

А. Г. Баранов

Кубанский государственный университет, г. Краснодар

ИСКУССТВО ПЕРЕВОДА: ВЕРОЯТНОСТНЫЕ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ

Ключевые слова: постклассическая наука, синергетика, скитерии оценки, вероятностное мышление, мыследействие, мыслекоммуникация, чистое мышление, поэтическая функция языка, типы коллокаций, знак-в-тексте, денотативные и коннотативные знаки, вероятностная модель перевода.

В статье утверждается, что проблемная область перевода как мета-текстовой деятельности требует нового теоретического обоснования в рамках пост-классической методологии моделирования. В отличие от классической науки, опирающейся на критерий истины, постклассическая наука выдвигает критерии красоты, элегантности, объяснительной силы, эффективности, которыми определяется адекватность версий перевода. Эти версии следует рассматривать как комплементарные переводческие модели.

A.G. Baranov

Kuban State University, Krasnodar

THE ART OF TRANSLATION: PROBABILISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Key terms: post-classical science, synergetics, criteria of evaluation, probabilistic thinking, thinking-doing, thinking-communicating, pure thinking, poetic function of language, collocation types, sign-in-text, denotative & connotative signs, probabilistic model of translation.

It is argued here that the problem domain of translation as meta-textual activity requires new theoretical foundation based on post-classical model-driven methodology. In it, the longstanding truth-approach is considered irrelevant. Instead, the criteria of beauty, elegance, explanatory power, effectiveness are applied to translation versions as complement-related models.

Ищу я выход из ворот,
Но нет его, есть только вход,
И то – не тот.

И.С. Высоцкий

I'm searching exit in the gates,
But of it – none, there's only entry,
Alas - not proper one.
(tr. by A.G. Baranov)

The domain of translation has the long-standing problem: how to achieve and how to determine high quality in translation, especially in fiction and

especially in poetry. The theory of translation, based mainly on the structural approach to language description, has offered a number of ideas and tools. The most prominent among them is the idea of transformation borrowed from N. Chomsky's standard generative theory with all its techniques including generative semantics. However, appreciation of quality has turned to two correlated terms – *adequacy* and *equivalence*. Neither of which has ever received any definition that could lead to formulating some criteria of certainty.

There are some people who doubt whether translation of poetry is possible at all. Among them is a poet - R. Frost - with his ironical statement, that poetry is what is lost in translation.

In spite of scientific pessimism, translation of poetry goes on. For instance, translations of "Eugene Onegin" by A.S. Pushkin into English multiply steadily (J. Falen, W. Ardnt, Ch. Jonston, the Elton/Briggs duo, V. Nabokov, D. Hofstadter – as known to me). This situation in scientific and applied spheres encourages me to look into the foundations of translation lore.

As I see it, help may come from such scientific developments that are known today as *post-classical science* (the theory of dynamic chaos, functional semiotics, philosophy of mind, the probabilistic model of language, French post-structuralism, and finally, psycho-pragmatic studies in linguistics and philology at large). The theory of dynamic chaos (synergetics) has worked out some gnostic principles of model-approach to the study of unstable, fuzzy systems. The equilibrium stability in them is achieved by applying energy of any sort. In case of human mind such energy is knowledge/information. In this mode of thinking the classical God-truth approach becomes irrelevant. The multiple models of some phenomenon are evaluated on the basis of such features as: *beauty, elegance, explanatory power, effectiveness* (Назаретян 2004: 310). Surely, if one has on his hands 29 translations of "Raven" by E. Poe into Russian – which one to select as best? And by what criteria worked out in God-truth approach?

The need to develop the post-classical analysis arises out of the dichotomy of continuity/discreteness, one so prominent a feature in the relation of *thinking* and *language*.

The natural language is the main instrument in the conceptualization of life experience. This basic function shows itself in the discreteness of language units. At the same time, the natural language has such additional properties as ambiguity, uncertainty, fuzziness, that allow it to function as the meta-language for any discourse practices. I ascertain here, that, thanks to these additional features, the natural language has both systemic and discourse means to overcome the mentioned dichotomy in communication. I settle further to enlarge on some relevant theoretical points.

