CONGRUENCE VIA EQUIVALENCE
(TRANSLATION ASPECTS)

S.A.Shvachko

Sumy State University

Sumy, Ukraine

The theory of congruence and equivalence applied to nominative units can be expanded to communicative units. This theory is based on the assumption that linguistic constructions can be characterized by clusters of pragmatic, semantic and syntactic properties. Different constructions, it appears, exhibit various degrees of correspondence. This kind of correspondence can be referred to as matching, and it extends over a continuum from full matching, via partial matching, to no matching at all. A higher degree of matching of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties reflects the higher degree of overall equivalence in terms of translation. Lexical and syntactic properties may vary from source language (SL) to target language (TL).

Cf. *Birds of a feather flock together.* – (Рус.) *Рыбак рыбака видит издалека.*

to kill two birds with one stone – (Рус.) *За двумя зайцами.*

Semantic and pragmatic identity of these communicative units may not befriend the syntactic and lexical identity, though they may go together.

Cf. *He who doesn't work neither shall eat.* – (Рус.) *Кто не работает, тот не ест.*

He laughs best who laughs last. – (Рус.) *Смеется тот, кто смеется последним.*

Thus, the proverb *Fine feathers make fine birds* may be rendered by different syntactical structures: (Рус.) *Одежда красит человека.*

Different images (Eng.) *features – birds;* (Рус.) *одежда - человек, пеньок – гарний* are used in these proverbs. But these divergences are not detrimental for semantics, for meaning is prior here.

Complete matching is to be observed when such semantic, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic parameters come into being which is quite vivid in the text, not beyond the verbal situation. **Cf.** *Add fuel to the fire (flame). –* (Рус.) *Подливать масло в огонь.*

Add wings to. – (Рус.) *Вдохновлять, окрылять.*

Against the hair. – (Рус.) *Против шерсти.*

All cats are grey in the night. – (Рус.) *Ночью все кошки серые.*

Partial matching is rooted in the semantic identity while other parameters vary.

Anything for a quiet life – (Рус.) *Чем бы дитя не тешилось, лишь бы не плакало.*

Feel the draught. – (Рус.) *Быть в тяжелом положении.*

Fetch one's salt. – (Рус.) *Зарабатывать на кусок хлеба.*

Matching works on different parameters - semantic, syntactic, pragmatic – with different languages.

Thus, we assume that constructions and communicative units with semantic identity may be different or similar in their surface aspect, i.e. explicitly.

A high degree of matching (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) is caused by the fact that the most prototypical, equivalent senses are immanent in the TL. Care should be taken with linguistic jokes of the following zeugmatic type:

They covered themselves with dust and glory.

He could permit himself a red tie and some private opinions.

He would get out of bed and humour.

Maxims as well as conundrums universally work with any language but their translation is a great nuisance, especially when these texts are marked with

idiosyncrasy [1, c.35]. In linguistic curiosity shop dominant are cases of play on words, zeugma and oxymoron, which should be rendered by special linguistic means of TL and handled with special care.

The <u>business</u> of the US is <u>business</u> (Coolidge). – (Рус.) *Главный бизнес в США - бизнес.*

In the play on words is relevant to the international nature of the word "business". Such words are not always translator's "true friends", some of them serve as "false friends of translators" (FFT).

Curiosity cases are not chaotic. There are certain principles, factors which rule them. Cf.: homonyms which give trouble for translators. These units are different with different languages (especially unpredictable in linguistic jokes). Here searches are made in the daylight with candles to produce a similar effect in the TL.

Cf. -*Waiter? – Yes, sir.*

-*What's this? – It's <u>bean</u> soup, sir.*

-*Never mind what it has <u>been</u>. I want to know what it is now.*

Thus, a translator should be first of all a philologist. Dealing with set expressions a translator should resort either to equivalents or to analogies [2, c.423]. Equivalents in TL may be (3) absolute and (4) close.

Cf. (3) *a lost sheep* – (Рус.)*"заблудшая овца"; the fair sex* – (Рус.) *"прекрасная половина"; Alladin's lamp* – (Рус.) *"лампа Алладина";*

(4) *baker's dozen* – (Рус.) *"чортова дюжина"; love is another love* (Рус.) *"любов порождает любовь"; one fool makes many* – (Рус.) *"глупость заразна".*

An overwhelming majority of English idioms have similar corresponding phraseological units (PhU) in Ukrainian, so called idiomatic analogies. As a rule these PhU are very close in their meaning, and metaphoric to that. Cf.: *to have the ready tongue* – (Рус.) *"за словом в карман не полезет"; like mistress, like maid* – (Рус.) *"яблуко от яблони недалеко падает",* etc. Approximate

analogies are partially similar to the SL idioms, though not less picturesque or expressive at that. Cf.: *to lose one's breath* – (Рус.) *"брость слова на ветер"; no bees, no honey* – (Рус.) *"под лежачий камень вода не течет".*

Descriptive translation consists in the shift of SL and TL levels; the structures of the units differ, while the meaning of them remains. Cf.: *wind in the head* – (Рус.) *"зазнайство"; mad as a hatter* – (Рус.) *"сумасшедший".*

Tentative conclusions which can be drawn from our study are as follows:

1) the linguistic forms of SL have more or less prototypical equivalents in a TL;

2) the prototypical effects vary over a considerable range of units in a TL;

3) non-prototypical effects come into being due to languages divergencies and fill gaps of linguistic competence; 4) a smaller degree of similarity (looser pattern matching) is expected to be present in typologically distant languages.

Литература

1. Кобякова І.К. Креативне конструювання вторинних утворень в англомовному дискурсі: Монографія. – Вінниця: Вид-во Нова книга, 2007. – 128 с.

2. Швачко С.А. Оязыковление концептосферы „Природа и человек": статус первичных и вторичных номинаций / Научный журнал: Культура народов Причерноморья. Симферополь. - 2008. -№ 142. - Т.2. – С.422-424.

3. Швачко С.О. Квантитативні одиниці англійської мови: перекладацькі аспекти / Швачко С.О. // Посібник. - Вінниця: Вид-во Нова книга, 2008. – 128 с.