PARADIGMATIC ORGANIZATION OF A SOURCE TEXT AND TARGET TEXT

Summary. Developing the apparatus for estimation a quality of translation is an actual problem of modern linguistics, because of the growing number of translating literature and the necessity of determination what a good translation is in the terms of linguistics.

The article discusses the paradigmatic organization of the source text and target text in terms of evaluating translation quality. Paradigmatic organization analysis claims to present a model of text perception. In the course of text understanding, the recipient moves from textual syntagmatics (words are lined up in the text) to mental paradigmatics («subject» images are linked according to the laws of logic and associations). Text understanding depends on paradigms’ characteristics and the interparadigmatic links. There is a hypothesis that similarities and differences between source and target texts paradigmatic organizations may be used for evaluation of translating quality.

The analysis of the text paradigmatic organization includes individual paradigms distinguishing; characterization of the composition, functions, mode of expression and configuration of paradigms and interparadigmatic relationships.

The analysis is based on Joseph Brodsky poem «Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря» and two of its translations: Daniel Weisbort translation «From nowhere with love, Marchember the enth» and autotranslation «From nowhere with love the enth of Marchember sir». These translations were chosen because of the exceptional quality noted by many researchers. The author was co-creator of the first translation and made the second on his own. However, there are significant differences in the paradigmatic organization of these works due to the theoretical views of translators, features of the original and target languages on the one hand, and on the other individual properties, which strengthened the role of individual paradigms in the text.

Analysis of the paradigmatic organization of the text as a model of text perception provides ample opportunities for further use for comparative analysis not only of the source text and target text, but also for the analysis of idiosyncrasies, works of different directions, etc.

Key words: paradigm, paradigmatic analysis, translation, autotranslation, perception, translation quality.
The article discusses the paradigmatic organization of the source text and target text in terms of evaluation translation quality.

A statement of the problem. Nowadays, the quality of text translation is evaluated in terms of multiplicity of different criteria. The most common of them are clarity, accuracy of phraseological expressions translation, a degree of a translation and original text semantic proximity, a presence of mistakes that distort the semantic content of an original text, a presence of mistakes that distort stylistic features of an original text, semantic fidelity, saving and recreation of original pragmatic aspect in translation and etc. (Komissarov, 2013).

Latest researches analysis. There are two main approaches to target text estimation in modern linguistics. They are «translation equivalence» (Nida & Taber; Komissarov; Pym and etc.) and «translation adequacy» (Vinogradov; Breus and etc.).

Alexandra Milostivaya and Irina Makhova declare that «equivalence is the condition of translation», so «the aim is to determine this condition specifying its essence and what is supposed to be preserved in translation» (Olson, 2008, p. 36).

Still there is no comprehensive apparatus for translation quality estimation, based on comparing perception models. Comparative analysis of paradigmatic organization of the source text and target text may be considered to be such an apparatus. The preceding determines the current research relevance.

The purpose of the study is the ascertainment of specific paradigmatic characteristics of the original text and its translations and estimation of the translation quality.

The perception of the text occurs both at the linguistic and figurative-conceptual levels. Throughout perceiving a text at the linguistic level, the recipient reads the words which it consists of, sequentially, one after another: the first, then the second, the third, etc. Words generate «objective» images in our minds. We understand the text if we link all the images with each other. However, the «objective» images, generated by words, are
connected not only due to language competence. Knowledge of surrounding world phenomena provides these connections. And these «objective» images are not connected consistently. The recipient may connect the first one with the fourth one, etc. Thus, in the course of perceiving the text, it is restructured, i.e. there is a transition from words images connected at the language level to «objective» images connected at the mental level.

The interconnected «objective» images form paradigms. Paradigmatic organization of text is text paradigms and connections between them. It is hypothesised that similarities and differences between a source text and target text paradigmatic organization may be a means of estimating translation quality.

Paradigmatic organization of the text is characterized by paradigm composition, paradigm function, paradigm configuration, paradigm mode of expression and connections between paradigms.

The research is based on Joseph Brodsky poem «Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря» and two its translations (by Daniel Weissbort and Joseph Brodsky).

