

Formal/Contrastive Correspondence and Translation Equivalence

Vladimir Ivir
Faculty of Philosophy
Universtiry of Zagreb

The paper reviews the use of the term »formal correspondence« in translation studies and its relationship to the term »translation equivalence«. It is shown that correspondence is established at the level of *langue* and equivalence at the level of *parole*. Since correspondence is the product of contrastive analysis of (parts of) linguistic systems, the term »contrastive correspondence« is to be preferred to »formal correspondence« (thus also avoiding the possible ambiguity of the term »formal«). The author presents his own method of extracting contrastive correspondents from translationally equivalent texts, relying on the notion of »backtranslation«, and describes their place among the elements that constitute the context of situation in which translation takes place and their role in achieving equivalence.

0. Formal correspondence is a term used in two separate yet not unrelated linguistic disciplines – translation studies and contrastive analysis. In fact, it is precisely the concept of formal correspondence that links the two linguistic disciplines: in one, translation, it provides the starting point in the search for equivalence; in the other, contrastive analysis, it is the product of comparison of linguistic units in pairs of languages exemplified by texts held together by translation equivalence. The linkage is quite strong, given the fact that translational equivalence is judged with reference to formal correspondence and that the necessary *tertium comparationis* for the establishment of formal correspondence in contrastive analysis is provided by translational equivalence.

1. The adjective »formal« in the term formal correspondence refers both to the (superficial) form and to the semantic content of linguistic units. In a chapter

devoted to formal correspondence, Nida recognizes that »there can be no absolute correspondence between languages« (Nida 1964:156), and goes on to note that there are two basic orientations in translating and hence two different types of (closest, not absolute) equivalence – formal and dynamic (1964:159). Formal equivalence, also called structural equivalence, is typified by »gloss translation«, in which the translator »attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original« (1964:159), preserving (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, and (3) meanings in terms of the source context (1964:165). The terms »formal equivalence« is replaced by »formal correspondence« in Nida & Taber (1969:22, 27–29), where it is explicitly opposed to »dynamic equivalence«.

While Nida saw formal correspondence as textually realized in translation (which explains why he first called it »equivalence«), Catford distinguished clearly between textual and systemic correspondences: he called the former translation equivalents and the latter formal correspondents. Thus, translation is defined as »the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language(TL)« (Catford 1965:20), whereas formal correspondence is defined as identity of function of correspondent items in two linguistic systems, so that a formal correspondent is taken to be »any TL category which may be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the »same« place in the economy of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL« (Catford 1965:32). It is noteworthy that for Nida the establishment of formal correspondence is an act of translation, involving a source-language text and a particular version of its target-language translation (one that preserves, as far as possible, the form and content of the linguistic units of the original; for Catford, on the other hand, formal correspondence is established by comparing paired linguistic systems to find categories (items, units) which occupy the »same« place in their respective economies.

Both approaches face considerable difficulties when challenged to operationalize their definitions. If Nida's formal correspondence is typified by gloss translation, it is obvious that it is not to be found in normal translation done for non-metalinguistic purposes. Where it is found, is in one of the stages of the 'multiple-stage translation' (Voegelin 1954:271–280), in which it serves to highlight the semantic and structural relationships between the source and the target language prior to making the changes (rearrangement, addition, deletion) necessitated by the target language and the context of situation in which communication is to be achieved through translation. The explicit listing of the source-text morphemes and faithful reproduction of its structures yields a checklist of linguistic means with which the original author communicated his intended message. The target text may not be able to use the same means for either linguistic or communicative (say, pragmatic) reasons. Linguistically, the target language may not have the particular means of expression