I. The chart of conscience, offered by V.V. Nalimov (Налимов 1989: 104) in his effort to penetrate deep into the mechanisms of human creative behavior, includes several levels:

1. The level of thinking (aristotelian logic, covering about 1% of mental activity);

2. The level of spontaneous afore-thinking (probabilistic logic);
3. The basement of conscience (perception of images);
4. Somatic substructure of conscience.

In addition to these four, V.V. Nalimov offers one more level (cosmic) - the structure of collective sub-conscience (arch-types, after K. Jung). This level is related to the third one – images.

Combined, the first three + might be metaphorically viewed as symbolic super-level (software) of conscience and the fourth one – the biological support of the symbolic level, its hardware. At least, this metaphor is coming to my mind under the influence of D. Hofstadter’s investigation into the relation of human mind and AI (2001, ch. XVII).

In my way of arguing, this chart might be important in the speculations on the ways and channels of production and perception of text. This discourse activity is - implementation of thought.

II. The probabilistic model of the natural language is developed by V.V. Nalimov (Налимов 1989). The main issue in this model – to show that human mind functions essentially in probabilistic grooves cut by the routine of everyday life activity. That’s why the 8-th thesis of the British school of data-driven linguistics runs: “ Much of language use is routine” (Stubbs 1998: 41). But in order to achieve creativity one has to cut new ways both in physical, mental, as well as communicative activity. The organization of natural language is such that the continuity of thinking can be ascertained in discourse activity by certain linguistic mechanisms:

The semantics of a word in zero context makes up a field, which can be metaphorically represented as a comet with a head and long tail. The further from the head - the smaller the probable semantic weight, the more specific context is required to bring it about, the fuzzier the usage becomes. For instance, in sonnet XIV, ch. II of “Eugene Onegin” Pushkin writes:

Мы все *глядим* в Наполеоны;
 Двухногих тварей миллионы
 Для нас орудие одно;
 Нам чувство дико и смешно.

The first line here contains the word «глядим». It is used in the collocation that stretches the combinability potential of the word in Russian to the metaphoric limit, thus bringing forth a cloud of contextual meanings (senses).

Describing the functions of the natural language, R. Jakobson formulates the essential source of the poetic function. In his opinion, discourse activity is based on two operations: *selection* and *combination* of discrete language units. Selection (choice) is performed on the basis of equivalence, similarity and distinction, synonymy and antonymy. Combination is based on contiguity. The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the level of selection to the level of combination (Якобсон 1975: 204).

The word semantics, taken as a comet-shaped field, may help differentiate the terms “meaning” and “sense”. In my view a word-as-sign appears in

collocations of various types. Let's return to Pushkin's «Мы все глядим в Наполеоны».

This example shows that we can distinguish 3 types of collocations, spread over the comet image of word semantics:

- a) *factual* (the head of comet) – *Мы глядим в книгу*;
- b) *trite* (vicinity of the head) – *Мы глядим в себя*;
- c) *innovative* (remote from the head) – *Мы глядим в Наполеоны*.

Vicinity and remote collocations trigger up connotative meanings. That's why they often set translation problems. Cf. the English version given by J. Falen:

We all *take on* Napoleon's features,
And millions of our fellow creatures
Are nothing more to us than tools...
Since feelings are for freaks and fools.

Here I do not evaluate J. Falen's work; I just point to the semantic field of the word «ГЛЯДИМ» and specific senses the reader might discover (or not) in the collocation. J. Falen did discover something...

III. Now comes the contribution of semiotics. The leading propositions of functional semiotics boil down to the following: the sign exists only in discourse; the basic sign is text. It is built up, if extended, by a chord of more or less elementary signs. These signs are clauses both finite and non-finite, collocations and words. This theoretical position calls forth to mind a dilemma which V.P. Litvinov (2008: 117) puts like this: language must be a sign system and cannot be a sign system. I add: language is a thesaurus of the afore-happened sign situations – the archeology of usage.

