

CORPUS APPROACH TO DEFINING A DOMINANT WAY OF ADEQUATE PROVERB TRANSLATION

V. Stepanov, Student;

S. Baranova, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor

Sumy State University,

2, Rymkogo-Korsakova St., Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

E-mail: vitalii.stepanov94@gmail.com; svitlanabaranova@gmail.com

The article deals with constructing an own strategy of defining a dominant way of adequate proverb translation into foreign languages, which is implemented within corpus, modeling and linguostatistic methods. A detailed theoretical and practical description of compiling and applying the researched proverb parallel corpus in the given field with respective statistic results of proverb-translation dominance are revealed in the paper as well.

Keywords: *proverb, proverb parallel corpus, adequate translation, translation dominance.*

Introduction. Within any language an important role is played by proverbs - brief statements revealing people's experience in a witty form. The article covers proverbs as a single set of units selected and compiled in a contrastive corpus of two languages - English and Ukrainian. Although proverbs have been already properly researched in terms of structure (M. F. Alefirenko, Zh. V. Koloiz, V. Mider, G. L. Permiakov, O. O. Potebnia, L. I. Taranenko, A. Teilor, V. M. Teliia, etc.), the mechanisms of defining their adequate-translation ways by corpus approaches is still studied not completely. That conditions **the research relevance**.

The subject matter is a proverb parallel corpus while **the specific research topic** consists in describing its applied potential from the perspective of the proverb-translation statistical analysis.

The issue of corpus applied use has been already researched by many scientists (O. Yu. Mordovin, O. V. Nagel, S. O. Savchuk, P. V. Sysoev, K. P. Sosnina, R. Carter, J. Leech, M. McCarthy, A. O'Keeffe, J. Sincler, etc.). Reviewing relevant recent corpus works allows forming own recommendations as to parallel-corpus engaging for proverb translation analysis and defining dominant ways of their adequate rendering into a foreign language. That is our **research objective** achieved by performing **the following tasks**:

1) to provide a theoretical interpretation of the concepts of adequate translation, proverb and parallel corpus;

2) to reveal the proverb-translation aspect: to point out traditional proverb-rendering techniques, to model an own algorithm for defining proverb adequate-translation dominance with conducting a further statistical corpus analysis and representing results in tables;

3) basing on the results, to single out the most dominant way of proverb adequate translation into a foreign language.

The research materials comprise a proverb parallel corpus compiled by us from the resources of relevant bilingual dictionaries.

The research methods include the modeling, registering and linguostatistic methods.

The research results. Human is a social creature whose full-fledged life requires communication that is information exchange. It happens quite often when humans are going to start communication being separated by different languages and cultures, which is called "the linguoethnic barrier" [1, p. 12]. Such an obstacle should be removed as quickly as possible for keeping contact and mutual understanding among communicants, which can be done by a language intermediary, or a translator.

© Stepanov V., Baranova S., 2017

Translators overcome the linguoethnic barrier in two ways: by adaptive transcoding or by translation. The difference between them is that the former reveals the initial content in a simplified form for keeping the communication aim while the latter conveys original content, structure and functions, which makes it a communicatively equal substitute for the original [2, p. 43–48]. That is why translation is the main form of language intermediation within bilingual communication.

Keeping original content, structure and functions is not a spontaneous requirement in the process of translation. In fact, the necessity to produce this three-component balance is conditioned by translation determinants (firstly, to preserve an equal regulatory source influence in the target text; secondly, to retain a semantic and structural source analogy in the target text) derived from the principle of its social destination- to produce an intermediate bilingual communication maximally assimilated to a simple monolingual one [1, p. 50],-which actualizes adapting a source text to a foreign-language communicative competence, namely to norms, usage and pre-informational stocks. The successful accomplishment of this task is possible due to two translation categories - equivalence and adequacy.