Daniel Weissbort’s translation was guided by Joseph Brodsky. Nevertheless «according to Brodsky, Weissbort, his translator, did not succeed in preserving these elements (the retention of metre and rhymes) of Brodsky’s verse; however, according to Weissbort, he did preserve the metre and used the solutions for rhyming based on sound and vowel equivalence more appropriate for a translation in English» (Ishov, 220, p. 182).

Still both translations are considered to be distinguished and as a consequence their comparative analysis is a matter of interest.

The OBLIVION paradigm starts the poem: "Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря, не вспомнить уже, ничей верный друг, дорогой, уважаемый, черт лица. The author is writing from placelessness and timelessness, which are resembling Lethe (Kosenkova, 2014) or Limbo. And everything has been defamiliarized (Kosenkova, 2014).

This paradigm is closely connected with LOVE paradigm (я любил тебя, мычающим «ты», милая, твои черты, безумное зеркало повторяя). Even some elements transfer from one paradigm to another (e.g. an impersonal element of OBLIVION черт лица becomes personal-ized твои черты as an element of LOVE).

There is one more interesting transition. The possessive pronoun ваш and personal pronoun вас included into OBLIVION paradigm are substituted with the possessive pronoun твои and personal pronoun тебя/ты included into LOVE paradigm. This transformation, this shift decreases the distance between the author and addressee, it’s a means of paradigms connection, either. E. A. Kozitskaya-Fleishman states that there are four categories of possible referents for the pronoun «you» in Brodsky’s poems: «you» can be understood «as a named / unnamed (tacit) concrete addressee; as an aloof lyrical ‘I’; as a reader who has a particular emotional or social experience that brings him together with the author; and, finally, as a person in general». Furthermore, E. A. Kozitskaia-Fleishman considers that sometimes one pronoun within a poem can refer simultaneously to more than one of these categories Kozitskaya-Fleishman, 2003, p. 108).

While the OBLIVION paradigm is unfolding, the lyrical subject is distanated from his past, the world, feelings. But then LOVE paradigm gets stronger, and this opposition leads to generation of the LONELINESS paradigm (с одного // из пяти континентов, держащегося на ковбоях; я любил тебя больше, чем ангелов и самого, и поэтому дальше теперь от тебя, чем от них обоих; поздно ночью, в уснувшей долине, на самом дне, в городе, занесённом снегом по ручку двери,
Still some transformations may be observed. Jamie L. Olson states «although the speaker initially claims to be writing from «nowhere», he actually gives a clue to his location when he says that he is writing» (Olson, 2008, p.184). The paradigms OBLIVION and LONELINESS are connected due to this transformation. At first the author states his location as “nowhere” (the element of the OBLIVION paradigm), but then it appears to be Amerika (the element of the LONELINESS paradigm).

The paradigms OBLIVION and LOVE contrast forms the main conflict of the poem.

The paradigm composition is a system of verbal images that generates a system of objective images on a mental level. Logically homogeneous and heterogeneous are distinguished. If there is a logical connection between units of text paradigms, then the composition of a verbal paradigm is logically homogeneous. If the connection between elements of the paradigms is associative, then the paradigm composition is logically heterogeneous. The composition of a paradigm can be motivated by text if verbal images may be combined into a paradigm just in this context, or motivated by extra-textual reality if verbal images may be combined outside the text framework (Stepanchenko et al, 2016, p. 25).

The paradigm composition of Joseph Brodsky poem «Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря» is motivated by the text and logically homogeneous. For example, elements of the OBLIVION paradigm (Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря, не вспомнить уже, ничей верный друг, дорогой, уважаемый, черт лица) cannot be united into the paradigm beyond the text, but the connection between the elements is logical.

Depending on the number of functions performed, the paradigms may be monofunctional (performing one function in the text) and polyfunctional (performing several functions in the text). Projective (forming image) and conceptual (defining the concept) are distinguished based on function characteristics (Stepanchenko et al, 2016, p. 43).

