

Motto: “Translation and paraphrasing”

A contrastive analysis of mediation processes: Translation and paraphrasing

1. Introduction

Translation and paraphrasing are both types of written mediation processes (CEFR, 2001, p. 87). They make communication possible between persons who are unable to communicate with each other directly, for instance, because of language differences. Translation is the process when the translator takes a written text and creates a parallel text in a different language. “The translator, being situated between the reader of the target language and the writer of the source language, needs to first interpret the meaning of the original text and then restate the meaning in the target language” (Shi, 2012, p. 136). Paraphrasing is “a kind of intra-lingual ‘translation’, a translation from one language into the same language or a restatement of a text in other words” (Tankó, 2013, p. 15). These mediation processes are similar because both of them result in a text which has practically the same meaning as the original passage. However, there are also differences. The main difference between translation and paraphrase is that translation involves more than one language, while paraphrase involves only one. Therefore, if the source text is in one language and is rewritten in another one, we talk about translation. If the source and the target texts are in the same language but contain different words, word forms, or grammatical structures and yet convey a very similar meaning, the new version of the text is called a paraphrase. To sum up, these processes are different but also closely related and rather complex, and as a result at times problematic. The aim of this essay is to discuss potential problems that may occur in the course of the translation and paraphrasing processes at syntactic and semantic levels and their solutions that might help alleviate these problems.

2. Method of analysis

Baker (1992) presents a systematic discussion of the aspects of translation equivalence at different levels. Bruce (1995) defines translation equivalence as “the similarity between a word (or expression) in one language and its translation in another. This similarity results from overlapping ranges of reference” (p. 26). Baker distinguishes several subtypes of translation equivalence, which listed from the simplest possible level to the most complex one are the following: equivalence at word level; equivalence above word level; grammatical equivalence; textual equivalence, which is divided into two parts — the first one is about thematic and information structures while the second addresses cohesion; and the last subtype is pragmatic equivalence. Given that the two mediation processes are very similar, it can be argued that a central concern of both is equivalence. Consequently, Baker's taxonomy of translation equivalence is used in this essay as a tool for the analysis of equivalence in the two mediation processes.

3. Discussion

In what follows, this essay discusses and juxtaposes equivalence in translation and paraphrasing. The analysis follows the taxonomy proposed by Baker (1992).

3.1 Translation equivalence type one

The first type of translation equivalence is equivalence at word level. It can happen that a word has no equivalent in the target language, so the translator cannot find a word with the same meaning as the word in the source language.

Baker (1992) claims that there are some types of non-equivalence, which can raise problems. Culture-specific concepts can cause difficulties for translators because they do not exist in other cultures. As an example, Hungarian husbands often say *házisárkány*, that is *housedragon* for their wives, which is funny in some contexts; for instance, when they want to

kid their partners, but it can be a negative word, meaning that the woman is furious, unkind, bossy, and controlling. The Hungarian word may have an equivalent in different languages, such as *virago* in English, but these equivalents do not refer especially to wives. Sometimes one word can reflect a meaning in one language but in another one the identical meaning can only be expressed by a whole stretch of language because one of the languages is semantically complex. For example, the Brazilian word *arruação* means “clearing the ground under coffee trees of rubbish and piling it in the middle of the row in order to aid in the recovery of beans dropped during harvesting” (as cited in Baker, 1992, p. 22), which cannot be translated by a single word into English. Furthermore, the source language and the target language might make slight distinctions in meaning. A word can have more equivalents in the target language, each of which may have small differences in meaning. As an example, Hungarian people differentiate whether an old man is *öreg*, *vén*, *koros*, *éltes*, or *aggastyán*, but English speakers say only *old* or maybe *very old*. If the source language does not include this phenomenon, the translator finds it difficult to choose the right equivalent. Moreover, the target language may lack superordinates, that is, general words, or hyponyms, which have type-of relationship with superordinates. For instance, Ya (2012) claims that “in English there is no superordinate for the color terms *red*, *green*, *yellow*, *blue*, *white*, etc. The term *color* is a noun, which is not of the same part of speech as the member terms” (p 10). The English language has many hyponyms under the word *jump* like *leap*, *vault*, *spring*, *bounce*, *dice*, *clear*, *plunge*, and *plummet*; however, Hungarian does not have a variety of specific words as people can only say *ugrik*, *ugrál*, and *szökken*. According to Heltai (1988), Hungarian does not include hyponyms for *tail*, that is *farok*, or *claw*, that is *karom* unlike English which has the expressions *stern*, *scut*, or *brush* for *tail* and *talon* or *clutch* for *claw*.

