

IGOR PANASIUK

ORCID 0000-0002-0121-8058

(Франкфурт (Одер)) (Frankfurt (Oder))

Place of work: Jacob from Paradise Academy Gorzów Wielkopolski, Poland;

European University Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

Country: Germany

Email: igor_panasiuk@wp.pl

TRANSLATION PROCESS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF POLYVARIETY OF TRANSLATION

Автор статті розглянув проблематику процесу перекладу в аспекті перекладознавчої дидактики. Підхід до дослідження процесу перекладу полягає у визначенні когнітивних механізмів процесу перекладу, які перекладач спостерігає в момент перекладацького акту. Це положення дозволяє використовувати психолінгвістичні аспекти процесу перекладу на практичних заняттях при підготовці майбутніх перекладачів, тому що окремі когнітивні механізми процесу перекладу можна свідомо спостерігати й так розвивати шляхом тренінгу.

Ключові слова: процес перекладу; когнітивні та психолінгвістичні процеси перекладу; психосемантична модель перекладу; креативність перекладу; поліваріантність перекладу; варіативність; лакуна.

The field of scientific interest of this study concerns the theory of translation. The research focuses on the process of translation in its psycholinguistic, cognitive and semiotic aspects. While observing students at the Institute of Translation and Interpreting at the Department of Russian language at the University of Heidelberg the author of this study came up with the idea to describe the process of translation, which consists of some conscious cognitive processes, in order to apply these to the translators' and interpreters' training.

The theoretical basis taken for the concept of polyvariety of translation is the postulate under which essentially the entirety of translation and interpreting (T&I) theory can be subsumed – Roman Jakobson's eminent postulate of "equivalence in difference". This postulate firstly states the relation between source and target, which is based on a difference, i.e. on an implicative relation in the semiotic sense, and secondly equivalence consists in a diversity of translation variants which are in a relationship of difference to the original, since the translator understands partly unconsciously and partly consciously; always selectively and purposefully; partly cognitively and partly intuitively; always subjectively" (Kautz, 2002, p. 66), which permits the availability of multiple translations of one and the same text by different translators with comparable translation competence which in their totality establish the polyvariety of translation. Each of the translation variants is distinguished by a certain semantic degree of approximation to the original.

In the first step of this study, an attempt has been made to describe polyvariety as a process of translation from a cognitive-semiotic viewpoint. The study centres on the cognitive-semiotic process of determining translation units which Wolfram Wilss (1992, p. 132) also terms the method of intuitively determined translation units which is founded upon the mechanism of probability forecasting. This circumstance is reinforced by the fact that literary texts are characterised by "low-probability collocations" (Catford, 1965, p. 102), where the collocation can be regarded as the minimum unit of translation. The main idea of the presented approach to studying the translation process can be traced to the notion that the progression of the process of translation exhibits clear identities with the progression of the process of interpreting. Proof of this can be observed in the creolian style of translating - sight translation -, which, in my view, embodies elements of translation and of interpreting. An irrefutable confirmation of this hypothesis is provided by the translation method practised by the renowned Dostoyevski translator Svetlana Geier. The motto of her translation method was "eyes up when translating!", which refers to the process of internalisation of the content of the text passage to be translated. The internalisation of the content is from the outset associated with the process of mental translation which accompanies the process

