the TL form. This is the most important question to ask, and using the terms "transformations", "operations" "techniques" we suggest that in some cases there is a direct road between two languages -but it leads through the translators mind.

Making use of the terms "transformation of meaning", or particularly "specification and generalization of meaning" which will be the topic of my lecture today, I am going to speak about these mental operations, carried out routinely, systematically and reliably (though not necessarily consciously) by all professional translators, but only randomly and unreliably by beginners.

#### **4. Describing translational operations**

The discussion of translation techniques can be traced from Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) through Eugene Nida (1964) to works of scholars from the former USSR Barkhudarov (1975), Komissarov (1973, 1980), Shveitser (1973) etc.

Vinay and Darbelnet made a list of seven main technical procedures ("les procédés techniques") in translation: emprunt, calque, traduction littérale, transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation. In the glossary of technical terms at the beginning of their book we find several other procedures as well, for example; actualisation, amplification, articulation, compensation, explicitation implicitation, généralisation, particularisation (Vinay-Darbelnet 1958: 4-16). Nida uses the term "techniques of adjustment". The main techniques of adjustment

in his work are: additions, subtractions and alterations (Nida 1964: 227).

Barkhudarov, the well-known Russian translologist uses the term "transformatsiya". He differentiates four types of transformations in translation: "perestankovka" ('transposition'), "zamena" ('substitution'), "dobavleniye" ('addition'), "opushcheniye" ('omission'). According to him, the most important reason for additions in translation from English into Russian are the elliptic nominal structures in English, that is the omission of certain semantic components in English surface structure which were present in the deep structure. As ellipsis is not characteristic of Russian, the omitted semantic components are reconstructed in the Russian surface structure (pay claim - trebovaniye povysit' zarplatu 'demand to raise the pay'; gun license - udostovereniye na pravo nosheniya oruzhiya, 'license for right to carry weapon' (Barkhudarov 1975:223).

A very detailed typology of lexical and grammatical transformations, including grammatical additions in Bulgarian-Russian and Russian-Bulgarian translation can be found in the work of the Bulgarian scholar Vaseva (1980). According to her additions are generated by the "linguistic asymmetry", that is by the necessity to express explicitly meanings in the target language that are contained implicitly in the source language. Cases of grammatical additions in Vaseva's work are explained by the so called "missing categories" and categories with different functions: Bulgarian has articles, while Russian has none; the possessive pronoun can be omitted in Russian, unlike in Bulgarian; the copula can be omitted in Russian but not in Bulgarian; the direct object can be - rarely - omitted in Russian, but never in Bulgarian etc. Besides the grammatical additions Vaseva shortly refers to the so called pragmatic additions as well, when concepts generally known for the source language audience may be unfamiliar for the target language audience and therefore they call for explanations in the translation.

## **5. The psychological reality of operations**

The different kinds of lexical and grammatical and even pragmatic transformations in the process of English-Russian, German-Russian, French-Russian, Spanish-Russian translation were very thoroughly described by the translation-specialists of the former USSR (Barkhudarov 1975, Komissarov 1973, Shveitser 1973, Gak 1977, Lvovskaya 1985 etc.) The question however was not raised by anybody, if these transformations have any psychological reality or not. They did

not touch on another important question either: what forms the basis for the transfer itself; in other words: is semantic representation in the translator's mind independent from the languages involved in the process of translation or not?

I think, both the question of the psychological reality of transformations and the question of the character of semantic representation is still open and I am afraid it will remain open in the near future. Nevertheless, this shouldn't prevent us from the study of semantic changes in translation.

## **6. Lexical operations and semantic changes**

The next question to be answered is the following: what is the relationship between the concept of "semantic changes in translation" and the concept of "lexical operations or transformations in translations". Many scholars who do not object the concept of "semantic changes", on the other hand reject the concept of "lexical operations or transformations" (Englund Dimitrova 1993).

Using the term "lexical operations or transformations" we propose that TL solutions are not natural phenomena, like the freezing of water under zero, but results of conscious decisions on the part of the translator.

## **7. The concept of translational operations**

In my paper I will use the term "translational operations" in the sense described above, that is as a complex mental operation, taking place when the road conducting from the mind to the linguistic form is not direct but leads through another language.