Equivalence is regarded as a content target-text correspondence to the source text [3, p. 415]. Depending on a situation the volume of keeping equivalence can vary, which makes it necessary to classify this category by amount of rendering the initial content into a target language, which in other words is called “equivalence levels” that are subdivided by V. N. Komissarov into five types [2, p. 51–79] with the indicated features in Table 1:

Table 1- Equivalence-Level Typology by V.N. Komissarov

Equivalence level	Amount of kept source content in target texts
First	Communication aim
Second	Communication aim, situation description
Third	Communication aim, situation description, way of situation description
Fourth	Communication aim, situation description, way of situation description, similar syntactic structures
Fifth	Communication aim, situation description, way of situation description, similar syntactic structures, similar word equivalents

Preserving equivalence in source and target texts differs depending on the structure of language systems and mechanisms of rendering content itself by corresponding languages, which makes some source-text fragments saved and some omitted in the process of translation for both revealing initial content with structure and providing a proper communicative effect. Such a need actualizes employing an additional translation category - adequacy.

Adequacy is treated as an exact source-text content transfer and its full-fledged functional-stylistic correspondence [4, p. 16]. Thus, equivalence conveys only source content while adequacy keeps its content, stylistic structure and communicative effect simultaneously. In other words, equivalence is an integral part of adequacy, which gives the latter a top priority in implementing text translations.

The adequacy category and translation determinants can be united together in one single notion of adequate translation offered by V. N. Komissarov, which is interpreted as a translation type performing pragmatic tasks on the appropriate equivalence level without violating language norms and usage as well as with observing genre-stylistic requirements to the given text and with corresponding to the conventional translation norm [3, p. 407]. From our perspective, such a term represents the best translation being a certain standard for a language mediator.

Adequate source-text rendering with preserving all text components (cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, situationality, informativity, intertextuality [5, p. 7–9]) as well as its adapting to a foreign-language communicative competence are impossible by only selecting translation equivalents because in the target language there is

often a lack of them within a given text. In such a case translators use some techniques of converting source content forms into similar target ones, which allows keeping adequacy successfully. These techniques are called “translation transformations”.

Translation transformations comprise changes on lexical, grammatical, lexical-grammatical and stylistic levels. Thus, there are lexical, grammatical, lexical-grammatical and stylistic translation transformations [2, p. 172; 6, p. 32–35; 7, p. 40, p. 97].

Transferring source content, structure and stylistic functions, even with involving translation transformations, is sometimes problematic when rendering some units that are used in speech as single blocks rather than created in it. These single units are regarded as phraseological ones being subdivided by pragmatic features into three groups [8, p. 180]- lexical, predicative and comparative phraseologisms.

Lexical phraseologisms semantically correlate with words being conceptually identical to them (*bone of discord, to make a mountain out of a molehill*). They are reproduced as ready lexical units being equivalent to parts of speech - noun, verb, etc. Their semantic indivisibility is revealed in a fixed single meaning. It is this single meaning rather than meaning of separate words that is realized in speech.

Predicative phraseologisms are judgments being automatic set sentences (*First catch your hare, First come, first served*). In other words, this group comprises proverbs, sayings, aphorisms reflecting people’s experience and wisdom.

Comparative phraseologisms are identified as set comparisons generated by one of two formulas: “adjective - conjunction - noun” (*cunning as a fox*), “verb - conjunction - noun” (*work like a horse*). The most typical conjunctions in such a case are the conjunction *as, like*.

Phraseologisms of each group have own ways of their rendering although in general they are united by the principle to keep the content, emotional-expressive and functional-stylistic components of a source set phrase [8, p. 181]. Such a requirement is especially important for proverbs, which actualizes a necessity to point out techniques of proverb translation with describing their essence.

According to V. S. Vinogradov, there are **five possible techniques of proverb translation** [8, p. 190–193]: full, partial, loan, pseudo-proverb and descriptive equivalents. Let us consider these techniques briefly.

The first proverb-translation technique is full equivalent. It is used when in the target language there is already a proverb being equal to the source one by its content, functions and stylistic features and matching the initial images fully or almost fully. In other words, the metaphor fixed in source and target proverbs is based on the same images (*Forewarned, forearmed-Заздалегідь попереджений - заздалегідь озброєний*).