of understanding (the process of internalising). Indeed, the relation between the two processes is a reciprocal one through which an ongoing verification of translation variants found by the translator takes place. This insight is founded on Roman Jakobson's thesis, which states that understanding is translating: It becomes possible to understand a sign only once the sign is recognised as a sign by being translated into another sign. The process of understanding is thus an unlimited process of translating signs into other signs, which in Semiotics is regarded as unlimited semiosis. This fact is what allows Svetlana Geier to dictate the text just having translated it mentally. Thus she performs a quasi-interpreting task which can immediately be applied for actual translation. Svetlana Geier is herself aware of the ubiquity of translation processes in that she sees them in every form of communication, which can only function through an understanding which is achieved in an unlimited translation process. The fact that a cognitive mechanism with an identical progression is inherent to all types of T&I also proves to be of benefit in the didactic regard. A mutually fruitful influence of the T&I types – translation and interpreting- on one another, highlighted by conscious sensitisation to the individual cognitive mechanisms of the T&I process when teaching translation, contributes to the development of a T&I competence in the area of simultaneous interpreting as well as in the area of translation. A professional conference interpreter ought first and foremost to be able to translate. This insight has been repeatedly substantiated didactically (see Miram 2010). The translation process as semiosis is therefore unable to be explained by the currently existing linear models of the T&I process, which tend to relativise the nature of the translation process and are thus hardly suitable for application in the teaching of translation. To make the translation process comprehensible for didactic purposes, the model of translation which should be constructed is one that would subsume all cognitive mechanisms that ought to be consciously tangible to the budding translator. Such a model has been developed and described by Krajev (1989, p. 5ff.) – in my view, it presents a real T&I situation in which, particularly for interpreting, as Krajev puts it, the psychosomatic processes of reception of the source text combine with the processes of the actual act of translating, which is true of the nature of semiosis. This is what is termed the reference phase of the translation act, which encompasses the cognitive processes of perception, constitution of sense, empathy, of mental translation into internal speech, of sense verification (mental translation into the target language). The reference phase of the translation act continues to be exemplified by way of the example of sight interpreting according to Weber (1990, h. 44ff.), in which the constitution of sense proceeds in a temporary sequence by conceptualisation and subsequent expression. How the process of conceptualisation progresses temporally in the text paradigm can be illustrated by the process and also by the mechanism of probability forecasting. Probability forecasting, anticipation, is readily observable in simultaneous interpreting. It is, however, also inherent to the translation process. After all, the unlocking of the content of the text to be translated progresses exactly the same way in the translation process as it would in simultaneous interpreting in fast motion, i.e. with differing effort of cognition in grasping meanings, which is also of eminent significance to the teaching of translation. The probably is thus associated with the translator's attempts to convey the content of the text being translated. An approximation of the original, as expressed by Svetlana Geier (2010) in the metaphor of a yearning for the unequalled original, can arise only through the probability of the translator's decision-making in each act of translation, which can also be measured semantically as a degree of probability. Probability as a psychological phenomenon can thus be comprehended with the semantic categories, which is expressed in the difference of the denotative structure (lacuna) of meanings at the two poles of the translation act. Hence the probability forecast is none other than the process of semiosis per se, which constantly moves between the two codes by way of the mechanism of code switching, according to Min'jar-Beloručev (1996). The skill of switching from one code to the other ought to be developed into a connotative flexibility of meanings on the part of budding translators and interpreters, which is what Pavel Palažčenko (2002), personal interpreter for Mikhail Gorbachev and Eduard Shevardnadze, advocates. According to Seměnova (1989, p. 31ff.), this is possible only through the development of interlingual semantic fields in the consciousness of translators. Thus translation as a decision-making process is characterised by a certain degree of probability. Here the probability turns out to be a cognitive source for the polyvariety of translation, for each approximation of the original is completed by deciding on a certain translation variant. The

reference phase of the translation process is thus divided into the probability forecast (constitution of sense, conceptualisation) and anticipatory synthesis (verification, mental translation into the target language), according to Zimnjaja and Černov (1972). The way in which constitution of sense functions in the form of the probability forecast can be observed from a semiotic perspective in the processes of semiosis, which also constitute the mechanisms of the translation act in the cognitive sense, to which budding translators and interpreters ought to be sensitised when being taught translation. In the case of the professional translator, switching on the mechanism of the probability forecast is supposed to evoke a range of translation variants triggered in the form of a mental chain reaction. Through this, polyvariety is already pre-programmed, and each of the variants is underpinned by a certain probability. The endlessness of this process is guided by criteria of decision-making – adequacy and equivalence. Translation as semiosis is based on what are termed the interpretation processes. Hence, according to Siever (2010, p. 342), the constitution of sense happens through the implicative processes derived as a consequence of inferences from certain premises. Thus the implication stands as the conclusion of the inferential processes. Consequently, implication is the process of finding the interpretant for the sign in the process of semiosis, which also applies to the probability forecast. The interpretation of the sign is thus made possible through the inferential structure of the sign, which also supplies the prerequisite for the further progression of the probability forecast. According to Siever (1996, p. 169ff.), the relationship between the original and the translation is based on implication, which is always characterised by a difference which, in turn, stands as the premise for the translation process. The relationship between the two poles of a translation act thus lies in the process of interpretation, the result of which can (but need not necessarily) also be a relation based on equivalence. Implication, which, in contrast to equivalence, is distinguished by a unilateral character in the translation process and thus always yields a difference, is the source of the variant relationships between source and target. According to Chernov (1991, p. 27ff.), the character of implication explains the law of diversity of translation units. According to Reiss (1980, p. 63ff.), the probability forecast is also made possible through the translator's ability to recognise the further progression of the context as a presage. Here abduction provides an assumption of hypotheses which also allow the progression of the probability forecast. The progression of the probability forecast, which in Psychology is based on the anticipatory depiction of reality and the raising, in anticipation of the speech signal, of a content-related hypothesis, is here set in train through the descent into the deep structures of the source text, through marking a series of sense points (Sorokin 1985) or of content-related orientation points (Širjaev 1979), i.e. through determining the depth of the hypothesis step – in a word, through ascertaining predication. Predication implies the process of transition to the level of sense, i.e. departing the level of linguistic structures. In a sense, the process of predication can also be compared with the process of implication. Predication, in my view, reaches beyond the interpretations of the one sign, its implication. Hence predication is a fragment of the context, which is founded on multiple implicative processes. The process of decision-making when translating is introduced by Shveicer's definition of the translation process, in which he sees the process of variable magnitudes and broad options for paraphrasing (contextual synonymy) which determine the inconsistency of the translator's decisions and which can lead from one utterance to multiple "correct" translation variants. Here Švejcer (1973, p. 71) refers to Jiří Levý's (1967/1969) approach to translation as a decision process which, according to him, progresses according to the rules of a game. The factors of decision-making in this context are of a functional nature. In concluding this chapter, the presentation of the translation process is topped off with a new perspective on a phenomenon which is the subject of dispute in translation theory - the translation unit. The mechanism of the translation process is thus attributed to the method of ascertaining translation units, which is based on the probability forecast. Following Stepanov (1965, p. 258f), the translation unit is defined as a dynamic process of sense recognition in a temporal sequence which is contingent upon the translator's competence in being able to determine the function of the text segment, which the translator is able to perceive within the temporal difference (temporal distance) between receiving this text segment in the original and producing it in the target language. The translation unit is recognised by ascertaining the predication which constitutes a translation act. A translation unit can also be viewed in collocation. Here the probability forecast is oriented to recognising translation units, which takes place in the act of translating.