The description of translational operations is in the centre of my book published recently under the title "The Theory and Practice of Translation". It is an attempt to describe a system of operations taking place in the translation of English/German/French/Russian into Hungarian and vice versa. Though Hungarian is not a widely spoken language, looking at English/German/French/Russian from a Hungarian point of view, can provide interesting insights nevertheless. The Hungarian "looking glass" can reveal striking similarities between these otherwise rather different languages. Describing the translational behavior of Hungarian in the process of its translation into English/German/French/Russian, we in fact describe how a

Finno-Ugric language works in the process of translation into the Indo-European languages and vice versa.

## **8. The typology of operations**

Translating any sentence from one language into another, even the simplest one, translators carry out a number of mental operations. These operations can be classified on the basis of different principles, taking as starting-point the reason of the operation, the purpose of the operation, the level of the operation etc. Thus operations can be: obligatory, optional and facultative operation; automatic and non automatic-operations; word-level, phrase-level, sentence-level and text-level operations; lexical, grammatical, stylistic and pragmatic operations etc.

Some of these operations can be explained by the differences in the lexical and grammatical structure of the languages - these operations are called "language-specific" operations. Others are explained by the differences of cultures, between generally shared knowledge of the members of different cultural communities - these operations can be called "culture-specific operations". Other operations can be explained neither by structural differences between the languages nor by cultural differences but by the nature of the translation-process itself, that is by the necessity to express ideas in the target language which were originally conceived in the source language. These operations can be called "translation-specific" operations.

All classifications have their advantages and shortcomings. I would like to offer an explanation, which tries to avoid mixing the different principles. The classification of operations followed here is based exclusively upon the "operational" - that is, "technical" - properties of the operations (and not on their reason, purpose etc.).

There are eleven main types of lexical operations

1. concretization (narrowing) of meaning
2. generalization (widening) of meaning
3. contraction of meaning
4. splitting (division) of meaning
5. lexical omissions

6. lexical additions
7. transposition of meaning
8. substitution of meaning
9. antonymous translation
10. total transformation of meaning
11. compensation for losses in translation.

There are seven main types of grammatical operations:

1. grammatical concretization and generalization
2. grammatical splitting (division)
3. grammatical contraction
4. grammatical additions
5. grammatical omissions
6. grammatical transpositions
7. grammatical substitution.

The main types of lexical and grammatical operations, mentioned above, are divided into further subtypes, that is the total number of translational operations illustrated and explained in the book is approximately one hundred. The examples are taken from more than two hundred literary works and their translations, selected from the work of more than two hundred different translators. We are not going to describe unique, especially successful solutions of famous translators, but rather limit our research to the average.

### **9. Specification of meaning in IE→H and H→IE translation**

In my lecture today I would like to discuss only two types of lexical operations characteristic of the process of translation from Hungarian into English, German, French and Russian and vice versa: concretization and generalization of meaning. Instead of the term "concretization" - which is the literal translation of the term "konkretizáció", which I use in Hungarian and which is widely used in the Russian literature as "concretizatsiya" - I will rather use the term "specification" as it is more common in the West.

First, I will speak about the specification of meaning in Hungarian → Indo-European

and Indo-European → Hungarian translation. Specification of meaning is a lexical operation whereby the SL unit of a more general meaning is replaced by a TL unit of a more specific meaning.

The main kinds of specification of meaning in Hungarian → Indo-European translation are the followings:

1. specification of the parts of the body in H→IE translation
2. specification of time-expressions in IE→H translation
3. specification of reporting verbs in IE→H translation
4. specification of inchoative verbs in IE→H translation
5. specification of semantically weak verbs in IE→H translation.

We are not going to discuss all the types of specification, only three of them: the specification of the parts of the body in Hungarian→IE translation, the specification of reporting verbs in IE→Hungarian translation and the specification of semantically weak verbs in IE→Hungarian translation.

### **9.1. Specification of the parts of the body in H→IE translation**

The first type of specification to be discussed is the specification of the parts of the body in translation. This occurs characteristically when translating from Hungarian into Indo-European.

Certain parts of the body have a more detailed lexical representation in Indo-European languages than in Hungarian. English makes a distinction between the face and cheek, hand and arm, foot and leg, mouth and lips, German makes a distinction between Gesicht and Wange, Fuß and Bein, Mund and Lippe, French makes a distinction between visage and joue, pied and jambe, Russian between the rot and guby, litso and shcheka etc.