The second proverb-translation technique is partial equivalent. In such a case a target proverb is equal to the source one by its content, functions and stylistic features but built on images being different from the initial ones (*Never offer to teach fish to swim- Не вчи вченого*).

The third proverb-translation technique is loan equivalent. It consists in rendering the source proverb into a target language by the word-for-word principle (*Kings have long arms-У королів довгі руки*). Sometimes the translated proverb preserves foreign color and realias (*Кто любит попа, а кто попадью – One man loves the pope and another – the pope’s wife*).

The fourth proverb-translation technique is pseudo-proverb equivalent. It is employed when in the target language there are no full or partial equivalents and provides for constructing a new proverb in a rhyme-rhythm form, which reveals with or without modifications initial images and content (*Do in Rome as Romans do – У кожному подвір’ї своє повір’я*).

The fifth proverb-translation technique is descriptive equivalent. It is engaged in the last case (when it is impossible to give other equivalents), which induces to reveal proverb essence in a descriptive way with losing all initial images (*Всяк сверчок знай свой шесток – Know your place*).

Proverbs belong to small-genre texts, which makes it impossible to research them as separate units. On the contrary, it is reasonable to research them as a huge group compiled by certain criteria into single sets that are called “corpora”.

Corpus is a machine-readable text set with an over-1000-word volume that is compiled for a maximum language representation [9, p. 48–49; 10, p. 197]. Each corpus has some features distinguishing it from other random text groups, namely:

- 1) representativeness (compiling corpora as to a certain criterion: genre, style, language period, etc.);
- 2) a machine-readable text form;
- 3) annotation (layout);
- 4) a multi-thousand-word size [11, p. 26].

Proverbs do not have direct translation equivalents whose absence makes it problematic to compile a corresponding corpus for further analysis. However, this obstacle can be overcome if we employ proverb bilingual dictionaries where there are proverbs with their ready foreign-language variants. From such dictionaries proverbs are selected by pairs “source proverb - target proverb”, which generates a contrastive proverb corpus that is called “parallel corpus”.

Parallel corpus is generally regarded as a set of source-language and target-language texts [12, p. 276–277]. A distinctive mark of such a corpus is “alignment” – a direct correspondence link between contrasted source and target units (sentences, paragraphs, texts, etc.). In this way one can contrast units of two, three, four or more languages.

Analyzing works of CIS and Western corpus researchers [13, p. 368–373; 14, p. 122–124; 15, p. 16–23] allows discerning possibilities of applying parallel corpora for different needs: compiling translation dictionaries, designing automatic machine-rendering programs with translation memory, teaching grammar and vocabulary, constructing translation exercises, researching linguistic phenomena, etc.

One of the branches of engaging parallel corpora is conducting linguostatistical researches. The main reason for such a parallel-corpus use is their representativeness, namely presence of some dominant features within corpus resources, which is a basis for further statistical record. In our research we are going to define the most dominant way of adequate proverb translation. This issue actualizes a necessity to establish a leading most-frequently-used proverb-translation technique and equivalence level. In our case they are regarded as the representative dominant proverb-rendering features within the given corpus and their combination in corpus proverb pairs will statistically reveal the most applied dominant translation way.

Defining dominant ways of translating proverbs adequately actualizes a question what algorithm allows performing their dominance statistical analysis. For this reason we offer involving **our own algorithm of defining a dominant way of adequate proverb translation**, which is implemented in the following six steps:

- 1) to compile a proverb parallel corpus for further researches;
- 2) to define which of five translation techniques is used for rendering each proverb;
- 3) to define which of five equivalence levels is used for rendering each proverb;
- 4) to display counting each translation technique and equivalence level in the table form;
- 5) to convert obtained table numbers into percentages and define a proverb-translation dominance order depending on the translation technique and equivalence level with the highest percentages;
- 6) in case of necessity - to compile an additional proverb parallel corpus with equivalents from another foreign language and repeat all five previous steps for comparing a dominant way of translating proverbs into one language with a dominant way of translating proverbs into another language.