Kussmaul

(1980, p. 29ff.) sees the translation unit in the illocution of a linguistic utterance with the aid of which the predication can be ascertained. The probability forecast is thus the cognitive mechanism of capturing sense, which not only constitutes the translation process but can also be applied as semiosis in other areas of sense recognition, e.g. in reading the somatic chart of an ill patient and describing disease profiles.

In the second step of this study, a brief survey has been undertaken of the problems of Cognitive Translation Studies in terms of the polyvariety of translation. Attention has been paid to the cognitive and psycholinguistic guidelines of the development of Soviet Translation Studies, which has concerned itself with the relevant topic area within the scope of Linguistic Translation Theory since the late 1960s, in contrast to German Cognitive Translation Studies, which appeared in the mid-1980s. The cognitive change in Russian Translation Studies began with the study of the translation process as a speech activity. The foremost advocate of this movement was Yuri Kuzmin (1968), who advocated the development of the psycholinguistic model of the translation process as speech activity. Here the insights of Russian Psycholinguistics, which at that point in time was in its ascendancy as the Theory of Speech Activity, have been applied. The psycholinguistic aspects of the process of understanding are also examined. The central distinction here is that between meaning and sense. According to Vygotski, the latter refers to the individual use of the meaning of a word, while Alefirenko (2006: 46) sees the meaning in its contextual use, which is composed of the stable and variable components. Thus the sense arises in the process of speech activity, of communication, the result of which is the context in which the semantic conditions for establishing the sense are present. The variable, changing component is distinguished by a dynamic character. This semantic ambiguity of the lexical meaning makes it possible to draw a distinction between equivalence and variance in the translation process. The latter, through its contextually synonymous nature, provides the possibility of polyvariety of translation. The centre point of the psycholinguistic approach to studying the translation process is the problematics of the sign relation, the relation of form and content which Kuzmin (1975, p. 3ff.) defines as a psycholinguistic problem. In this regard, it is worth mentioning the translation process of Eugenio Coseriu (1969, p. 104ff.) in which the translation process divides into two phases – semasiology and onomasiology of the text. The two phases - de-lingualisation and lingualisation – are the translator's pathway from the form of the text being translated to the content and from the content to the form in formulating the translation. Thus Vygotski (1968) sees in the sign a mental basis for the human being's thought activity. The human being creates a sign and applies it. The latter is what Vygotski calls the process of signification. In order to perform this mental activity, the human being utilises signs as tools, and it is from this that Vygotski derives the instrumental function of the sign. In the application of signs, the process of insight expresses itself. Here thinking functions as a derivation function of the verbal sign. This kind of attention to the psycholinguistic research works on Semiotics can be explained by the nature of the sign itself, which constitutes the interface between Psychology and Semiotics and which is regarded both as a psychological arsenal and as a semiotic one, consequently justifying the two approaches to studying the mental nature of lexical meaning: The denotative structure of a linguistic sign has anchored within it the mental structure or the mental nature of a lexical meaning. Thus thinking takes place through applying linguistic signs. According to Zvegintsev (1967, p. 2439), in the thought process the human being operates with semantic fields which coalesce into interlingual semantic fields in the translation process. The capturing of sense takes place through applying signs, which becomes possible through the probability structure of language. Hans Hörmann (1967, p. 185) continues to probe the exact foundations of the psycholinguistic mechanism of the probability forecast. In communication, sense is captured through generating a probability forecast which consummates itself on the basis of associations or of the associative meaning. A stimulus within a context triggers certain associations which arise in the form of responses. Two stimuli have the same associative meaning if they elicit identical responses, according to Deese (1962, p. 163). The interrelation between the associative responses is thus the associative meaning of the stimulus in question. It is common knowledge that associative meaning is the basis of synonymy. The associative relationships between the individual meanings in the scope of a context thus determine the probability of occurrence of the words in that particular context or cotext, which shapes the frequency or probability structure of the linguistic world. Here Hörmann speaks of

the probabilistic laws of an individual linguistic event. The probability forecast is the effect of certain events on later events and circumstances within a linguistic sequence. This is explained in sequential Psycholinguistics with the aid of the finite Markov state model: A linguistic event consists of structural sequences which are distinguished through a redundant character, i.e. are sufficiently informative to be able to be used for making inferences in regard to later events. The lower informativeness (redundancy) per unit facilitates and improves a translator's understanding performance. The probability structure of language is linked to genuine language with the concept of the approximation of different degrees of order. The approximation takes place through gradation from the senseless to the sensible and takes the form of a degree of approximation, a transition probability. The higher degree of approximation to the sensible (to genuine language) contributes to a higher degree of context-determinedness. In the case of the translation process, the issue is the meeting of criteria of adequacy of the translation in relation to the original.

