

REVIEWS

Bednárová-Gibová, K. (2012) *Non-literary and Literary Text in Translation*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity. 100pp.

The main concept addressed by the monograph written by the Prešov-based linguist Klaudia Bednárová-Gibová is translation procedures, which are dealt with as such, as well as in relation to different types of text. The author strives to answer questions which have arisen from interaction with translation trainees in seminars upon realising the existence of a niche in translational literature. The fundamental question is if different genres require different translation procedures to be employed. To answer the question, the author firstly examines various theoretical approaches to translation procedures and attempts to classify them. Then, a comparative and contrastive analysis is utilised as a methodology which helps to identify links between individual properties of texts and appropriate translation techniques. Two very diverse types of text were chosen, a non-literary legal text of European Union directives and a literary text of fiction, a Christian novel. A certain risk is hidden in the arbitrariness of the choice of contrast which the author made, but such intentional selection is inherent to the method of contrastive analysis.

Although the author claims that the literature dealing with translation procedures is not very vast, she has reviewed quite a large number of sources, particularly from the last decade. However, the most representative sources for her research are the classic textbook of comparative stylistics *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais* by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1958), Peter Newmark's *A Textbook on Translation* (1988, developed from the first sketch on translation procedures in *Approaches to Translation* from 1981) and the monograph *Übersetzung und Bearbeitung. Zur Differenzierung und Abgrenzung des Übersetzungsbegriffs* by Michael Schreiber (1993). She also surveys the development which approaches to translation of non-literary texts have seen in the past decades, from the terminologically-oriented ones (characteristic of translation of legal texts), through functionalist and structuralist approaches, pragmatically and sociologically determined ones to the current trends based on corpus and critical linguistics.

Bednárová-Gibová notes that there is a problem of classifying literary texts within the system of text types as no agreement exists about what type of texts literary ones can be contrasted with. The difference between non-literary and

literary texts is thus rather possible to feel than describe explicitly, but she attempts to delineate these categories from the perspective of text linguistics. Her approach endorses the conception adopted after the so-called communicative-pragmatic turn, seeing text functionally and dynamically as 'text-in-function' or 'text-in-situation' and stressing that text as an organised whole must reveal a communicative intention, perform a communicative function and meet various standards of textuality (Beaugrand & Dressler 2002, Göpferich 2006).

In terms of comparison of literary and non-literary texts, their thematic structuring and notionalty are mentioned as the essential properties of non-literary texts, which puts them in the category of informative and operative text type in Bühler-inspired translation-focused text typology by Reiss (1981/2000). Similarly, translation of non-literary text follows the principles of Newmark's (1981) 'semantic translation' and Nord's (2005) 'documentary translation'.

Literary text is contrasted with non-literary on the grounds of its typical features, including its focus on language and form, detachment from practical context, and its aesthetic, intertextual and (self-)reflexive functions. As Bednářová-Gibová states several times, the specificity of literary texts lies in the presence of a literary code with its marked form and language and the target text as the product of the process of translation must recreate these qualities (i.e. preserve the style) in the source language.

Taxonomically, literary text (specifically novels) belongs to the expressive text type in Reiss' (1981/2000) typology and 'readerly' texts in a classification inspired by Barthes. From the point of view of translational approach, literary text ranks as Nord's (2005) 'instrumental translation'. The corresponding label based on Newmark's typology is 'communicative translation'. A stark contrast is made between the approaches to translation of both types of text in question. Being similar to Newmark's opinions, Gibová-Bednářová's university colleague Hrehovčík (2006: 56) is aptly quoted, saying that "if literary translation is considered an art, then non-literary translation may be considered a science" (p. 33).

The principal contribution of the monograph is the application of painstakingly excerpted translational theory on the two contrastive sample texts. Chapter 3 is thus devoted to analysing translation procedures (or translation techniques), which describe how the target text functions (semantically and formally) in relation to the source text. Bednářová-Gibová quotes Molina and Hurtado-Albir (2002:509) to recapitulate the essential characteristics of translation procedures, namely that they affect the result of translation, that they are classified by comparison with the original, affect micro-units of texts, are by nature discursive and contextual, and that they are functional (p. 37). They are conditioned by

a more global choice of translation method and activation of more narrowly defined translation strategies, indispensable in solving translation problems.