The semantics of text is represented by two types of in-text signs: denotative and connotative which, correspondingly, carry denotative and connotative meanings. If denotative meanings are taken from memory, the connotative ones are predominantly created *ad hoc* in text production. R. Barth considers that the denotative signs of text serve as the plane of expression for connotative meanings (Барт 2001: 34). Though, sometimes denotative signs or their parts can hold inherent connotative components. For instance, in the above given example from Pushkin the plural formant of “Наполеоны” is connotatively remarkable (by the way, lost in the translation by J. Falen).

To round up with signs-in-text, I consider that denotative signs in text join up in some *ad hoc* clusters, acquiring additional quality. Very often denotative signs and clusters of them serve as the plane of expression for *ad hoc* connotative meanings, i.e. becoming connotative signs. One more issue in sign theory: R. Barth considers that denotation is *the last* of possible connotations (Барт 2001: 34). By the way, my own view on it was worded in 1988, when I stated that the propositional elements of text, treated as deprived of any modality, ultimately acquire connotative quality through specific patterns of factual words

and through the feeling-provoking quality of situations described. To sum up, the translator's headache are signs-in-text.

IV. The philosophy of mind (философия системомыследеятельности) developed by G.P. Schedrovitsky (Щедровицкий 1995: 299) represents cognitive/cognitive-communicative activity as organized on three interwoven levels: thinking-doing (мыследействие), thinking-communicating (мыслекоммуникация) and pure thinking (чистое мышление). This scheme has a two-way application – both in the production and perception of texts.

The level of thinking-doing accounts for individual human life experience (memories, images, motor-activity and the like (experiential level of mind - see Lakoff 1988: 119). This level is the one to call forth *inward visualization* of the verbally depicted situations. It is essential: understanding is achieved by way of the active construction of images.

The level of thinking-communicating accounts for semiotic ability of humans to use various codes in actual semiotic interaction. This is the level where humans actually produce and perceive texts of any code pattern. The demand of this level – knowledge of the verbal language (phonetic, lexicogrammatic, rhetoric and hermeneutic) – all knowledge and skills of language lying at the basis of communication).

The level of pure thinking concentrates on paradigms of culture, i. e. knowledge represented in mental structures, - mostly in the form of iconic patterns varying from prototypical images to the highest degree of abstraction (mathematical models).

In perception one starts with the level of thinking-communicating. Then, one turns to thinking-doing where experiential items of knowledge are revived and inwardly visualized. Then one turns to pure thinking, actualizing the relevant paradigms of culture. This ordering of perceptive moves may be called the direct one . The Indirect one can fork either to thinking-doing or pure thinking, as the start. Anyway, perception is viewed as a recurrent movement through the hermeneutic circle.

In production, the hermeneutic circle may start with any level. Though, what should not be overlooked or neglected is the experiential knowledge on the level of thinking-doing accompanied with situational visualizations. One more item is important here, the text produced always retains some rhetoric traces of the author's hermeneutic moves within the SMD-scheme.

These four sources of synergetic approach to translation may help overview the long-standing model of translation:

I. The perception of a source-language text – transition from discreteness to continuity in several steps:

- a) inner visualization of images and situations, verbalized in the source-text;
- b) discovering the pattern of denotative meanings represented by strings of clauses;

c)discovering the pattern of connotative meanings built over the denotative elements;

d)shaping the actual meaning pattern of the text – its integral sense content..

II. Production of a target-language text – transition from continuity to discreteness in several steps:

a)selection of discrete signs of the target-language guided by the principle of probabilistic usage;

b)building patterns of denotative signs in collocations to represent textual situations;

c)building patterns of connotative signs over the denotative ones;

d)final shaping of denotative-connotative presentation of target- text, i.e. its integral sense content.