The first algorithm step - to compile a proverb parallel corpus for further researches - is done by us ourselves: we generate a parallel corpus of 171 English-Ukrainian proverb pairs derived from the K. T. Barantsev’s English-Ukrainian Phraseology Dictionary [16]. The

total list of these parallel-corpus proverbs can be reviewed in Appendix A via the following reference: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4bPc2s3vyCEOW1KOEpVUVdGRFE/view?usp=sharing\[17\]](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4bPc2s3vyCEOW1KOEpVUVdGRFE/view?usp=sharing[17]).

Then we complete the second step - to define which of five translation techniques is used for rendering each proverb. That is based on rendering proverbs by full, partial, loan, pseudo-proverb or descriptive equivalents, which has been already revealed by us in the article above and makes no obstacles for defining translation techniques in each proverb.

However, certain difficulties hide in the third step - to define which of five equivalence levels is used for rendering each proverb - because nowadays it is unknown how it is possible to establish equivalence volume exactly for proverbs. Thus, we offer our own algorithm of defining proverb-translation equivalence levels, which is based on the V. N. Komissarov's equivalence features [2, p. 51–79] and further transformed by us into **five equivalence levels of adequate proverb translation**:

1) **first equivalence level**- proverb-directive rendering with full image loss (communication aim by V.N. Komissarov): *Better ask than go astray*- *Не соромся питати*;

2) **second equivalence level**-proverb-directive and proverb-content rendering by different images (communication aim, situation description by V. N. Komissarov): *A black hen lays a white egg*-*Чорна корова, та молоко біле*;

3) **third equivalence level**- proverb-directive and proverb-content rendering by similar images (communication aim, situation description, way of situation description by V. N. Komissarov): *Do not count your chickens before they are hatched* - *Курчат восени лічать*;

4) **fourth equivalence level** - proverb-directive and proverb-content rendering by similar images and syntactic structures (communication aim, situation description, way of situation description, similar syntactic structures by V. N. Komissarov): *Be swift to hear, slow to speak* — *Більше слухай, а менше говори*;

5) **fifth equivalence level**- proverb-directive and proverb-content rendering by similar images, syntactic structures and dictionary word equivalents (communication aim, situation description, way of situation description, similar syntactic structures, similar word equivalents by V. N. Komissarov): *Advice when most needed is least heeded*- *Пораду не слухають тоді, коли вона найбільш потрібна*.

The above-mentioned techniques and equivalence levels are to be defined in each of 171 proverb pairs (Table A.1 of Appendix A [17]), which is the fourth step with counting and adding them to Table 2:

Table 2 - Analyzing Techniques and Equivalence Levels of Adequate Proverb Translation from English into Ukrainian (on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)

	Amount	Equivalence levels				
		First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
Full equivalent (22 %)	38 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	4 (10 %)	6 (16 %)	28 (74 %)
Partial equivalent (44 %)	76 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	44 (58 %)	24 (32 %)	7 (9 %)	1 (1 %)
Loan equivalent (8 %)	13 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	1 (8 %)	0 (0 %)	12 (92 %)
Pseudo-proverb equivalent (15 %)	26 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	13 (50 %)	10 (38 %)	0 (0 %)	3 (12 %)
Descriptive equivalent (11 %)	18 (100 %)	4 (22 %)	8 (44 %)	6 (34 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
Total (100 %)	171 (100 %)	4 (2 %)	65 (38 %)	45 (26 %)	13 (8 %)	44 (26 %)

The obtained number and percentage results of analyzing techniques and equivalence levels show that in English-Ukrainian proverb translation the most frequently used technique is the partial equivalent (76 units of 171, 44 %) while the most frequently used equivalence level is the second (65 units of 171, 38 %). Overlaying such features on one another indicates that 44 English proverbs of 171 (26 % of 100 %) are translated into Ukrainian by the partial equivalent with the second equivalence level, which gets the first place within proverb-translation dominance.

Among the corpus-analysis results one can also see a prevailing character of the third and fifth equivalence levels whose values are 45 proverbs of 171 (26 % of 100 %) and 44 proverbs of 171 (26 % of 100 %) respectively. The third level dominates in the partial equivalent (24 units of 171, 14 % of 100 %), while the fifth level dominates in the full equivalent (28 units of 171, 16 % of 100 %), which provides the former with the third dominance place and the latter with the second dominance place.