Differences can also appear in form. In the case of suffixes or prefixes, translators often do not find an equivalent in the target language because it does not include a particular

word form; thus, they have to understand the exact meaning of suffixes or prefixes to be able to translate the problematic words correctly. For instance, English has many couplets like *employer/employee* or *trainer/trainee* and not all of them have an equivalent in Hungarian. *Employer* and *employee* can be translated as *munkáltató* and *munkavállaló*, and *edző* is the equivalent for *trainer*. But the word *trainee* has to be explained as “the person who is training” or “the person who is being trained”. Additionally, there are specific forms which are not used so frequently in the target language as in the source language or they are used for other purposes. English uses the continuous –ing form of verbs for linking clauses very frequently. Some languages have equivalents for this, but they might not use it so often. If a translator uses this form in a German text as frequently as it is used in English, the result will be very unnatural. Finally, loan words in the source text also cause problems. They are used for their prestige, but if there is no equivalent loan word in the target language, they are translated and thus lose their prestigious meaning. English speakers use some French loan words such as *au fait* which means *by the way*. It is not used in the Hungarian language, thus the translator has to translate it, so the prestigious meaning disappears.

Problems at word level also appear in connection with paraphrasing. Tankó (2013) claims that paraphrasing the source text is not an easy task because it has to meet many requirements. The whole passage to be paraphrased should be rewritten in a way that the paraphrased version looks very different from the original text while it contains exactly the same information as the original. Some of the author’s own wordings cannot be simply mixed up with the paraphraser’s words because that results in patchwriting (Pecorari, 2003) and not paraphrasing; therefore, as many of the source text words should be paraphrased as possible.

Paraphrasing develops the “competence in text-responsible writing” (Keck, 2006, p. 263) which is very important at universities. If a text is not paraphrased but used in an academic writing, the writer commits plagiarism. However, there are parts of texts which

cannot or should not be paraphrased. Steer (1995) suggests that public domain words, that is generic words which have no true synonyms, should not be substituted because this change may lead to a vague or an inappropriate meaning. Instead of the word *horse*, the paraphraser should not say *domesticated perissodactyl mammal* or *paci* instead of *ló* because these changes sound very strange, inadequate, and even hilarious (Tankó, 2013). Furthermore, technical terms, like *software* or *currency* in connection with stock exchange or currency change, should not be paraphrased either as most of them have no synonyms. However, the paraphraser has to find the balance because if he or she leaves too many words unchanged then the result might be a near copy instead of a paraphrase (Keck, 2006).

Fortunately, there are various strategies which can be used to solve these word-level problems. First of all, for instance, a culture-specific concept can be translated by a cultural substitution. It may not have the same meaning, but it probably conveys a similar meaning to the reader. For instance, English people have *Cream Tea* in the afternoon, which is a meal including tea, scone, clotted cream to eat, and sometimes sandwiches, cakes, and cookies. However, Hungarian people have *uzsonna*, which is also a meal during the afternoon, but does not necessarily contain tea and cakes. People eat what they feel like eating. Secondly, if the target language lacks a specific hyponym, it can be translated by a superordinate, that is a more general word which covers the missing specific term. English speaking girls often *polish* their nails with nail polish, but Hungarian girls rather *fest*, that is *paint* them with nail polish. Thirdly, translators can also use loan words, but in this case they have to explain their meaning in order to be able to use them without any problems later on. A few years ago, translators had to explain what a *hot dog* or a *hamburger* was before they used these loan words in Hungarian texts. Nowadays, these words do not mean any problem to any age group. Fourthly, some words or expressions can be simply omitted from a sentence if their meanings are expressed by other words. For example, the Hungarian word *már*, that is *already* in the

sentence *Már jártam Párizsban* is not translated as in English the Present Perfect Tense (*I have been to Paris.*) expresses its meaning. However, this method should be used carefully as it may result in loss of meaning in some cases. Additionally, illustrations can be used which are especially effective and useful when the word in the source language refers to an object which can be illustrated very easily but has no equivalent in the target language. For instance, instead of trying to explicate what a *puli* looks like, the translator can paste a picture of the dog in the place of the explanation.