Now, I turn to exemplifying the above-formulated theoretical notions. I take sonnet 42, ch. 4 of “Eugene Onegin” by A.S. Pushkin and its translation by D. Hofstadter (2001: XV):

И вот уже трещат морозы still she's cozy	Frost's crackling, too, but
И серебрятся среди полей... silv'ry dust...	Amidst the fields' light
(Читатель ждет уж рифмы «розы»; write “rosy”,	(you're all supposing I'll
На, вот возьми ее скорей!) must!)	As Pushkin did – and so I
Опрятней модного паркета swept nicely	Slick as a nice parquet
Блестает речка, льдом одета. glistens icily.	The brooklet glints and
Мальчишек радостный народ shod boys	A joyous band of skate-
Коньками звучно режет лед: noise.	Cuts graceful ruts to rowdy
На красных лапках гусь тяжелый contrast, wishing	A clumsy goose by
Задумав плыть по лону вод, sheet,	To swim upon the glassy
Ступает бережно на лед, webbed feet	Lands stumbling on its
Скользит и падает; веселый Swirling, swishing.	And slips and tumbles.
Мелькает, вьется первый снег, snow's first try -	Gay twinkling stars – the
Звездами падая на брег. they die.	Bedaub the creekside ere

D. Hofstadter's translation is remarkable, for he got attracted by Pushkin's genuine merge of form and meaning, then he comparatively analyzed the translations by Ch. Jonston and J. Falen and, finally, as a lover of languages and language games, did his contribution.

In the target-text there are some strange solutions. First, they are lines 3 and 4 – here Douglas resorts to rather deviant translation, having introduced himself into the target-text. Besides, Pushkin addresses the reader non-personally, while the translation is more concrete: *You're all supposing...* The second remark is about snowflakes (line 12-14). D. Hofstadter explains his decision about their dying (melting) referring to chapter 5 – «СНЕГ ВЫПАЛ ТОЛЬКО В ЯНВАРЕ...»

On the level of selection and combination the source-text manifests an outstanding merging of form and meaning - Pushkin creates the tonality of joyful, intimate feeling of Nature. On the contrary, the target-text relates quite a different one. Such words as *band*, *rowdy noise*, *swishing stars*, *bedaub* the creekside rather create negative tonality.

The selection of such words as *swept*, *ruts*, *brooklet*, *creek* in their collocations do not comply with the denotations of the depicted situations. For instance, a brooklet (ручеек) cannot hold a crowd of skate-shod boys.

Surely, D. Hofstadter compensates all the failures with evaluative adjectives and adverbs. The number of them twice extends that in the source-text. I may only suppose, that Hofstadter aimed at achieving emotional-evaluative equivalence with the source-text – the lofty poetic tone. Additional reason of his choice of words is preserving rhyme-rhythmic pattern of the source-text. Especially, that he is so sensitive a lover of music. Besides, in his work he, sure, was under the pressure of the already performed translations.

To achieve the so called binocular vision of the art of translation and its probabilistic nature, two more translations of the same sonnet are offered here without criticism, just to compare:

J. Falen	Ch. Jonston
The frost already cracks and crunches; with a will is	Hoar-frost that crackles
The fields are silver where they froze... plain...	already silvering all the
(And you, good reader, with your hunches, rhyme is lilies:	(the reader thinks the
Expect the rhyme, so take it – Rose!) quatrain!)	here, seize it quick for this
No fine parquet could hope to muster river	Like modish parquetry, the
The ice-clad river's glassy luster; sliver;	glitters beneath its icing-
The joyous tribe of boys berates loudly slice	boy-tribes with skates on

And cuts the ice with ringing skates; the ice;	their joyous way across
A waddling red-foot goose now scurries something fearful,	a red-foot goose, weight
To swim upon the water's breast; He treads the ice with care to test...	anticipates a swim, in stead tries out the ice with
cautious tread,	
And down he goes! The first snow flurries down; the cheerful	and skids and tumbles
Come flitting, flicking, swirling round round and sink	first flakes of snow whirl
To fall like stars upon the ground. brink.	In stars upon the river-

The probabilistic model-approach to translation demands the holistic attitude both to the source- and target texts. The solutions taken in translation should be considered jointly, rather than apiece. Each version of translation in itself is a variant of translation model. To them one should apply the criteria of beauty, elegance, effectiveness. Just, all the versions of sonnet 42 given here, and all in Internet, deserve enjoying exquisiteness achieved.