Other equivalence levels - the first and the fourth one - have low values: 4 units of 171 (2 % of 100 %) and 13 units of 171 (8 % of 100 %) respectively. If we repeat overlaying them on prevailing translation techniques, we find out that the first level dominates in the descriptive equivalent (4 units of 171, 2 % of 100%) while the fourth level dominates in the full equivalent (6 units of 171, 3.5 % of 100 %) and partial equivalent (7 units of 171, 4 % of 100 %). That allows putting the latter on the fourth dominance place and the former on the fifth dominance place.

The interpreted and sorted proverb-translation dominance values are finally given in Table 3:

*Table 3 - Dominance of Translating Proverbs from English into Ukrainian
(on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)*

Dominance place	Equivalence level	Translation technique	Use frequency (numbers)	Use frequency (percentage)
1	Second	Partial equivalent	44	26 %
2	Fifth	Full equivalent	28	16 %
3	Third	Partial equivalent	24	14 %
4	Fourth	Partial equivalent	7	4 %
		Full equivalent	6	3.5 %
5	First	Descriptive equivalent	4	2 %
Rest	58 of 171; 34.5 % of 100 %			

Such results induce to a thought that the Ukrainian language tends towards rendering not only a proverb directive but also a proverb content with similar images, which is proved by keeping the top dominant equivalence levels (the second, fifth and third ones) and respective translation techniques (the full and partial equivalents). Thus, our conclusion as to the dominant way of adequate proverb translation from English into Ukrainian is a prevailing use of the partial equivalent with the second or third equivalence levels, namely source proverb-directive and proverb-content rendering by similar or modified images.

We have completed five steps of the modeled dominance algorithm. In order to confirm its all-purpose character we offer to perform the sixth step: compiling an additional proverb parallel corpus of English originals (from the K. T. Barantsev's English-Ukrainian Phraseology Dictionary [16]) and Russian equivalents (from the virtual corpus (the Internet) processed by the Yandex search engine). It covers 171 proverb pairs whose full list is given in Tables A.2.1–A.2.5 of Appendix A [17].

This new corpus is analyzed in the same way as previously - proverb-translation techniques and equivalence levels of each proverb are defined with displaying results in number and percentage forms that are shown in Table 4:

Table 4 - Analyzing Techniques and Equivalence Levels of Adequate Proverb Translation from English into Russian (on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)

	Amount	Equivalence levels				
		First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
Full equivalent (11 %)	19 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	4 (21 %)	2 (11 %)	13 (68 %)
Partial equivalent (54 %)	93 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	66 (71 %)	21 (23 %)	5 (5 %)	1 (1 %)
Loan equivalent (8 %)	14 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	2 (14 %)	0 (0 %)	12 (86 %)
Pseudo-proverb equivalent (22 %)	37 (100 %)	0 (0 %)	21 (57 %)	12 (32 %)	2 (5,5 %)	2 (5,5 %)
Descriptive equivalent (5 %)	8 (100 %)	2 (25 %)	6 (75 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
Total (100 %)	171 (100 %)	2 (1 %)	93 (54 %)	39 (23 %)	9 (5 %)	28 (17 %)

Table 4 establishes dominance of proverb-translation equivalence levels - second, third, fifth, fourth, first - that is recorded with respective rendering techniques in Table 5:

Table 5 - Dominance of Translating Proverbs from English into Russian (on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)

Dominance place	Equivalence level	Translation technique	Use frequency (numbers)	Use frequency (percentage)
1	Second	Partial equivalent	66	39%
2	Third	Partial equivalent	21	12%
3	Fifth	Full equivalent	13	7,6%
		Loan translation	12	7%
4	Fourth	Partial equivalent	5	3%
5	First	Descriptive equivalent	2	1%
Rest	52 of 171, 30.4 % of 100 %			

Table 5 reveals that in the Russian language dominance belongs to the second, third and fifth equivalence levels with partial or full equivalents, namely the tendency is similar to that one in the Ukrainian language: to convey a proverb directive with rendering a proverb content by similar or modified images. Thus, our conclusion as to a dominant way of adequate proverb translation into Russian is using the partial equivalent with keeping the second or third equivalence levels, which is identical to Ukrainian proverb-translation dominance.