In step 3 of this study, attention has been paid to the cognitive-semantic mechanisms of the phenomenon of polyvariety of translation. The nature of this phenomenon, which is inherent to the translation process per se, is founded in the phenomenon of synonymy. Here interlingual contextual synonymy serves as a frame for the adequacy of all possible translation variants in regard to the original. As far back as Gauger (1972, p. 57f), the synonymy of various linguistic means for the content to be conveyed in the translation process presupposes the situation of choice or decision. As a consequence, each time we become conscious of a linguistic utterance, synonymy is activated. Eco sees in interlingual contextual synonymy the possibility of a translation. The relationship of interlingual synonymy between the original utterance and that of the translation establishes the relation of variety or variance. A set of translation variants is viewed as translational variety or as polyvariety which is founded in interlingual contextual synonymy. Here variance is regarded as a semantic gradation of equivalence which is bound to the denotative structure of lexical meaning and, as a consequence, is measured by the intensity of the lacuna. Here Haure (2006, p. 72f) speaks of the variance demands which found Wolfram Wilss' metaphor of the translator as "adventurer of difference" in the sense of the polyvariety of translation. The relation of variance in the translation process continues to be illustrated with the concept of homology of Lance Hewson and Jacky Martin (1991, p. 47f). A homology arises on the basis of contextual synonymy which, in the act of translating, transitions into interlingual contextual synonymy. The role of intuition in the translation process has also been treated, with the latter being regarded, according to Göpferich (2008, p. 165), as an intuitive-cognitive process in its mutual alternation. Here Hans G. Hönl (1995, p. 56) uses the concept of associational competence, which also proves especially important when anticipating, is situated at the very beginning of the translation process and, moreover, is of particular relevance in the didactic regard. The graduability of polyvariety of translation is the semantic gradation of variance. This continues to be treated in terms of the creativity of translation. In this regard, Hönl & Kussmaul (1982, p. 58) develop a maxim of the necessary degree of differentiation or precision "The necessity of setting the degree of differentiation is linked to the probability forecast in the course of the translation act". This is then also coupled with semantic gradation of the creativity of translation. The strategy of the necessary degree of differentiation is also referred to as the necessary more-or-less principle. In determining the necessary degree of differentiation, the translation act is consummated, i.e. the semantic intensity of a lacuna is set in the translation act. The degree of differentiation is thus measured by the semantic intensity of the lacuna. In the end, it is the degree of differentiation that states the attempt or degree of approximation to the original, which proves to be the result of the probability forecast made by the translator. Accordingly, the equivalence relation is evaluated as 'underdifferentiated' or 'overdifferentiated' if the matter is one of semantic underdifferentiation or overdifferentiation of the core idea of an original scene. Here an adequate translation variant is evaluated as 'sufficiently differentiated' or 'sufficiently accurate'. The necessary degree of differentiation of the translation act also exhibits a kindred relation to the Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986), which have been successfully applied to translation theory by Gutt (1991/1993). The principle of relevance is context-dependent. According to the degree of relevance able to be achieved in a context, a verbal utterance can vary, which is regarded as the most important factor for understanding the nature of the translation process. The degree of optimal relevance entirely equates to the necessary degree of differentiation of verbalisation in the translation process. The creativity of translation is thus one of the aspects of the polyvariety of