While in Hungarian the second part of the above mentioned oppositions though existing is less frequently used. Translators thus in the Hungarian text will generally have the general term rather: arc, száj, kéz, láb, and when translating Hungarian into Indo-European languages, they have to decide whether the sentence is about the 'whole face' or about the 'left' or 'right part' of it etc.

- H→E (1) "A lány most már tele szájjal kacagott, mintha csiklandozták volna."  
 (2) "Now she laughed with her mouth wide open as though she were being tickled."  
 Hungarian: száj → English: mouth
- H→E (3) "De mégis ellágyult, és megcsókolta a lányt a száján."  
 (4) "Still, he was touched, and kissed her lips."  
 Hungarian: száj → English: lips
- H→G (5) "A császár h\_s termében pihen, a koldusok pedig a pálmafák alatt horkolnak, tátott szájjal."  
 (6) "Der Kaiser ruht in kühlem Saal, die Bettler aber schnarchen unter den Palmen, mit offenem Mund."  
 Hungarian: száj → German: Mund
- H→G (7) "Én gúnyosan elbiggyesztettem a szájam."  
 (8) "Ich stülpte hämisch die Lippen auf."  
 Hungarian: száj → German: Lippe
- H→F (9) "Arcok vigyorogtak feléje, sok-sok kis arc, mely egyetlenegy óriási, ijedelmes bálványarccá fancsalodott."  
 (10) "En face de lui, des visages ricanaien, beaucoup, beaucoup de petits visages, qui ne formaient plus, dans leur grimace, qu'une unique, énorme et effrayante figure d'idole."  
 Hungarian: arc → French: visage
- H→F (11) "Arcuk olyan volt, mint a tejbe ejtett rózsa.  
 (12) "Leurs joues étaient comme des roses trepées dans du lait."  
 Hungarian: arc → French: joue
- H→R (13) "Felelet helyett a Leszik kítátotta a száját. Mutatta, hogy nincs több."

(14) "Vemsto otveta Lesik razynul rot, pokazyvaya: net. "

Hungarian: száj → Russian: rot

H→R (15) "Az \_rmester megnyalta a szája szélét."

(16) "Serzhant obliznul guby."

Hungarian: száj → Russian: guby

## 9.2. Specification of reporting verbs in IE→H translation

The second type of specification I will discuss, is the specification of reporting verbs. This operation is characteristic of translation from Indo-European into Hungarian.

Verbs accompanying reported speech in literary works are generally semantically weak verbs in the four Indo-European languages (to say, sagen, dire, skazat') but semantically rich verbs in Hungarian. Hungarian translators generally choose a more specific and less frequent verb in translation. Not because there are no reporting verbs in Hungarian of a more general character. The Hungarian verb "mondani" stands on the same level of generality than to say, sagen, dire, skazat'. It is the Hungarian literary tradition what makes the translators choose less frequent verbs in the Hungarian text. It is perceived as too monotonous to repeat the same reporting verb throughout, and less frequent reporting verbs are preferred instead of other verbs, capable of fulfilling occasionally the reporting function.

This operation can be justified not by the differences in the lexicon but by differences in literary traditions.

H→E (17) "'Oh, thank you, madam,' said Edna."

(18) "- Jaj, köszönöm, nagysága! - hálálkodott Edna."

English: say → Hungarian: hálálkodik ('express one's gratitude')

H→E (19) "'Well, you mustn't abuse my legs,' said the old man."

(20) "- Te csak ne csepüld az én lábamat - tiltakozott az öregember."

English: say → Hungarian: tiltakozik ('protest', 'object')