Proverbs quite often behave like poetic-creativity objects when their directive and content are reproduced in a rhyme-rhythm form. It is explained by the fact that rhyme provides proverbs with better laconism for increasing the communicative effect, which makes us sort out dominant mechanisms of poetic proverb translation. This will be observed below.

Resorting to our methodology of defining a proverb-translation way - combination of a leading translation technique with a respective equivalence level, - we find it reasonable to use this method for poetic proverb rendering as well. The first component - a leading translation technique - is the pseudo-proverb equivalent whose notion provides for translating proverbs in a rhyme-rhythm form with conveying their content and keeping or modifying initial images. Thus, it is this translation technique which we will regard as dominant in the poetic proverb rendering.

However, there is a problem within the second component - a leading equivalence level. For its defining we are going to employ a proverb corpus analysis with our algorithm of analyzing equivalence levels again. Since there is a small amount of poetic proverb equivalents in the compiled corpus of Appendix A and treating poetic translation as a result of translator's creative skills, we find it necessary to compile a new corpus with pseudo-proverb equivalents. It comprises 171 triads: English source units from the K.T. Barantsev's English-Ukrainian Phraseology Dictionary [16] as well as Ukrainian and Russian target units created by us ourselves in a rhyme-rhythm form. The total list of these triads is given in Appendix B [17].

This pseudo-proverb corpus is analyzed, which allows establishing equivalence levels in each of 171 proverb triads. The received number and percentage results are revealed in Table 6:

Table 6 - Analyzing Equivalence Levels of Ukrainian and Russian Pseudo-Proverb Equivalents (on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)

	Amount	Equivalence levels				
		First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
Ukrainian variant	171 (100 %)	1 (1 %)	100 (58 %)	54 (32 %)	16 (9 %)	0 (0 %)
Russian variant	171 (100 %)	1 (1 %)	104 (61 %)	47 (27 %)	17 (10 %)	2 (1 %)

The obtained results of kept equivalence levels are to be arranged in a decreasing dominance order, which is shown in Table 7:

Table 7 - Dominance of Equivalence Levels in Ukrainian and Russian Pseudo-Proverb Equivalents (on the Basis of the Proverb Parallel Corpus)

Ukrainian variants (total amount - 171 proverbs)		
Dominance place	Equivalence level	Use frequency (numbers and percentage)
1	Second	100 (58 %)
2	Third	54 (32 %)
3	Fourth	16 (9 %)
4	First	1 (1 %)
5	Fifth	0 (0 %)
Russian variants (total amount - 171 proverbs)		
Dominance place	Equivalence level	Use frequency (numbers and percentage)
1	Second	104 (61 %)
2	Third	47 (27 %)
3	Fourth	17 (10 %)
4	Fifth	2 (1 %)
5	First	1 (1 %)

Table 7 convinces that priority among equivalence levels in the Ukrainian and Russian pseudo-proverb variants is given to the second level (58%, 100 units of 171 and 61 %, 104 units of 171 respectively) while the second place belongs to the third level (32 %, 54 units of 171 and 27 %, 47 units of 171 respectively). If we compare these results with the pseudo-proverb dominance of Appendix A (tables 2 and 4), we receive similar results: dominant equivalence levels of Ukrainian pseudo-proverbs are the second (50%, 13 units of 26) and third (38%, 10 units of 26), which coincides with equivalence dominance of Russian poetic variants (the second level: 57 %, 21 units of 37; the third level: 32 %, 12 units of 37).

Thus, we have all grounds to say that the dominant way of adequate poetic proverb rendering into a foreign language is using a pseudo-proverb translation technique with the

second or third equivalence levels. In other words, this way involves rhyme-rhythm forms with reproducing source directive and content by identical or different images.