translation. The cognitive mechanism of translation creativity shall now be dealt with in detail. The creativity of translation shall be presented in cognitive-semantic terms, following Kussmaul (2000). This phenomenon, which is difficult to define, is explained in the translational sense using the inventory of prototype systematics and the scenes-and-frames model. In treating translation creativity, Kussmaul centralises the lateral thinking introduced into the creativity research of Edward de Bono (1979, p. 146). This is a vertical style of thinking which goes beyond the boundaries of individual categories, breaks through them, thereby opening new perspectives and joins the categories which at first glance are irreconcilable. Kussmaul sees creative translation as translation which presents something new, though the translation ought to be semantically appropriate to the original. Thus creativity is a psychological or psycholinguistic phenomenon. The phenomenon of creativity fulfils itself through what are known as cognitive category jumps, which take place within the scope of the prototypical scenario. In the process, the cognitive scene elements are linked to one another within the scope of one and the same prototypical scenario. According to Lakoff (1980, 1987), the scenario is composed of metaphor components between which there exists a relationship of association, which can equate to a semantic word field. The scenario can, however, be construed far more broadly than a semantic word field, i.e. it may link together semantic elements from different word fields in the scope of a context. Such meaning links are what Lakoff terms chaining of categories. If categories from different semantic word fields are linked together, then the translator is performing a metaphoric category jump, thus performing a creative translation act. Kussmaul observes such acts of translator creation when analysing records of thinking aloud. A category jump as an expression shift can be measured through the semantic intensity of a lacuna. Thus a leap of thought results from a chain or concatenation of variants which progresses according to the principle of connectionism. Such a concatenation arises as a consequence of the probability forecast, which proceeds by way of determining the prototypicality of the contextually bound meaning. The prototype thus acts as a vehicle of the probability forecast. The fuzziness of the prototype makes it possible to break through the referential usability of a lexical meaning. The prototype semantic chaining organisation principle of meanings by core and peripheries is further supplemented by Kussmaul through Charles Fillmore's scenes-and-frames model (1977, p. 63). According to Kussmaul, the translation process is understanding by means of scenic ideas and simultaneously the verbalisation of these scenic ideas. According to Vermeer (1992, p. 77), a scene possesses a two-dimensional structure, i.e. it is composed of cognitive, that is to say referential elements and evaluative, axiological elements. These elements are associations rooted in culture, situation and disposition. As a consequence, the prototype is a culture-specific central scene which can also take the form of culture-specific visualisations. Being able to generate these visualisations in the course of understanding the text to be translated is also of major significance in the didactic regard. According to Vannerem and Snell-Hornby (1986/1994, p. 186), the mutual activation of scenes and frames in the translation process progresses with varying degrees of complexity, the cause of which may lie in the lexical incongruencies of different languages. The balancing out of this incompleteness takes place through conveying broader scenes through a narrower frame (channel reduction), i.e. the conception of the whole in a part as well as through channel modification where a frame exhibits elements of meaning not present in the particular scene. What takes place, then, is the modification of a scene, which Vermeer and Witte (1990, p. 82) term channel amplification. Consequently, the T&I process can be conceptualised as a progression of scenes and frames production and reception through channel reduction and channel amplification. Thus, a creative category jump takes place through the utilisation of lateral thinking by the T&I practitioner, termed a "lateral thinker" by Albrecht Neubert (1986, p. 100) in his concept of translational relativity. This means that the T&I practitioner ought not to become prematurely set on certain structures of the source text, which would obscure the view of creative solutions, but ought rather to identify a certain relativity of these structures, their validity or their preliminariness, in order to retain his view of the other options for the translation process to progress. The source-language sequence to be reconstructed or created anew in the translation process is what Neubert sees as the unit of translation. Hence the cognitive category jump is to be regarded as a signal of the presence of a translation unit. In this connection, reference is made to Edward de Bono's principle of the development of alternatives, in which shift of perspective and change of focus contribute to the development of new alternatives in the translation process. Furthermore, attention will be devoted

to the three conditions for achieving semantic adequacy according to Kussmaul (2000: 127): 1. Presence of prototypical target-language frames for one or more source-language scenes, 2. Replacement of a scene with a core element of that particular scene, 3. Replacement of the source-language frame with one or more core elements of the target-language scene. Next, Kussmaul identifies four options for achieving creativity of translation: 1. Conveying a frame using a frame, 2. a frame using a scene, 3. a scene using a scene and 4. a scene using a frame. In conclusion, the problematics of translation theory are discussed. The view of Maria Piotrowska's (2007, p. 67) translation strategy has been critically evaluated and translating strategies and a distinction drawn between methods, processes, techniques, transformations in the translation process.

In step 4 of this study, the translation experiment has been presented as a translation method and as a process in its inner and outer form (introspective or prospective as well as retrospective view of the translation process) taking as an example the analysis of translation notes or rough copies and translation reports. The essence of the translation experiment establishes what is known as the stylistic experiment of Peškovskij (1930/2007). The stylistic experiment was introduced to translation research by the Soviet and Russian translation scholar Feodorov (1969). It commences whenever the translator makes the choice of different translation variants, guided by an interpretation of the original. That is to say that the implicative processes of meaning interpretation always result in interlingual synonymy, which always produce a difference in regard to the original. The significance of this fact to translation is the need always to avoid the literalness which ensues from imitating the content, or even the grammar, of the original, broaches the range of the direct equivalence relation and declares the carrying out of the stylistic experiment, and thus of the translational experiment, an impossibility. So, the stylistic experiment consists in the substitution test of different variants, among them some failed ones, and in investigating the causes of this failure, which explain the success, the coherence of a text. Evaluation of stylistic shifts, or of shifting stylistic proportions, is made possible by the stability (homogeneity) of the logical content and the synonymy of its linguistic means. The stylistic experiment regarded as the work method and means of analysing and evaluating artistic language is based on the linguistic experiment which works with elements of a language (morphemes, words, word combinations etc.) and trials the feasibility of a particular linguistic model by using it in work combinations and sentences. The stylistic experiment is thus used in the area of speech as well as in that of text, while the linguistic experiment pertains to the area of language as a system. The carrying out of the translation experiment has been demonstrated using numerous examples from translation competitions and also analysis of translation reports and notes, which have yielded their largely stylistic inadequacy. The reasons lie in a lack of translational competence on the part of the translators who participated in the competitions. Analysis of these translation attempts was done in the course of the translational experiment. Furthermore, the individual translators of repute, in their translation reports, have detailed their arduous toil in translating various literary works. The cognitive processes of understanding and translating were able to be observed in these translation reports and described using the theoretical insights of the present study. Translation roughs which proved especially interesting and fruitful were those of Karl Dedecius' translation of the "Affenspiegel" satirical commentaries by Adolf Nowaczyński, in which the translation process was able to be identified in its dynamics. By comparing changes in the translation roughs in relation to the original and comparing the published final version with the translation variants, the implicative processes of meaning interpretation in the course of the probability forecast were able to be clearly evidenced. One of the sources of polyvariety of translation is the translator's individual style. In the sub-chapter on Boris Pasternak, the individual style of Pasternak is illustrated by comparison to Radlova, as is that of Marina Tsvetayeva by contrast to Lev Ginzburg, and this is described as another potential cause of polyvariety of translation.