In fact, the poetry by Pushkin is not overloaded by metaphors and other tropes. This feature is expressed by the Russian term «без-образность» The finesse of Pushkin's poetry lies in the precise selection of lexis and its use in finely-set collocations, often selected under the demand of rhyme and rhythm. All of it gives his verse elegance, simplicity and vividness and...a lot of headache for those who dare to translate.

Literature

1. Баранов А.Г. Текст в функционально-прагматической парадигме. - Краснодар, 1988.- 95с.
2. Барт Р. S/Z. Пер. с фр. 2-у изд. Под ред. Г.К. Косикова.- М., 2001.- 232с.
3. Литвинов В. П. Гуманитарная философия Г.П. Щедровицкого.- М., ННФ «Институт развития им. Г.П. Щедровицкого», 2008.- 408с.
4. Назаретян А.П. Цивилизационные кризисы в контексте универсальной истории (синергетика – психология – прогнозирование). – М.: Мир, 2004. - 367с.
5. Налимов В.В. Спонтанность сознания. Вероятностная теория смыслов и смысловая архитектура личности. – М.: Прометей МГПИ им. Ленина, 1989. – 287с.
6. Хофштадтер Д. ГЁДЕЛЬ, ЭШЕР, БАХ: эта бесконечная гирлянда. – Самара: Издательский Дом «Бахрах-М», 2001. – 752с.
7. Щедровицкий Г.П. Схема мыследеятельности – системно-структурное строение, смысл и содержание // Щедровицкий Г.П. Избранные труды.- М: Школа культурной политики, 1995. - С. 281-289.

8. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика // Структурализм: «за» и «против». М.: Прогресс, 1975. - С. 193-230.

9. Lakoff J., 1988, Cognitive Semantics. In: Meaning and Mental Representations. - Bloomington, 1988. - P. 195- 154.

10. Stubbs M., Text and Corpus Analysis.- Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1998. – 267p.

References

1. Baranov A.G. Text in the functional-pragmatic paradigm [Tekst v funktsionalno-pragmaticheskoy paradigme].- Krasnodar, 1988.- 95 s.

2. Bart R. S/Z [S/Z]. Per. s fr. 2-u izd. Pod red. G.K. Kosikova.- M., 2001.- 232 s.

3. Litvinov V. P. Humanitarian philosophy of G.P. Shchedrovitsky [Gumanitarnaya filosofiya G.P. Shchedrovitskogo].- M., NNF «Institut razvitiya im. G.P. Shchedrovitskogo», 2008. - 408s.

4. Nazaretyan A.P. Civilization crises in the context of universal history (Synergetics - Psychology - prediction). [Tsivilizatsionnyye krizisy v kontekste universalnoy istorii (sinergetika – psikhologiya – prognozirovaniye)]. – M.: Mir, 2004. - 367s.

5. Nalimov V.V. Spontaneity of consciousness. Probabilistic theory of semantic meanings and personality architectonics [Spontannost soznaniya. Veroyatnostnaya teoriya smyslov i smyslovaya arkhitektonika lichnosti]. – M.: Prometey MGPI im. Lenina, 1989. – 287s.

6. Khofshtadter D. Gödel, Escher, Bach: this endless garland. [GEDEL, EShER, BAKh: eta beskonechnaya girlyanda]. – Samara: Izdatelskiy Dom «Bakhrakh-M», 2001. – 752 s.

7. Shchedrovitskiy G.P. Mental activity diagram – system and structural framework, the meaning and content [Skhema mysledeyatelnosti – sistemno-strukturnoye stroyeniye, smysl i sodержaniye] // Shchedrovitskiy G.P. Izbrannyye trudy.- M: Shkola kulturnoy politiki, 1995. - S. 281-289.

8. Yakobson R. Linguistics and Poetics [Lingvistika i poetika] // Strukturalizm: «za» i «protiv». M.: Progress, 1975. - S. 193-230.

9. Lakoff J., 1988, Cognitive Semantics. In: Meaning and Mental Representations. - Bloomington, 1988. - P. 195 - 154.

10. Stubbs M., Text and Corpus Analysis.- Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1998. – 267 p.