- H→G (21) ""Lesen wir weiter!" sagte Margarete, und ihre Stimme klang dunkel, voll und warm wie vorher."
- (22) "- Olvassunk tovább, - legyintett Margit, és hangja újból olyan melegen, telin, felszabadultan csengett, mint azel\_tt."  
German: sagen ('say') → Hungarian: legyint (literally: 'chase away a fly')
- H→F (23) "- Laisse-moi!, dit elle, tu me chiffonnes."  
(24) "- Vigyázz! - türelmetlenkedett Emma. - Összegy\_röd a ruhámat."  
French: dire ('say') → Hungarian: türelmetlenkedik ('lose patience', 'get impatient')
- H→F (25) "- Oh! j'adore la mer, dit M. Leon."  
(26) "- O, a tenger! - rajongott Léon úr.- Imádom az óceánt!"  
French: dire ('say') → Hungarian: rajong ('be enthusiastic about', 'adore')
- H→R (27) "- Sto, sto, sto? - skazal znachitelnoye litso."  
(28) "- Micsoda? - szörnyülködött a tekintélyes személy."  
Russian: skazat ('say') → Hungarian: szörnyülködik ('be terrified', 'be horrified')
- H→R (29) "- Nichevo... - skazala ona. - Eto ya tak ..."  
(30) "- Semmi ... - hebegte. - Csak úgy ..."  
Russian: skazat ('say') → Hungarian: hebeg ('stammer')

### 9.3. Specification of semantically weak verbs in IE→H translation

Using more specific verbs in Indo-European → Hungarian translation is characteristic not only of the translation of reporting verbs. Hungarian is an agglutinative language, in which word forms have a much more complex morphological structure than in Indo-European languages. By their complex conjugation Hungarian verbs can compress in a single verb form a lot of functions expressed in Indo-European languages by personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, auxiliary and

modal verbs etc.

Furthermore, the Hungarian verb has a very rich word-formation system; it is possible to differentiate the smallest nuances of the meaning through the attachment of different derivational suffixes to the same stem. Authors of original Hungarian texts of course very extensively rely on the ability of the Hungarian verb to incorporate a number of grammatical and lexical information within a single Hungarian verb form. If translators want to produce a Hungarian text, where the language is not poorer and paler than the original, they have to utilize these advantages of the Hungarian verb formation system. Let me remark in passing, that one reason for translationese is just this inadequate utilization of the linguistic resources of the TL.

The specification of Indo-European verbs in Hungarian translation is not an obligatory lexical operation, because translators could always find a Hungarian verb of similarly general meaning. Using more specific Hungarian verbs in translation is a way to avoid translationese.

E→H (31) "One held a rosary in her heavy hand."

(32) "Az egyik olvasót morzsolt kövér kezében."

English: hold → Hungarian: morzsol ('keep on telling one's beads')

E→H (33) "They had seen him stop ..."

(34) "Látták, ahogy megtorpan, ..."

English: stop → Hungarian: megtorpan ('come to a sudden standstill')

G→H (35) "Dann kam der Nebel, auch er tagelang, wochenlang ..."

(36) "Aztán megtelepedett a köd, napokra, hetekre ..."

German: kommen ('come') → Hungarian: megtelepszik ('settle down')

G→H (37) "Er war glücklich ins Bett gestiegen, nun kamen die Sorgen."

(38) "Boldogan bújt ágyba, de most megrohanták a gondok."

German: kommen ('come') → Hungarian: megrohan → ('rush on')

F→H (39) "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

... "

- (40) "Egy este, amint mondtam, egy este, hogy hazajött egy hosszú sétalovaglásról, leroskadt velem szemben egy alacsony székre, kipirult orcával, ziháló mellel, elgyötört lábbal ... "

French: tomber ('fall') → Hungarian: leroskad ('sink, drop, flop into an armchair')

- F→H (41) "Mais je tombai moi-même, la figure coupée par deux coups de cravache;"

- (42) "De magam is felbukfenceztem, egy lovaglókorbács vágott kétszer az arcomba; ... "

French: tomber ('fall') → Hungarian: felbukfencezik ('turn a somersault')

## 10. Generalization of meaning in IE→H and H→IE translation

In the last part of my lecture I will speak about the next type of lexical operations - that is about the generalization of meaning in the Hungarian → Indo-European and Indo-European → Hungarian translation.

The main types of the generalization are the followings:

1. generalization of the parts of the body in IE→H translation
2. generalization of time-expressions in H→IE translation
3. generalization of reporting verbs in H→IE translation
4. generalization of inchoative verbs in H→IE translation
5. generalization of semantically strong verbs in H→IE translation
6. generalization of culture-specific words

We are not going to discuss all types of generalization here only three of them: the generalization of the parts of the body in Indo-European → Hungarian translation, the generalization of time-expressions in Indo-European → Hungarian translation, and the generalization of culture specific words in both direction.