In conclusion, didactic reflections have been undertaken in step 5 on the cognitive-semiotic presentation of the translation process. The didactic relevance of sight translation has again been dealt with in detail. Furthermore, the inference types, such as presupposition and implicature, have been presented as means of sense interpretation and mechanisms of probability forecasting in the act or translating, and translation drills by Christiane Nord (1996, p. 321f) intended to heighten budding translators' sensitivity to the polyvariety of translation have been exemplified.

REFERENCES

- Alefirenko, N. F. (2005a). *Spornye problemy semantiki [Controversial problems of semantics]*. Moskva [in Russian].
- Alefirenko, N. F. (2005b). *Sovremennye problemy nauki o iazyke [Modern problems of the science of language]: učebnoe posobie*. Moskva: Flinta: Nauka [in Russian].
- Alefirenko, N. F. (2006). Kognitivnaia semantika: mif ili realnost' [Cognitive semantics: myth or reality]. *Vestnik TGPU. Seria: Gumanitarnye nauki (filologija) [Bulletin of the Tomsk State Pedagogical University. Series Humanities (philology)]*, 5 (56), 43-48 [in Russian].
- Bono de, Edward. (1979). *Word Power. An Illustrated Dictionary of Vital Words*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Catford, J. C. (1965/1969). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London
- Chernov, Ghelly V. (1991). Cognitive and Pragmatic Inferencing and the Intercultural Component in Translation. In Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (Ed.), *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies* (pp. 27-34). Selected Papers of the TRANSIF Seminar, Sanvonlinna 1988. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. (1969). Bedeutung und Bezeichnung im Lichte der strukturellen Semantik. In Hartmann, P. Vernay, H. (Hrsg.): *Sprachwissenschaft und Übersetzen*. Symposium an der Universität Heidelberg, 24.2 – 26.2.1969. (pp. 104-121). Max Hueber Verlag München.
- Deese, Jame. (1962). On the structure of associative meaning. *Psychological Review*, 69, 161-175.
- Fedorov, M. V. (1969). K voprosu o stilisticheskom eksperimente [On the question of a stylistic experiment]. In *Voprosy teorii i istorii iazyka [Questions of theory and history of language]: sbornik statei, posviashchennykh pamiati V. A. Larina* (pp. 114-119). Leningrad [in Russian].
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1977). Scenes-and-frames semantics. In A. Zampolli (Hrsg.), *Linguistic Structures Processing* (pp. 55-81). Amsterdam.
- Gauger, Hans-Martin. (1972). *Zum Problem der Synonymie. Avec un résumé en français: Apport au problème des synonymes*. Tübingen.
- Geier, Swetlana. (2010). *Ein Leben zwischen den Sprachen. Russisch-deutsche Erinnerungsbilder aufgezeichnet von Taja Gut*. Pforte Verlag Dornach.
- Göpferich, Susanne. (2008). *Translationsprozessforschung. Stand, Methoden, Perspektiven*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Gutt, Ernst-August. (1991/1993). *Translation and Relevance. Cognition and Context*. Blackwell Oxford UK and Cambridge USA.
- Haure, Octavia (2006): Towards an Understanding of the Structural Gap. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 72-109. Retrieved from http://www.jostrans.org/issue05/art_haure.pdf.
- Hewson, L., Martin, J. (1991). *Redefining Translation. The Variational Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Hönig, G. Hans/Kußmaul, Paul. (1982). *Strategie der Übersetzung. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Darmstadt.
- Hönig, Hans G. (1995). *Konstruktives Übersetzen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg (Translation Bd. 1)
- Hörmann, Hans. (1967). *Psychologie der Sprache*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York
- Jakobson, Roman. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. *Brower ed.*, 232-239.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1959/1988). Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung. In Holenstein, Elmar (Ed.): *Roman Jakobson. Semiotik. Ausgewählte Texte 1919-1982*. Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1979): Linguistik und Poetik. In *Poetik. Ausgewählte Aufsätze 1921-1971* (pp. 83-121). Frankfurt am Main.
- Kautz, Ulrich. (2002). *Handbuch Didaktik des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*. Goethe-Institut. 2 Auflage. München: Iudicium.
- Kraev, V. L. (1989). Nekotorye aspekty perevodcheskoi deiatelnosti kak psikhologicheskogo protcessa [Some aspects of translation activity as a psychological process]. In Chernov, G. V. (Ed.), *Kommunikationnyi invariant perevoda v tekstakh raznykh zhanrov [Communicative translation invariant in texts of different genres]: sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (Is. 343, pp. 5-11). Moskva [in Russian].
- Kußmaul, Paul, (1980). Der Sprechakt als Übersetzungseinheit. In Wolfgang Kühlwein & Albert Raasch (Hrsg.): *Sprache und Verstehen: Kongressberichte der 10. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistik GAL, e. V., Mainz 1979* (Band II, pp. 29-41).
- Kußmaul, Paul. (2000a). *Kreatives Übersetzen*. Tübingen.
- Kuzmin, Ju. G. (1968). K voprosu o predmete i metode teorii perevoda [On the subject and method of translation]. In *Voprosy teorii i praktiki nauchno-technicheskogo perevoda [Questions of theory and practice of scientific and technical translation]*. Leningrad [in Russian].
- Kuzmin, Ju. G. (1975). Perevod kak myslitelno-rechevaia deiatelnost (k voprosu ob obshchei teorii perevoda) [Translation as a mental-speech activity (on the question of the general theory of translation)]. In *Tetrady perevodchika [Translator's notebooks]* (Is. XII, pp. 3-19). Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia [in Russian].
- Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.