Conclusions. Summing up the corpus-analysis results of adequate English-proverb translation into the Ukrainian and Russian languages, we provide proverbs with a tendency of unchanged or modified transfer of source images, which is realized as a dominant use of the second or third equivalence levels with the partial (for proverb translation in general) or pseudo-proverb (for poetic proverb translation in particular) techniques.

The future research prospects are studying dominant ways of rendering other small-genre texts (fables, parables, etc.).

КОРПУСНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ДОМІНАНТНОГО СПОСОБУ АДЕКВАТНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ПРИСЛІВ'ІВ

В. В. Степанов, студент;

С. В. Баранова, канд. філол. наук, доцент

Сумський державний університет,

вул. Римського-Корсакова 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна

E-mail: vitalii.stepanov94@gmail.com; svitlanabaranova@gmail.com

Стаття присвячена конструюванню власної стратегії визначення домінантного способу адекватного перекладу прислів'їв іноземною мовою, що реалізується в рамках корпусних і лінгвостатистичних методик, а також у руслі методу моделювання. Наводиться детальний теоретичний і практичний опис механізмів укладання та використання досліджуваного паралельного корпусу прислів'їв із репрезентацією відповідних статистичних результатів домінантності ініомовного відтворення паремій.

Ключові слова: *прислів'я, паралельний корпус прислів'їв, адекватний переклад, домінантність перекладу.*

КОРПУСНИЙ ПОДХІД К ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЮ ДОМИНАНТНОГО СПОСОБА АДЕКВАТНОГО ПЕРЕВОДА ПОСЛОВИЦ

В. В. Степанов, студент;

С. В. Баранова, канд. філол. наук, доцент

Сумський державний університет,

вул. Римського-Корсакова 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна

E-mail: vitalii.stepanov94@gmail.com; svitlanabaranova@gmail.com

Статья посвящена вопросам конструирования собственной стратегии определения доминантного способа адекватного перевода пословиц, что осуществляется посредством корпусных и лингвостатистических методик, а также при помощи метода моделирования. Приводится детальное описание теоретических и практических аспектов составления и использования исследуемого параллельного корпуса пословиц с репрезентацией соответствующих результатов доминантности иноязычного воспроизведения паремий.

Ключевые слова: *пословица, параллельный корпус пословиц, адекватный перевод, доминантность перевода.*

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Латышев Л. К. Технология перевода : учебное пособие по подготовке переводчиков (с немецким языком) / Л. К. Латышев. – Москва : НВИ–ТЕЗАУРУС, 2000. – 280 с.
2. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты) / В. Н. Комиссаров. – Москва : Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с.
3. Комиссаров В. Н. Современное переводоведение : учебное пособие / В. Н. Комиссаров. –Москва : ЭТС, 2002. – 424 с.
4. Алимов В.В. Теория перевода. Перевод в сфере профессиональной коммуникации : учебное пособие / В. В. Алимов. – 4-е изд., испр. – Москва : КомКнига, 2006. – 160 с.
5. Егорова М. А. Дискурс и текст в аспекте перевода / М. А. Егорова. – Воронеж : Воронежский государственный университет, 2003. – 51 с.
6. Науменко Л. Practical Course of Translation from English into Ukrainian : навч. посібник / Л. Науменко, А. Гордеева. – Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2011. – 136 с.