### 10.1. Generalization of the parts of the body in IE→H translation

The reason for the generalization of the parts of the body in Indo-European → Hungarian

translation is the same as for their specification in Hungarian → Indo-European translation: that is the different segmentation of the body by the different languages. Interestingly enough, the four Indo-European languages contrast with the Hungarian in exactly the same way.

The distinction between the part and the whole characteristic for Indo-European languages disappear in the process of translation into Hungarian. English cheek and face are translated equally by the general word arc in Hungarian, just like German Fuß and Bein are translated equally by the general term láb in Hungarian, and French joue and visage also become arc in Hungarian, and the Russian words shcheka and litso are also translated into the general word arc in Hungarian.

E→H (43) "She gently embraced her husband, who kissed her on the cheek."

(44) "Gyöngéden megölelte férjét, az pedig arcon csókolta."

English: cheek → Hungarian: arc

E→H (45) "He kissed her face and tasted the salt of her tears."

(46) "Az megcsókolta \_t, s a könnye sós ízét ott érezte arcán."

English: face → Hungarian: arc

G→H (47) "Er ging nachlässig und ungleichmäßig, während Hansens schlanke Beine in den schwarzen Strümpfen so elastisch und taktfest einherschritten ..."

(48) "Hanyagul, egyenetlen léptekkel járt, míg Hansen karcsú fekete harisnyás lábai rugalmasan és ütemesen rótták a járdát ..."

German: Bein → Hungarian: láb

G→H (49) "Er hatte seinen Fuß ausgeheilt, der wie es im Steckbrief hieß, infolge eines Schusses hinkte."

(50) "Már meggyógyította lábát, amelyre a köröz \_levél szerint, l \_tt seb következtében sántított."

German: Fuß → Hungarian: láb

F→H (51) "Elle ressemblait a Paul; elle avait les memes yeux bleus ombrés de cils noirs, les

mèmes joues pâles."

- (52) "Igen hasonlított Paulhoz; éppen olyan kék szem\_, fekete szempillákkal árnyalva, s éppen olyan sápadt arcú."

French: joue → Hungarian: arc

- F→H (53) "Le silence de ce visage monstrueux qui changeait de forme terrifiait la victime."

- (54) "E rettenetes és hallgatag arc, amely egyre változott, az \_rületig ijesztette áldozatát."

French: visage → Hungarian: arc

- R→H (55) "Kraska nachinaet igrat' na moi shchekah."

- (56) "Az egészség pírja látszik arcomon."

Russian: shcheka → Hungarian: arc

- R→H (57) "Yevo kurnosnoe litso iskazilos."

- (58) "Arca, pisze orra elfintorodott."

Russian: litso → Hungarian: arc

## 10.2. Generalization of time-expressions in H→IE Translation

The reason for the next type of generalization, that is the generalization of time-expressions, is the different distribution of the day. The first part of the day is divided into three parts in Hungarian: hajnal ('early morning'), reggel ('morning') and délel\_t ('the hours before the noon') This distinction does exist in the four Indo-European languages too, but the words indicating early morning (dawn, Tagesanbruch) and the hours before noon (forenoon, Vormittag) are used less frequently. The distinction between hajnal ('dawn') and reggel ('morning'), and the distinction between reggel ('morning') and délel\_t ('forenoon') often disappear in the process of translation into Indo-European languages and instead the more general word is found everywhere: morning in English, Morgen in German, matin in French, and utro in Russian.

- H→E (59) "Egy délel\_t a Kerepesi temet\_ben találom magam, ..."

- (60) "One morning, finding myself in the Kerepes Cemetery," Hungarian: délel\_\_tt ('forenoon') → English: morning
- H→E (61) "Neró hajnalig kínlódott."  
 (62) "Nero wrestled with his torture till morning came."  
 Hungarian: hajnal ('dawn') → English: morning
- H→G (63) "Másnap délel\_\_tt a herceg alig öltözködött föl, lármát hallott a palota lépcs\_\_in."  
 (64) "In den Morgenstunden des nächsten Tages vernahm der Prinz, kaum daß er sich angekleidet hatte, auf der Treppe Lärm. "  
 Hungarian: délel\_\_tt ('forenoon') → German: Morgen ('morning')
- H→G (65) "Neró hajnalig kínlódott."  
 (66) "Bis zum Morgen rang Nero mit seiner Pein."  
 Hungarian: hajnal ('dawn') → German: Morgen ('morning')
- H→F (67) "Hajnali három órakor már talpon volt az egész ház."  
 (68) "A trois heures du matin, toute la maisonnée fût sur pied."  
 Hungarian: hajnal → French: matin ('morning')
- H→F (69) "Délel\_\_tt tizenegykor fürödni készült."  
 (70) "A onze heures du matin, il se préparait à prendre son bain."  
 Hungarian: délel\_\_tt ('forenoon') → French: matin ('morning')
- H→R (71) "Amikor végetért a délel\_\_tti vizit ..."  
 (72) "Utrenniy obhod zakanchivalsya..."  
 Hungarian: délel\_\_tt ('forenoon') → Russian: utro ('morning')