- Levý, Jiří. (1967). Translation as a decision process. In *To honour Roman Jakobson* (Vol. II The Hague, pp. 1171-1182).
- Levý, Jiří. (1967/1981). Übersetzung als Entscheidungsprozess. In Wolfram Wilss (Hrsg.): *Übersetzungswissenschaft* (pp. 219-235). Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Darmstadt.
- Levý, Jiří. (1969). *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung*. Athenäum Verlag Frankfurt am Main Bonn.
- Miram, G. E., Dajneko, V. V., Ivanova, S. V., & Ampleev, P. V. (2010). *Trening-kurs po sinchronnomu perevodu*. Kiev: Arij.
- Miniar-Beloručev, R. K. (1996). *Teoria i metody perevoda [Theory and methods of translation]*. Moskva [in Russian].
- Neubert, Albrecht. (1986). Translatorische Relativität. In Mary Snell-Hornby (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung*. 2 (pp. 85-105). Auflage, Francke.
- Nord, Christiane. (1996). Wer nimmt denn mal den ersten Satz? Überlegungen zu neuen Arbeitsformen im Übersetzungsunterricht. In Angelika Lauer, Heindrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Johann Haller, Erich Steiner (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch. Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss zum 70. Geburtstag* (pp. 313-327). Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Palazhchenko, Pavel. (2002). *Moi nesistematicheskie slovar. Russko-angliiskii anglo-russkii. (Iz zapisnoi knizhki perevodchika) [My unsystematic vocabulary. Russian-English English-Russian. (From the translator's notebook)]*. Moskva: R. Valent [in Russian].
- Panasiuk, Igor. (2016). *Polyvarietät der Übersetzung*. Verlag Dr. Kovač Hamburg.
- Peshkovskii, A. M. (1930). *Voprosy metodiki rodnogo iazyka lingvistiki i stilistiki [Peshkovsky A.M. Problems of the methodology of the native language of linguistics and stylistics]*. Moskva; Leningrad [in Russian].
- Peshkovskii, A. M. (2007). *Linguistika. Poetika. Stilistika [Linguistics. Poetics. Stylistics]: izbrannye trudy: uchebnoe posobie*. Moskva: Vysshiaia shkola [in Russian].
- Piotrowska, Maria. (2007). *Proces decyzyjny tłumacza. Podstawy metodologii nauczania przekładu pisemnego*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej Kraków 2007
- Reiß, Katharina. (1980). Zeichen oder Anzeichen? Probleme der AS-Textanalyse im Blick auf die Übersetzung. In Wolfram Wilss (Hrsg.), *Semiotik und Übersetzen* (pp. 63-72). Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Semenova, I. M. (1989). O poniatii mezhdzvukovogo polia i vozmozhnosti ego ispolzovaniia v lingvo-pedagogicheskom issledovanii [On the concept of an intersonic field and the possibility of its use in linguo-pedagogical research]. In Chernov, G. V. (Ed.), *Kommunikativnyi invariant perevoda v tekstakh raznykh zhanrov [Communicative translation invariant in texts of different genres]: sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (Is. 343, pp. 31-43). Moskva [in Russian].
- Siever, Holger. (1996). Äquivalenz und Differenz. In Andreas F. Kellertat (Hrsg.), *Übersetzerische Kompetenz* (pp. 169-175). Beiträge zur universitären Übersetzerausbildung in Deutschland und Skandinavien. Peter Lang.
- Siever, Holger. (2010). *Übersetzen und Interpretation. Die Herausbildung der Übersetzungswissenschaft als eigenständige wissenschaftliche Disziplin im deutschen Sprachraum von 1960 bis 2000*. Leipziger Studien zur angewandten Linguistik und Translatologie 8. Peter Lang.
- Shiriaev, A. F. (1979). *Sinkhronnyi perevod. Deiatelnost sinkhronnogo perevodchika i metodika prepodavaniia sinkhronnogo perevoda [Simultaneous translation. Activities of a simultaneous interpreter and teaching methods of simultaneous translation]*. Moskva [in Russian].
- Sorokin, Ju. A. (1985). *Psikholingvisticheskie aspekty izucheniia teksta [Psychological aspects of studying the text]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
- Sperber, Dan, & Wilson, Deirdre. (1986). *Relevance: communication and cognition*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Stepanov, Ju. S. (1965). *Francuzskaja stilistika: v sravnenii s russkoj*. La stylistique française. Vis-à-vis de la russe. URSS Moskva/Moscou 2002.
- Šveicer, A. D. (1973). *Perevod i lingvistika [Translation and linguistics]*. Moskva: Voenizdat [in Russian].
- Vannerem, Mia; Snell-Hornby. (1986). Die Szene hinter dem Text: „scenes-and-frames semantics“ in der Übersetzung. In Mary Snell-Hornby (Hrsg.): *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung*. 2. Auflage. Francke 1994 (pp. 184-205).
- Vermeer, Hans J. (1992). Eine kurze Skizze der scenes-&-frames-Semantik für Translation. In Heidemarie Salevsky (Hrsg.): *Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen der Sprachmittlung*. Berliner Beiträge zur Übersetzungswissenschaft (pp. 75-83). Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.
- Vermeer, Hans J., & Witte, Heidrun. (1990). *Mögen Sie Zistrosen? Scenes & frames & channels im translatorischen Handeln*. Julius Groos Verlag Heidelberg.
- Vygotskii, L. S. (1968). Iz neizdannyykh materialov [From unreleased materials]. In Leontev A. A., Riabova T. V. (Comps.), *Psikhologiya grammatiki [Psychology of grammar]* (pp. 178-198). Moskva: MGU [in Russian].
- Weber, Wilhelm K. (1990). The Importance of Sight Translation in an Interpreter Training Program. *American Translators Association scholarly monograph series, IV*, 44-52.
- Wilss, Wolfram. (1992). *Übersetzungsfertigkeit. Annäherungen an einen komplexen übersetzungspraktischen Begriff*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