The aforementioned translation procedures model by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) is analysed in greater detail, distinguishing between direct translation procedures (viz. borrowing, calque and literal translation), used when there is exact structural, lexical and morphological equivalence between the source (SL) and target (TL) languages, and oblique translation procedures. The latter mentioned are applied in the case of gaps (or the so-called 'lacunae') caused by dissimilarities between the languages, disabling simple transposition. To convey the message meaningfully and without stylistic disturbance, procedures of transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation can be distinguished within the category of oblique translation procedures.

The British school of translation studies is represented by Peter Newmark and his model of translation procedures developed in 1981. They comprise transcription (alternatively called loanword, transfer or transference), literal translation, calque, lexical synonymy, componential analysis, transposition, modulation, compensation, cultural equivalence, translation label, definition, paraphrase, expansion, contraction (or reduction), recasting sentences, rearrangement (or improvement) and translation couplet (pp. 41-42). In the expanded model from 1988, Newmark added some translation procedures, such as naturalisation and recognised translation.

Schreiber's model of 1993 and 1998 draws on Vinay and Darbelnet as well as on Newmark, but the individual translation procedures are grouped into three broader categories, lexical (e.g. lexical borrowing, lexical substitution), grammatical (e.g. word-for-word translation, permutation, expansion, reduction, transposition, transformation) and semantic (semantic borrowing, modulation, explication, implication, mutation).

The translation procedures from all three authoritative models are then subjected to quantitative corpus text analysis. The author explains each individual procedure, discusses its benefits and application in the sample literary and non-literary texts and illustrates it with extracts in tables. These contain the source English sentence, the translated target text in Slovak, a formal transcription describing the involved change in word class or syntactic structure ('sentence members') and a figure giving percentage representation of the given procedure in each genre. Some translation procedures were found endemic to literary texts only, such as naturalisation (i.e. adaptation of a SL word to the normal pronunciation and later to the normal morphology of the TL), adaptation (used where the situation in the SL message is unknown in the culture of the TL), recasting sentences and paraphrase ("a creative re-composition of the SL

message which re-codes its communicative value in an artistic and unrestrained fashion", p. 86).

The results of the comparative analysis prove that despite differences in their relative proportions, translation procedures are a universal feature of any kind of text, whether literary or non-literary. Non-literary texts reveal an equal share of direct and oblique translation procedures, whereas literary texts employ oblique translation procedures about three times as often as direct ones. The dominant category of non-literary texts has been identified as calque (which supports the tendency to keep a foreignising character of texts, but rather results from abiding by the guidelines of EU language policy, particularly within the framework of institutional legal and administrative texts). Calque is followed by word-class (WC) transposition. Also expansion, modulation and permutation are significant. Conversely, literary texts are characterised by a much more equally distributed use of translation procedures, slightly dominated by permutation, followed by WC transposition, reduction and paraphrase.

The present monograph by Klaudia Bednářová-Gibová, in addition to the detailed discussion of similarities and differences in the use of translation procedures between literary and non-literary texts, enriches readers and the discipline of translatology with two fundamental qualities. Firstly, it can be used as a profoundly practical handbook of translation procedures, drawn from several well-conceived sources, clearly described and adequately illustrated. And secondly, it is a nice example of the usefulness of comparative and contrastive linguistic analysis which, despite a limited and arbitrary corpus of texts, gives very relevant quantitative and consequently qualitative results in the never-ending effort to understand better a human's most precious tool, language.

Radek Vogel

References

- de Beaugrand, R. and Dressler, W. (2002) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman. Online version. Retrieved from <http://www.beaugrande.com/introduction-to-text-linguistics.htm>
- Göpferich, S. (2006) 'Text, Textsorte, Texttyp.' In: Snell-Hornby, M. et al. *Handbuch Translation*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag. 61-64.
- Hrehovčík, T. (2006) *Introduction to Translation*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. 44-60.
- Molina, L. and Hurtado-Albir, A. (2002) 'Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach.' In: *Meta* (online), XLVII.4, 498-512. Retrieved from <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2002/v47/n4/008033ar.pdf>
- Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988) *A Textbook on Translation*. New York and London: Prentice Hall.
- Nord, C. (2005) *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

- Reiss, K. (1981/2000) 'Type, kind and individuality of text.' In: Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 160-171.
- Schreiber, M. (1993) *Übersetzung und Bearbeitung. Zur Differenzierung und Abgrenzung des Übersetzungsbegriffs*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Vinay, J. P. and Darbelnet, J. (1958/1995) *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier. Transl. and edited by J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel as *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.