### 10.3. Generalization of culture-specific words in both direction

The last type of generalization we will discuss is the generalization of culture specific words.

Culture specific words are names of foods, dances, dishes are well known to everybody in the source language culture but meaningless for the target language audience.

The strategies to be applied by translators depend on the textual function of the culture specific words in question. If the concept behind the culture specific word plays an important role in the source text, translators should apply the methods of explanatory translation, but if the concept behind the culture specific word is not very important, translators can apply a generalization of meaning.

E→H (73) "A slice of cold pie, a glass of port, a cup of tea"

(74) "Egy szelet hideg húspástétom, egy pohár bor, egy csésze tea, ... "

English: port ('sweet wine') → Hungarian: bor ('wine')

H→G (75) "A kurucok is betörték, és a dúsgazdag Végh Tamás Vica nev\_ hajadon lányát ragadták el egy lakodalomból, mikor ifjabb Nagy Mihállyal a löttyögtet\_t járta; ..."

(76) "... 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, ..."

Hungarian: löttyögtet ('a kind of Hungarian folkdance') → German: Tanze ('dance')

H→G (77) "Ott legalább folyton eszik az ember. Kemény tojást, savanyú cukrot, sonkás zsemlet, nápolyit. Aztán leöblíti sörrel vagy bambival."

(78) "Dort kann der Mensch wenigstens zu immerzu essen. Harte Eier, saure Drops, Schinkenbrötchen, Waffeln. Und dann begießt man das Ganze mit Bier oder Limonade."

Hungarian: bambi ('brandname for a Hungarian lemon beverage') - German: Limonade ('lemonade, sweetened lemon beverage')

F→H (79) "... prends un petit verre de cassis pour te remettre."

(80) "... igyál egy pohárka lik\_ör, ez majd rendbehoz."

French: cassis ('French black-currant liquor') → Hungarian: likör ('sweet, alcoholic drink')

H→R (81) "Úgy szédült, mint aki fülig szerelmes vagy örül a tavasznak, vagy két fröccsöt szopott be egymás után."

(82) "Golova kruzhilas kak u cheloveka kotoriy vlyublyon, ili raduetsya vesne, ili propustil odin-dve rjumki."

Hungarian: fröccs ('wine with soda water') → Russian: rjumka ('small glass')

By describing, classifying and explaining translational operations we hope to serve one of the main objects of translation studies, the discovery of rules governing the seemingly subjective decisions of translators.

## References

- Barkhudarov L. S. (1975), *Yazik i perevod*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (1993), "Semantic change in Translation - A Cognitive Perspective". In: Y. Gambier and J. Tömmola (eds.) *Translation and Knowledge*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Gak, V. G. (1977), *Sravnitel'naya tipologiya frantsuzskovo i russkovo yazykov*. Leningrad: Prosveshcheniye.
- Klaudy, K. (1994), *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítástechnikai példatárral*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Komissarov, V. N. (1973), *Slovo o perevode*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Komissarov, V. N. (1980), *Lingvistika perevoda*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Lvovskaya, Z. D. (1985), *Teoreticheskie problemy perevoda*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Nida, E. A. (1964), *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1975), *Language, langues et mémoire*. Paris: Minard.
- Shveitser, A. D. (1973), *Perevod i lingvistika*. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Vaseva, I. (1980), *Teoriya i praktika perevoda*. Sophia: Nauka i isskustvo.

Vinay, J. P. - Darbelnet, J. (1958), *Stilistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier.

Vehmas-Lehto, I. (1989), *Quasi-Correctness. A critical study of Finnish translations of Russian Journalistic texts*. Helsinki: Neuvostoliitto Instituutti.