7. Толковый переводческий словарь / [сост. Л. Л. Нелюбин]. – 3-е изд., перераб. – Москва : Флинта : Наука, 2003. – 320 с.
8. Виноградов В. С. Введение в переводоведение (общие и лексические вопросы) / В. С. Виноградов. – Москва : Издательство института общего среднего образования РАО, 2001. – 224 с.
9. Baker P. A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics / P. Baker, A. Hardie, T. McEnery. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 187 p.
10. McEnery T. Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction / T. McEnery, A. Wilson. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2001. – 235 p.
11. Грудева Е. В. Корпусная лингвистика / Е. В. Грудева. – Москва : ФЛИНТА, 2012. – 165 с.
12. Lüdeling A. Corpus Linguistics. An International Handbook / A. Lüdeling, M. Kytö. – Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 2008. – 1353 p.
13. Кутузов А. Б. Корпусные методики в переводоведении и преподавании перевода / А. Б. Кутузов // Материалы международного научно-методического colloquium «Проблемы билингвизма в современном межкультурном дискурсе». – Пермь : ПГТУ, 2011. – С. 368–373.
14. Lexicology and Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction / [M. A. K. Halliday, W. Teubert, C. Yallop, A. Čermáková]. – London : Continuum, 2004. – 184 p.
15. Zanettin F. Corpora in Translator Education / F. Zanettin, S. Bernardini, D. Stewart. – Manchester : St. Jerome Publishing, 2003. – 153 p.
16. Англо-український фразеологічний словник / [уклад. К.Т. Баранцев]. – 2-ге вид., випр. – Київ : Товариство «Знання», КОО, 2005. – 1056 с.
17. Appendixes to the Article 'CORPUS APPROACH TO DEFINING A DOMINANT WAY OF ADEQUATE PROVERB TRANSLATION' [Electronic resource]. – Available : <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4bPc2s3vyCEOW1KOEpVUVdGRFE/view?usp=sharing>.

REFERENCES

1. Latyshev, L. K. (2000). *Tehnologiia perevoda* [Translation Technology]. Moscow, Russia: NVI – TEZARUS.
2. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). *Teoriia perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty)* [Translation Theory (Linguistic Aspects)]. Moscow, Russia: Vysshiaia shkola.
3. Komissarov, V. N. (2002). *Sovremenoe perevodovedenie* [Modern Translation Science]. Moscow, Russia: ETS.
4. Alimov, V. V. (2006). *Teoriia perevoda. Perevod v sfere profesionalnoi komunikatsii* [Translation Theory. Translation in Professional Communication] (4th ed., revised). Moscow, Russia: KomKniga.
5. Yegorova, M. A. (2003). *Diskurs i tekst v aspect perevoda* [Discourse and Text from the Translation Aspect]. Voronezh, Russia: Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet.
6. Naumenko, L., & Hordieieva, A. (2011). *Practical Course of Translation from English into Ukrainian*. Vinnytsia, Ukraine: Nova Knyha.
7. Neliubin, L. L. (Ed.) (2003). *Tolkovyi perevodcheskii slovar* [Explanatory Translation Dictionary] (3rd ed., revised). Moscow, Russia: Flinta: Nauka.
8. Vinogradov, V. S. (2001). *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie (obshie i leksicheskie voprosy)* [Introduction to Translation Science (General and Lexical Problems)]. Moscow, Russia: Izdatelstvo instituta obshchego srednego obrazovaniia RAO.
9. Baker, P. A., Hardie, A., & McEnery, T. (2006). *Glossary of Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
10. McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
11. Grudeva, Ye. V. (2012). *Korpusnaia lingvistika* [Corpus Linguistics]. Moscow, Russia: FLINTA.
12. Lüdeling, A., & Kytö, M. (2008). *Corpus Linguistics. An International Handbook*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
13. Kutuzov, A. B. (2011). *Korpusnye metodiki v perevodovedenii i v prepodavanii perevoda* [Corpus Methodology in Translation Science and Translation Teaching]. Proceedings of International Scientific and Methodical Colloquium “Problemy Bilingvizma v Sovremennom Mezhdokulturnom Diskurse” (pp. 368–373). Perm, Russia: PGU.
14. Halliday, M. A. K., Teubert, W., Yallop, C., & Čermáková, A. (2004). *Lexicology and Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction*. London, UK: Continuum.
15. Zanettin, F., Bernardini, S., & Stewart, D. (2003). *Corpora in Translator Education*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
16. Barantsev, K. T. (Ed.) (2005). *English-Ukrainian Phraseology Dictionary* (2nd ed., revised). Kyiv, Ukraine: Tovarystvo “Znannia”, KOO.
17. Appendixes to the Article: *Corpus Approach to Defining a Dominant Way of Proverb Adequate Translation*. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4bPc2s3vyCEOW1KOEpVUVdGRFE/view?usp=sharing>

Received: April 16, 2017