that the source language has (for instance, Croatian has distinct forms for the masculine, feminine and neuter gender of the third-person plural personal pronoun – *oni* m pl, *one* f pl, *ona* n pl – while English has only one form, *they*, for all three genders), or it may have and obligatorily use the means that the source language does not have (for instance, English expresses the link between the beginning of an action in the past and its continuation up to the present moment by relying on the present perfect tense in an example like *I have been here for half-an-hour*, while no such link is expressed by the present tense in the Croatian *Ja sam ovdje pola sata* »I am here half-an-hour«). Communicatively, some of the formal structural and semantic features of the source text get abandoned and/or replaced by features not present in the source text but required to ensure communication in the new context of situation (involving a different language, different culture, different sender, i.e., translator, different purpose, and different receivers). Thus, since gloss translation is possible only as a metalinguistic exercise and not as normal translation, the identification of formal correspondents in translated texts is somewhat arbitrary.

The task is made more difficult, if anything, when »sameness« of two linguistic systems is invoked, as it is not at all clear how paired items can occupy the 'same' place in the economies of their respective languages. Can, for instance, even such closely related items as the English and German definite articles be said to play the same role in the economies of English and German? Or the English progressive tense and the Slavic verbal aspect? Of course, the likelihood of there being »same« items (linguistic units, categories) in different languages decreases with genetic distance. That likelihood is even smaller for the more rigorous requirement of congruence, characterized by the presence, in the two languages, of the same number of equivalent formatives arranged in the same order (Marton 1968, Krzeszowski 1971). For that reason, one of the two proponents of the concept of congruence (Krzeszowski 1972: 80) later focused his attention on the relation of equivalence, which he, however, defined as sameness of deep structure (so that equivalent sentences were also congruent at deep-structure level, but their congruence disappeared on the way to the surface structure).

2. The problem of formal correspondence is twofold – one of methodology and one of relevance. Methodologically, the problem boils down to that of the *tertium comparationis* on the basis of which correspondence is established; and for which there are three possible candidates: functional systemic identity, common metalanguage, and translation equivalence. The first two are language-based and the third is text-based. In the former case, paired linguistic units of two languages are held together as correspondents by their functional (formal and semantic) and/or metalinguistic identity as elements of two linguistic systems.

It has already been shown that working with arbitrarily isolated linguistic units does not promise usable results: in the first place, it is not obvious how, and which, units of a given language are chosen for comparison; secondly, it is not clear on what grounds particular units of another language are recognized as formal correspondents (since, belonging to a different language, they display a different form, and since there is no objective way of ascertaining the identity of their meaning; metalinguistic labels may look like an excellent *tertium comparationis* until one remembers that they, too, are language-specific and that the same category names are applied to very different phenomena – the definite article is not the same thing in English and Hungarian, for instance); thirdly, it is not easy to say what place a given unit occupies in the economy of a given language, and much less easy to say whether a given counterpart unit occupies the same place in the system of another language – if »sameness« of place is at all conceivable across languages.

As for relevance, especially relevance for translation theory and practice, formal correspondence established systemically and built on a non-translational *tertium comparationis* would not seem to be very useful, even if it were practically feasible. (Its usefulness for language pedagogy is also questionable, but this is not our concern at present.) Students of translation have stressed repeatedly that translation involves not the comparison of languages but the production of texts: Jakobson (1959:235) speaks of the substitution of messages in one language, »not for separate code-units, but for entire messages in some other language«. Bolinger (1966: 130) makes the distinction between the two operations in Saussurean terms: »Translation may be viewed amorphously as the rendition of a text from one language to another. This is translation from the standpoint of *la parole*: the text, the act of speech or writing is the thing. Or it may be viewed as a systematic comparison of two languages: this is translation from the standpoint *la langue*.« Wilss (1982:60) clearly separates translational performance from systemic competence: »The classification of the science of translation as performance linguistics is an important precondition for separating it from /.../ contrastive (confrontative) linguistics and bi- or plurilingual structural comparison of languages.« And, of course, there are those translation theorists who explicitly reject linguistic insights as a basis for a realistic theory of translation: »La theorie de la traduction n'est donc pas une linguistique appliquee.« (Meschonnic 1973, quoted in Steiner 1975:X) They thus directly contradict those who claim with Mounin (1963:17) that »(t)oute operation de traduction /.../ comporte a la base une serie d'analyses et operations qui relevent specifiquement de la linguistique /.../.«

