**University of Khenchla**

**Department of English**

***Sophomores (2020-2021)***

**Translation (Ramdane)**

**Semester (1)**

 **The Notion of Equivalence In Translation**

 **« Seen by Vinay and Darbelney »**

**(Lesson 7)**

 The notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused, and it seems quite probable that it will continue to cause, heated debates within the field of translation studies. This term has been analyzed, evaluated and extensively discussed from different points of view and has been approached from many different perspectives.

 One of the perspectives that seems important to be discussed is that of *Jean Paul* *Vinay* and *Jean Darbelnet* ; the best known majors of the literal tendency and the founders of the comparative stylistic of French and English, who propose a set of principle techniques as methodological guidelines that help the translator in making decisions about specific translation problems while transfering from a linguistic system to another.

 These two pioneers consider the equivalence as a “***procedure which replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording***”. So, equivalence, according to them, is the technique which expresses the same situation referring to a “formular” or “redaction” in the TL that differs from the first one given in the SL not in terms of meaning, notice here that the same meaning should be conveyed by the second, but in terms of grammatical form or structure. It’s also imposed from the first sight when the translator discovers the exact value of the statement to be translated. This example can clarify their point of view : “*It’s raining cats and dogs* » means that it’s raining heavily. If the translator wants to render the meaning of this idiomatic expression from Englih into Arabic, he has to look for other structures that reflects the same situation known by Arabs which are «*ينهمر المطر مدرارا* » and the metaphorical expression « *تمطر كأفواه القرب* ». It’s noticeabale that these two expressions are optimum to make the readership understand the message and receive the same effect. While this mistranslated expression « تمطر قططا وكلابا » neither sounds readable nor preserves the superordinate goal of the SL. In fact , it distorts the meaning and is out of the context.

 Dealing with equivalence makes the translator abandon the analysis of translion units in order to recall the situation. So, he deals with the statement reflecting an equivalence as a whole, which means no existence of the process of « cutting ». For instance, the translator, while transferring « *Open to the public* » (idiomatic expression) with « *Entrée libre* » in French which is said about a space or an area we can visit freely through an organized visit, can’t talk about transposition (open/entrée) and modulation (to the public/libre) but he treats « *Open to the public* » as only one statement that can not be analysed.

 They also suggest that, if this procedure is applied during the translation process, it can maintain the stylistic impact of the source text ST in the target text TT. It’s the ideal method, for them, when the translator has to deal with something almost inherently cultural like proverbs, idioms, clichés, nominal or adjectival phrases and onomatopoeia.This latter is defined as a word reflecting a sound imitating what is called shout, scream, noise, animal sounds . Let’s take this example given by *Vinay* and *Darbelnet* of someone expressing pain. In English, the term *« Ouch !* *»* is used while in French a literal rendering of the sound would be of no use to reader. Instead, the equivalent of *« Ouch ! »* in French is *« Aïe ! » .* Both words would immediately indicate to the reader that there is some level of pain involved.

 Regarding equivalent expressions between language pairs, *Vinay* and *Darbelnet* claim that they are acceptable as long as they are listed in a bilingual dictionary as « full equivalents ». However, they note that glossaries and collections of idioms can never be exhaustive. They conclude by saying that the need for creating equivalences arises from the situation itself and it is in the situation of the source text that the translator have to look for a solution.

 Even if the semantic equivalent of an expression in the SL text is quoted in a dictionary or a glossary, it is not enough and it doesn’t garantee a successful translation. For this reason, the translator would find another equivalence in a similar situation. « *Take one* », for instance, is a fixed expression which would have as an equivalent the French translation « Prenez-en un ». However, if the expression appeared as a notice next to a basket of free samples in a large store, the translator woud have to look for an equivalence in a similar situation and use the expression « Echantillon gratuit ».