The paradigms of the analysed text perform just conceptual functions. E.g. the LOVE paradigm generates the concept of deep affection.

The paradigms configuration is the relationship between separate paradigms. It determines the features of their unification into the hyperparadigm of the whole text (Stepanchenko, 2009, p. 329). Unconditional and conditional paradigm configurations are distinguished. Texts whose paradigms are connected by relationships that are analogous to parataxis (paradigms complement each other in the composition of hyperparadigms, form an open conceptual series) have unconditional paradigms configuration. Texts whose paradigms are united by relationships that are analogous to hypotaxis have conditional paradigms configuration (Stepanchenko et al, 2016, p. 49).

The paradigms of Joseph Brodsky poem are closely connected to each other. The paradigms configuration is analogous to hypotaxis, hence conditional. Elements of LOVE and OBLIVION paradigms shift to LONELINESS paradigm (see above).

The connection of paradigms in the text may be established at the language level (lexical and grammatical links) and at the mental level (associative and logical connections), and also at both levels simultaneously, (Stepanchenko et al, 2016, p. 50).

The paradigms of the text are connected at both language and mental levels. At the language level paradigms are connected lexically (we may observe transfer of a formal second person pronoun «вы» to informal second person pronoun «ты») and grammatically (elements of the paradigms LOVE and OBLIVION are juxtaposed within one syntagma я взбиваю подушку мычащим «ты»// за морями). At the mental level paradigms are connected logically (it’s obvious that paradigms LOVE and LONELINESS are antagonists).

The text paradigms are partially implicit. The OBLIVION paradigm includes a subparadigm CRAZINESS. Its elements are found in strong text position: at the beginning (надцатого мартобря) and at the end (безумное зеркало). A part of this paradigm is implied. This paradigm alludes to Nikolai Gogol’s "Diary of a Madman" and superinduces the motive of insanity to the poem.

Hence, the paradigmatic organization of Joseph Brodsky’s original poem is the following: the paradigm composition is motivated by the text and logically homogeneous; the paradigms are monofunctional and conceptual; the paradigms configuration is conditional; the paradigms of the text are connected at both language and mental levels; the text paradigms are partially implicit.
Let us discuss Daniel Weissbort’s translation of the poem. Daniel Weissbort was one of Brodsky’s co-translators and the author of several publications about Brodsky’s translation activities.

From nowhere with love, Marchember the enth, my dear respected darling, but it doesn’t matter who, since to be frank, the features aren’t distinct anymore, neither your nor anyone else’s everloving friend, salutations from one (on the backs of cowboys) of the five continents,

I loved you more than himself or his angels, and so now am further from you than from both of them,

late at night, in the sleeping valley, deep, in a small town up to its doorknobs in snow, writhing on top of the sheets, which to say the least, isn’t stated below; I pummel the pillow, mumbling “you”, across the seas which have no bounds or limits, in the dark, my whole body repeating anew your features, as in some crazy mirror.

The main paradigms of the target text are the same as the ones functioning in the source text: LONELINESS (neither your nor anyone // else’s everloving friend, one (on the backs of cowboys) of the five continents, am further from you, in the sleeping valley, deep, in a small town up to its doorknobs in snow, writhing on top of the sheets, across the seas which have no bounds or limits, in the dark); LOVE (my dear respected darling, I loved you more than himself or his angels, my whole body repeating anew// your features, as in some crazy mirror); OBLIVION (From nowhere with love, Marchember the enth, but it doesn’t// matter who, the features aren’t // distinct anymore).

The paradigm composition is motivated by text and logically homogeneous. Elements of the paradigms cannot be united beyond the text.

The paradigms are monofunctional and conceptual. For instance, the LONELINESS paradigm forms the concept «solitude».

The paradigm configuration is unconditional, there is not much paradigm dependence on one another. The paradigms lost their interdependence due to the specific punctuation Weissbort used. The target text includes redundant commas that increase the “distance” between the paradigms and their independence. The target text paradigms form an open conceptual series.

The paradigms are explicit. The intertext was lost due to the translation.