The discussion of the relevance of formal correspondence for translation theory and practice is inextricably linked with the understanding of the nature of translation equivalence by a particular theorist or practitioner. Two extreme views are possible, and have indeed been adopted throughout the history of translation: one is that linguistic correspondences are what translation is all about and that translating means matching linguistic units across languages; the other is that the *raison d'etre* of translation is to convey to the ultimate receiver the sender's communicative intention,

achieving the same communicative effect that the sender's original achieved on its receivers, using to this end not the original sender's means of expression but the linguistic means that would guarantee such an effect given the requirements of the new communicative situation (involving a different language, different culture, different receivers, different purpose of communication). No references are needed for the two views: suffice it only to say that the first view gives rise to translations that go under the names such as literal, source-language oriented, sender-oriented, author-oriented, and the second to translations that are dubbed as free, target-language oriented, receiver-oriented, reader-oriented. The theory of translation built on the first view would be essentially linguistic, and that built on the second view essentially communicative.

The opposition between the two views is not as stark in real life as it is here presented, as both the practitioners and theorists of translation recognize that linguistic correspondences have a role to play in translation, but that their role is limited and other factors intervene: »Ainsi une linguistique de la traduction, si la linguistique proprement dit en constitue un element essentiel, doit s'ouvrir a une semiologie qui n'etudie seulement les signes porteurs de signification dans le cadre des structures linguistiques en question, mais leur role dans l'acte de communication et dans la vie sociale.« (Vernay 1974:211) Degrees of »extremism« vary, with some authors giving up the idea of language being an object of translation and others recognizing that language is involved but is subsumed under the more important, actually dominant, factor of the purpose of translation. Thus, Holz-Mänttari (1986:355) has no qualms about excluding language from the business of translating: »Für »translatorisches Handeln« ist es wesentlich, den Gedanken fallen zu lassen, dass Texte oder Teile davon oder gar Sprachen »übersetzt« werden.« Reiss & Vermeer (1984) do not deny the role of language, but they see it as subservient to the purpose for which translation is done: »Die Dominante aller Translation ist deren Zweck.« (1984: 96) And the (communicative) end justifies the (linguistic) means: »Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel.« (1984:101)

3. Much of the discussion of the role of interlingual relationships in translation is inspired by the participants' failure to establish a link between *langue* and *parole*. Systemic relationships are established between languages as abstract objects but are then found to be inadequate for the reality of human communication involving translation. Consequently, they are abandoned wholesale (by the more radical proponents of translation as a »communicative transaction«, involving the original sender, translator and receiver, but not the relationship between their languages; cf. Harris 1983; cf. also Seleskovitch 1990:529: »La traduction s'interesse aux discours et non aux langues.«) or accepted as an initial step in the process of 'text-induced text production« (Neubert 1985:18). On the other hand, linguists do not seem eager to utilize normal human translations (produced for non-metalinguistic purposes) for the establishment of contrastive correspondences. Their reluctance is due to their

inability to isolate the systematic (*langue*) relationships from what they see as random, *ad hoc* communicative (*parole*) relationships resulting from a variety of other than linguistic factors. It is not surprising, therefore, that their analyses are based on translations of isolated sentences done for non-communicative (i.e., metalinguistic) purposes and that in each instance the correspondences that are established are one-to-one. Thus, a vicious circle characterizes the relation between translational equivalence and formal (contrastive) correspondence: formal correspondence is seen as irrelevant in the search for translation equivalence, and translation equivalence for its part fails to provide the necessary *tertium comparationis* for the establishment of correspondences between linguistic (sub)systems.