- Zimniaia, I. A., & Chernov, G. V. (1972). Veroiatnoe prognozirovanie v protsesse sinkhronnogo perevoda [Probable prediction in the process of simultaneous interpretation]. In *Psicholingvistika v SSSR [Psycholinguistics in the USSR]: informacionnyi bulleten*. Moskva [in Russian].
- Zvegintcev, V. A. (1967). Chelovek i znak [Man and sign]. In *To Honor Roman Jakobson* (Vol. III, pp. 2427-2441).
- Zvegintcev, V. A. (1970). *Semiologicheskie universalii. Iazyk i chelovek [Semiological universals. Language and man]*. Moskva [in Russian].

IGOR PANASIUK

TRANSLATION PROCESS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF POLYVARIETY OF TRANSLATION

The research focuses on the process of translation in its psycholinguistic, cognitive and semiotic aspects. While observing students at the Institute of Translation and Interpreting at the Department of Russian language at the University of Heidelberg the author of this study came up with the idea to describe the process of translation, which consists of some conscious cognitive processes, in order to apply these to the translators' and interpreters' training. The theoretical basis taken for the concept of polyvariety of translation is the postulate under which essentially the entirety of translation and interpreting (T&I) theory can be subsumed – Roman Jakobson's eminent postulate of "equivalence in difference". This postulate firstly states the relation between source and target, which is based on a difference, i.e. on an implicative relation in the semiotic sense, and secondly equivalence consists in a diversity of translation variants which are in a relationship of difference to the original, since the translator understands partly unconsciously and partly consciously; always selectively and purposefully; partly cognitively and partly intuitively; always subjectively, which permits the availability of multiple translations of one and the same text by different translators with comparable translation competence which in their totality establish the polyvariety of translation. Such complex attitude at the process of translation opens a new sight on the theory of translation, builds a bridge between the theory and practice of translation and can be successfully applied to the didactic purposes.

Key words: translation process; cognitive and psycholinguistic translation processes; psychosemantic model of translation; creativity of translation; polyvariety of translation; variability; lacuna.

Отримано 3.05.2021 р.