The paradigms are connected both at mental and language levels. The paradigms are connected within on syntagma (salutations // from one (on the backs of cowboys) of the five continents) and logically due to logical opposition «remembering» (as the part of the LOVE paradigm) - «forgetting» (as the part of the OBLIVION paradigm).

Hence, the paradigmatic organization of Daniel Weissbort’s translation is the following: the paradigm composition is motivated by the text and logically homogeneous; the paradigms are monofunctional and conceptual; the paradigms configuration is unconditional; the paradigms of the text are connected at both language and mental levels; the text paradigms are explicit.

Z. Ishov claims: «Lastly one must acknowledge that Weissbort did grasp the general tone of the original and that the contrasts of diction which is a constant tool used with Brodsky are preserved in a good balance in the translation» (Ishov, 2008, p. 197).

As for Brodsky’s translation technique, «he was a supporter of an adaptive method, which proved to be quite a difficult task due to different trends in English and Russian poetic traditions as well as differences in their grammatical structures» (Adaptive (or mimetic) translation presupposes attempts by the translator to find precise metrical and stylistic equivalents of the foreign original in the target language, both on the level of form and content) (Trkulja, 2017, p. 45).

Concerning self-translation Brodsky is claimed to have «an enormous advantage over other translators» (Trkulja, 2017, p. 39), being an author and translator simultaneously.

From nowhere with love the enth of Marchember sir
sweetie respected darling but in the end it’s irrelevant who for memory won’t restore features not yours and no one’s devoted friend greets you from this fifth last part of earth resting on whalere like backs of cowherding boys I loved you better than angels and Him Himself and am farther off due to that from you than I am from both of them now late at night in the sleeping vale in the little township up to its doorknobs in
snow writhing upon the stale sheets for the whole matter’s skin-deep I’m howling “youuu” through my pillow dike

many seas away that are milling nearer with my limbs in the dark playing your double like

an insanity-stricken mirror.

The same main paradigms are performed in Brodsky’s self-translation, but the paradigms’ elements and functions do not coincide.

The translation strengthened the OBLIVION paradigm (From nowhere with love the enth of Marchember, sir, sweetie, respected, darling, it’s irrelevant, memory won’t restore features) and weakened the LOVE paradigm (loved you better than angels and Him Himself. I’m howling “youuu”, playing your double, feature, insanity-stricken mirror).

The LONELINESS paradigm (not yours and no one’s devoted friend, farther off due to, this fifth last part of earth // resting on whale-like backs of cowherding boys, the little township up to its doorknobs in // snow, many seas away) appears to be a dominant text paradigm (the most important paradigm for text perception, the main idea of the text is closely connected to it).

The paradigm composition is motivated by text and logically homogeneous. Elements of the paradigms cannot be united beyond the text.

The paradigms are monofunctional and conceptual. For instance, the OBLIVION paradigm forms the concept “nothingness”.

The paradigm configuration is conditional in Brodsky original text and self-translation, but it is unconditional in Weissbort translation. Conditional configuration strengthens paradigms codependency. As for the analysed poem, it makes the text hyperparadigm more holistic. Loneliness becomes absolute, unquestionable, all-consuming within the framework of Brodsky original text and self-translation. The distance between the paradigms is bigger in Weissbort translation. Loneliness is not so desperate.

Gender shifts are worth mentioning, too. In the original poem the adressate is unclear at first (дорогой, уважаемый, милая). It reflects a slightly chaotic world vision, pretending that it is really «не важно // даже кто». It is achieved due to the usage of different genders of adjectives. Of course, this method is impossible in English. It is completely lost in Weissbort translation (my dear respected darling), but preserved in the self-translation (sir // sweetie respected darling). Brodsky achieves the same depersonalization in English as in Russian due to contrast sir - sweetie juxta-posing words referring to people of different sex.

Both translations of Brodsky «Ниоткуда с любовью, надцатого мартобря» are masterpieces, and we may notice similar texts paradigmatic organizations.

Henceforward paradigmatic organization analysis may be used for comparative analysis of works of different genres, idiostyle analysis, etc.
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