The vicious circle can be broken only by re-establishing the link between translation equivalence and contrastive correspondence and thus also between translation and contrastive analysis. (Notice that in this context the term »contrastive correspondence« is to be preferred to »formal correspondence«, both because of the possible ambiguity of the adjective »formal« and because the term is thus firmly located within the domain of contrastive linguistics.) This also guarantees that *langue* features will be discussed in both domains with reference to *parole*, and, conversely, *parole* features with reference to *langue*. In particular, the two will be identified and clearly distinguished from each other.

4. The procedure to be presented here has been worked out for the Zagreb-based Serbo-Croatian – English Contrastive Project, using a large translated corpus (Filipović 1971), and outlined in several papers reflecting different stages in the evolution of the concept (Ivir 1969, 1970, 1981). The main characteristics of the proposed procedure are the following: (1) The source and the target text, which together form the corpus with which the analyst works, are assumed to stand in a relation of translational equivalence. (2) Formal elements (morphological, syntactic, lexical) are isolated from the source text and their counterparts are sought in the target text. (3) The counterparts are recognized as contrastive correspondents if they satisfy the backtranslation test (cf. Spalatin 1967, Ivir 1988). Backtranslation differs from translation proper in that it is restricted, semantically bound (meaning-preserving), non-communicative, and metalinguistic. (4) Correspondences are typically one-to-many rather than one-to-one. (5) The absence of correspondence in equivalent texts is ascribable either to linguistic (ultimately cultural) differences between the languages involved or to differences between the two contexts of situation in which the original and the translational communication take place.

The above characteristics require further specification. As regards the relation of equivalence, the analyst takes it for granted, accepting the authority of the translator as a competent bilingual speaker and competent communicator, as well as the fact that the translation served its purpose – however approximately and imperfect-

ly – of communicating to the ultimate receivers (i.e., receivers of the translated text) the original sender's communicative intention. This approach rests on a particular view of translation as a highly relative undertaking. In fact, all communication is relative rather than absolute, and translational communication is only more so. The reasons for that relativity are to be sought in the nature of the factors that make up the context of situation in which communication, including communication involving translation, takes place. These factors include the extralinguistic content to be communicated, the language chosen for communication (L1), the original sender as a linguistic person (speaker of L1), the spatio-temporal channel of communication, the nature of the original sender's relationship with his perceived (intended) receiver(s), the receiver as a linguistic person (speaker of L1); in the case of translation, the (usually unintended) receiver is the translator, who is also a particular linguistic person (speaker of L1), then the language into which translation is done (L2), the translator as a linguistic person in that language (speaker of L2), the nature of the translator's relation to the ultimate receiver, the second channel of communication, and the ultimate receiver as a linguistic person (speaker of L2). Each of these factors affects the process and the result of communication, and any change in any of these factors changes the communicative effect.

The original sender starts with the extralinguistic content that he intends to communicate; he encodes it relying on the expressive potential of L1 to the extent that it is available to him at the moment of coding, suiting his expression to the real or imagined feedback from his intended receivers. If he used a different language, or used the same language at a different point in time (when he was a different linguistic person), or intended to reach different receivers, his encoded message would come out differently. His message (in the form of T1 or source text) travels through the channel of communication towards its intended and/or unintended receivers, undergoing a certain change in the process owing to noise in the spatio-temporal channel. The receiver decodes the message in a way that he can, given his characteristics of a particular linguistic person (speaker of L1). Different receivers will decode the same message differently and receive different portions or aspects of the extralinguistic content that the original sender intended to communicate. Equally, one and the same receiver will also decode the message differently at different points in time, because at each such point he is a different linguistic person.

The translator, too, is a particular linguistic person (speaker of L1) at the moment when he appears in the role of the receiver, and he decodes the original sender's message in the way that his knowledge of L1 allows. He next encodes the extralinguistic content thus obtained, using the resources of L2 to the extent that they are available to him as a linguistic person (speaker of L2) at the moment of encoding. Again, a different translator would be a different linguistic person, having a different command of the resources of L2, and his encoded message (T2 or

target text) would consequently be different. The same is true, of course, also of one and the same translator at different points in time. The translator stands in a particular relation to his receivers and adjusts his expression in accordance with the real or imagined feedback from them. The translator's encoded message travels through the second channel of communication with its own noise, and eventually reaches the ultimate receiver. He is a particular linguistic person (speaker of L2) and he decodes the translator's message as his knowledge of L2 at that particular point in time and in that particular context of situation allows.

The infinitely changing nature of all of the factors which make up the communicative context of situation is responsible for the relativity of all communication - within a single language and across languages. Communication involving translation is only more relative than communication without the need for translation, because there are two contexts of situation in that case and each factor (language, sender, channel, receiver) acts twice instead of only once. The source language (L1) is equipped in a particular way to deal with the extralinguistic content to be communicated. Its potential is relatively constant (even though it, too, changes over time and place), but, what is more important, it is certainly different from the potential that L2 puts at its speakers' disposal to deal with that extralinguistic content. Speakers can only express what their languages enable them to express. What the original sender's language will enable him to express is certainly not the same as what the translator's language will enable the translator to express. The sender acts as a speaker of L1: his command of that language differs from that of any other speaker of L1 and from his own command at other points in time (for instance, he does not control the resources of his language in the same way in different periods of his life, or when he is fresh as against when he is tired, when he is sober as against when he has had a drink or two, when he has been exposed to particular manifestations of that language as against when he has not been exposed to them, etc.). Similarly, his encoding will vary with his perception of the receivers with whom he intends to communicate. In face-to-face communication, he will adjust his wording in response to the feedback reaction from the receiver(s), while in his communication with receivers who are not actually present his encoding process is guided by some imagined feedback. The point to note is that the sender is quite willing to concede the non-absolute status of his message and is prepared to modify it so as to reach his receivers more effectively. (Notice that while variation caused by the sender's particular qualities as a speaker of L1 is for the most part unconscious, variation caused by the feedback from the receivers is often conscious and deliberate. But in either case the effect is to make communication relative - the price that the communicants readily pay, knowing that this is the only way that communication can be achieved.) The changes that the transmitted message undergoes in the channel of communication owing to the phenomenon of noise and the variable decoding

of the received message by the receiver as a particular linguistic person (speaker of L1) add further to the relativity of communication. Precisely the same kind of considerations apply to the translator as receiver, translator as sender, the second channel of communication, and the ultimate receiver, thus only compounding the relative nature of translational communication. One should note also a more pervasive factor of communication, namely, culture: the purpose of communication is, in most general terms, to convey culture, but equally, and more importantly, all communication takes place against the background of culture. The original sender shares the same culture with his receivers (who thus belong to an in-group with respect to that culture), but he does not share it with the receivers of the translation (who are, with respect to that culture, members of an out-group). The extent of cultural distance is yet another factor making for the relativity of communication.

5. The process of translationally effected communication sketched here is actually the process of achieving equivalence. Equivalence is thus seen to be relative and not absolute, achievable only in the communicative context of situation and having no existence outside that context, created anew in each new context as defined by the interplay of all the factors described above and not stipulated in advance by an algorithm for the conversion of linguistic units of L1 (including whole texts as linguistic units of the highest order) into linguistic units of L2 (Ivir 1991/92). There are only two points in this process at which languages as systems, with their repertoires of units and rules for their functioning, become operative. One is the original sender's choice of a particular language for communication and the other is the translator's choice of another language for translation.

The two languages, L1 and L2, are different systems, each offering its users a different set of expressive means for the particular extralinguistic content and each having a different potential on the level of *langue* – quite irrespective of the use to which a given speaker as a particular linguistic person is able to put that potential in the act of *parole* in a particular context of situation. Being different systems, different languages map the extralinguistic reality in different ways, and individual speakers have little control over what a given language can, cannot, must or must not say. Also, they have little choice: they must accept the language as they find it, warts and all, or abandon the attempt to communicate. Fortunately, most speakers readily accept the preferred ways of expression offered by their languages, blissfully unaware of any limitations imposed by their chosen language. Only an occasional poet will complain of the inadequacy of his language as a vehicle for the expression of what he would like to communicate. It is only when a speaker confronts his language with another language that he begins to appreciate that there are different possible ways of mapping the same extralinguistic reality and that his language obligatorily expresses certain feature of that reality which the other language does not, and conversely that his language fails to express certain features that the other

language readily expresses. The translator, of course, being bilingual by definition, contrasts his two languages and is very much aware of the differences between them.

The systematic contrasting of L1 and L2 serves to establish correspondences (and their absence) between the two systems and to compare the expressive potentialities of the two languages. Contrasting can be, and has been, attempted in different ways. One approach is to take an L1 formal unit and contrast it with an L2 unit having the same form. This can be illustrated by internationalisms, say, German *eventuell* and English *eventual*, and by identical abstract structures, such as the German Perfekt tense (formed with the present tense of the auxiliary verb *haben* and the past participle of the main verb: *Ich habe gegessen*) and the English Present Perfect (formed also with the present tense of the auxiliary verb *have* and the past participle of the main verb: *I have eaten*). The formally identical units thus established are taken as formal correspondents and then compared semantically and/or functionally. Another possible approach is to take independently defined semantic categories as the starting point and then identify their realizations in L1 and L2. These realizations are regarded as formal (contrastive) correspondents held together by meaning as the common third element. Examples would be, for instance, Definiteness in, say, English and Russian, Iterativeness in Croatian and Italian, expression of Instrument in Spanish and English, etc. The third approach relies on metalinguistic labels as *tertium comparationis*, and linguistic units and processes are contrasted across pairs of languages – for instance, Adjectives in English and Croatian, Reflexivization in Russian and Italian, Nominalization in French and German, the Instrumental Case in Russian and Polish, etc. The formal correspondents in this case are units or processes covered by the same label in the descriptions of the two languages.

Various objections can be raised in connection with each of these approaches: the first approach relies on the identity of form, but that identity is the exception rather than the rule (notice that languages are recognized as different precisely because they differ in form, as is most strikingly illustrated by differences in the shape of lexical items); the second approach is jeopardized by the lack of a language-independent semantic system (we do not know what its categories are) and of any reliable criteria of class membership for any given category (for instance, are Croatian definite adjectives and Russian word order members of the category Definiteness and contrastive correspondents of the English definite article, which presumably belongs to that category? and what are the other possible members of that category in English? how many are there?); the third approach presupposes a consistent linguistic theory with a fully developed metalanguage in terms of which both of the languages under analysis have been described to the same degree of exhaustiveness - an ideal that can hardly be said to have been achieved for any pair of languages. A more general approach valid for all three approaches is that they

limit themselves methodologically to *langue* and take no account of *parole*, which is responsible for the relative paucity of the insights thus gained and their limited usefulness for the practice of translating.

A different approach has therefore been proposed (Ivir 1969, 1970, 1981), one which relies on translation and assumes – in view of the concept of translation outlined above – that contrastive correspondents are potentially present in paired texts held together by the relation of equivalence, but that – since the contrastive relationship between linguistic systems is only one of the factors present in the translational context of situation in which equivalence emerges from the interplay of all the factors involved – the translated text will fail to display some of the linguistic units present in the source text, while at the same time displaying certain linguistic units not present in the source text. The reasons for the translator's departure from the linguistic makeup of the source text are twofold (Ivir 1983): the shift is necessitated either by the difference between the linguistic systems (such that L2 offers no correspondent for the particular L1 unit) or by the communicative needs arising out of the action of some other factor in the context of situation (thus, a valid correspondent may be available in L2 but the translator may not know it or momentarily recall it, or he may judge that it would not be suitable for the receivers, or, most frequently, that the communicative effect would not be achieved as effectively with the correspondent as with some other, non-correspondent expression).

The approach to contrastive correspondence advocated here, then, starts with a source text and its translation. The first step is to identify a particular unit of form in L1 for which contrastive correspondents (notice the plural, since correspondences are typically one-to-more than one) are to be sought in L2. Suppose that the original text is in Croatian and the translation in English, and that contrastive correspondents are to be established for the Croatian Instrumental Case. The original text will yield a number of instances of use of that particular formal element, and for each of these uses the translation will have either zero or some L2 unit(s) relatable to the Instrumental: *rezati nožem* – cut with a knife, *doći sa ženom* – come with one's wife, *doći vlakom* – come by train, *doći popodnevnim vlakom* – come on the afternoon train, *doći automobilom* – come by car/in a car, *putovati prvim razredom* – travel first class, *letjeti Lufthansom* – fly Lufthansa, *šetati parkom* – walk in the park, *prolaziti poljem* – walk across the field, *prolaziti šumom* – walk through the forest, *odbiti s indignacijom* – refuse indignantly/with indignation, *predavati utorkom* – lecture on Tuesday/on Tuesdays/Tuesdays, *pisati tintom* – write in ink, etc. An example of the Instrumental having no counterpart in the translated text is found when the instruction *pišite velikim štampanim slovima* (»write in block capitals«) is translated as *use block capitals*. The difference between this last example and all the preceding examples is one between contrastive correspondents and a non-correspondent. The procedure used to establish the difference and isolate contrastive correspondents in

translationally equivalent texts is that of backtranslation (cf. Spalatin 1967, Ivir 1988), which is semantically bound translation, intended to serve as a check on the semantic content. Translated units which – as linguistic units of L2 and not as pieces of communication – translate back into the starting units of L1 are their correspondents. Those that do not translate in this way are not recognized as contrastive correspondents (in our last example, *use block capitals* backtranslates as *koristite/upotrijebite velika štampana slova*).

It should be noted that the successful identification of contrastive correspondents in the way described here achieves two things: first, while recognizing that both are involved, it separates the *langue* from the *parole* aspects of translation and thereby makes for a neater theoretical study of the translation process; second, it not only provides a more or less exhaustive list of correspondents (depending on the size of the corpus) but also enables generalizations to be made about the particular function of the L1 unit that the different correspondents reflect (in our example, the Croatian Instrumental has different English correspondents for functions such as Instrument, Company, Manner, Mode, Means, Place, Time, etc.). Even the functional ambiguity of L1 gets resolved in the L2 correspondent: *pisati olovkom* has the corresponding *write with a pencil* when the interpretation is Instrumental and *write in pencil* when the interpretation is Mode. Practical uses of such contrastive statements for translation pedagogy are not negligible, while a full-scale analysis of pairs of languages would result in bilingual dictionaries of correspondent linguistic units with specifications of the functions of each L1 unit covered by a particular L2 correspondent.

In this way, contrastive correspondence and translation equivalence, though separated methodologically as they should be, would remain firmly linked, just as they are in translation itself: contrastive correspondents would be established on the basis of equivalent texts and would in turn be used by translators in their search for translation equivalence.

REFERENCES

- BOLINGER, D. 1966. »Transmutation: Structural translation«. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*. IX: 130–144.
- CATFORD, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- FILIPOVIĆ, R. 1971. »The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian – English contrastive project«. In: G. Nickel, ed., *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 107–114.

- HARRIS, B. 1983. »Co-writing: A Canadian technique for communicative equivalence«. In: G. Jäger and A. Neubert, Hrsg., *Semantik und Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge 6. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie. 121–132.
- HOLZ-MÄNTTÄRI, J. 1986. »Translatorisches Handeln – theoretisch fundierte Berufsprofile«. In: M. Snell-Hornby, ed., *Übersetzungswissenschaft: Eine Neuorientierung*. Tübingen: Francke. 348–374.
- IVIR, V. 1969. »Contrasting via translation: Formal correspondence vs. translation equivalence«. *Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian – English Contrastive Project, Studies*. 1: 13–25.
- IVIR, V. 1970. »Remarks on contrastive analysis and translation«. *Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian – English Contrastive Project, Studies*. 2: 14–26.
- IVIR, V. 1981. »Formal correspondence vs. translation equivalence revisited«. *Poetics Today*. 2: 4. 51–59.
- IVIR, V. 1983. »Reasons for semantic shifts in translation«. In: G. Jäger and A. Neubert, Hrsg., *Semantik und Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge 6. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie. 62–67.
- IVIR, V. 1988. »Translation and backtranslation«. In: M. Radovanović, ed., *Yugoslav General Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 131–143.
- IVIR, V. 1991–92. »On the non-algorithmic nature of translation theory«. *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagabiensia*. XXXVI–XXXVII: 85–91.
- KRZESZOWSKI, T.P. 1971. »Equivalence, congruence and deep structure«. In: G. Nickel, ed., *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 37–48.
- KRZESZOWSKI, T.P. 1972. »Kontrastive generative Grammatik«. In: G. Nickel, ed., *Reader zur kontrastiven Linguistik*. Frankfurt: Athenäum Fischer Verlag. 75–84.
- MARTON, W. 1968. »Equivalence and congruence in transformational contrastive studies«. *Studia Anglicae Posnaniensia*. I: 53–62.
- MESCHONNIC, H. 1973. *Poétique de la traduction /Pour la poésie II/*. Paris: Gallimard.
- MOUNIN, G. 1963. *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
- NEUBERT, A. 1985. *Text and Translation*. Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge 8. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- NIDA, E.A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- NIDA, E.A. and C.R. Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- REISS, K. and H.J. Vermeer. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- SELESKOVITCH, D. 1990. »La contribution de l'interprétation à la théorie de la traduction.« In: R. Arntz and G. Thome, Hrsg., *Übersetzungswissenschaft: Ergebnisse und Perspektiven. Festschrift für Wolfram Wilts zum 65. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 528–535.
- SPALATIN, L. 1967. »Contrastive methods«. *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagabiensia*. 23: 29–45.
- STEINER, G. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- VERNAY, H. 1974. *Essai sur l'organisation de l'espace par divers systèmes linguistiques: Contribution à une linguistique de la traduction*. München.
- VOEGLIN, C.F. 1954. »Multiple stage translation«. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 20. 271–280.
- WILSS, W. 1982. *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

FORMALNA/KONTRASTIVNA KORESPONDENCIJA I PRIJEVODNA
EKVIVALENCIJA

Ovaj članak daje pregled upotrebe naziva »formalna korespondencija« u teoriji prevođenja i njegov odnos prema nazivu »prijevodna ekvivalencija«. Ističe se da se korespondencija uspostavlja na razini langue, dok se ekvivalencija uspostavlja na razini parole. Budući da je korespondencija produkt kontrastivne analize (djelova) jezičnih sustava, predlaže se izraz »kontrastivna korespondencija« kao adekvatniji od »formalne korespondencije« (čime se, uz ostalo, izbjegava i moguća dvosmislenost termina »formalan«). Autor izlaže vlastitu metodu dobivanja kontrastivnih korespondenata iz prijevodno ekvivalentnih tekstova, oslanjajući se na pojam »povratnog prijevoda«, te opisuje njihovo mjesto među elementima koji sačinjavaju kontekst situacije u kojem se odvija prevođenje i njihovu ulogu u ostvarenju ekvivalencije.