With respect to paraphrasing, the academic writer can make numerous word-level changes, such as using synonyms, substituting, adding or deleting words, or replacing a function word with another one (Keck, 2006). A thesaurus can help the paraphraser find the appropriate synonym for a word because being unfamiliar with a new word can result in an inadequate text. Connotations also have to be taken into consideration (Steer, 1995). A phrase or clause can be added reflecting a thought which is not explicitly expressed in the original passage (Shi, 2012). Some grammatical changes can also be made on word level if the writer cannot find a proper synonym. Word classes can be changed, for instance, a noun can become another noun (*work* → *worker*), a verb (*trainer* → *to train*), an adjective (*difficulty* → *difficult*), or even an adverb (*difference* → *differently*) (Tankó, 2013). Verbs can also appear in infinitive or gerund form, such as *to make* → *making*, they can be changed from active into passive voice, like *They find it.* → *It is found.* and vica versa. However, synonyms should not be overused because using different words to denote the same thing can confuse readers, thus *mansion*, *manor*, *villa*, *hall*, and *castle* should not be used for a *huge house* within one text. Furthermore, rearranging the order of words combined with word level changes and changes in grammatical number (Keck, 2006), such as using *people* instead of *everybody*, is a very effective way to paraphrase a passage (Tankó, 2013). For example, *building of the house* can be reordered as *house building* and then rephrased as *house construction*. These strategies can

help the writer to solve problems which occur at word level in the course of the mediation processes.

3.2 Translation equivalence type two

The second type is equivalence above word level. There are restrictions which define the way in which words can combine with words to form stretches of language. Collocations, idioms, and fixed expressions belong to these lexical patterns. In the first group every single word can collocate with many other words, so they have a specific relationship. Their forms can be changed or they can be combined in many grammatical forms, so they are flexible in this respect. However, sometimes words do not collocate with all forms of another word. On the other hand, idioms and fixed expressions can be mentioned in the same group of lexical patterns as they are very similar. Unlike collocations, they are frozen patterns and cannot be varied. The writer cannot change the word order; add, or cross out a word; substitute a word with another; or change the grammatical structure of an idiom. The whole stretch of language expresses a particular meaning, which sometimes cannot be guessed from the constitutive elements. In contrast, the meanings of fixed expressions and proverbs, which have to be considered as one unit that expresses a particular meaning (Baker, 1992), can be guessed from their individual components.

Collocations are associated with problems in translation because collocational patterns differ from each other in different languages. Consequently, translators should not use the same collocation pattern from the source-language if it is unusual in the target-language. For instance, English speaking people take photos while Hungarians make or do them. On the other hand, the meaning of a pattern can be misinterpreted very easily when it has a similar form in both languages but a different meaning. For example, the phrase *hit up* means visiting somebody or calling somebody in English; however, in Hungarian the literal translation *felütni* means to open up a book or to strike, for instance, a shuttlecock onto the top of

something or highly into the air. Furthermore, keeping the meaning of the source collocation and producing a typical collocation in the target language is a difficult task. Some losses of meaning or additions are almost unavoidable. In Hungary, short drinks refer to spirits, which are called hard drinks in English, however, these collocations do not include the same kinds of alcoholic drinks. For example, the famous Hungarian spirit, *pálinka* belongs to short drinks, but not to hard drinks. Hard drinks are distilled rather than fermented, which means that *pálinka* cannot be a member of this group. Moreover, the problem with culture-specific concepts also arises at this level. The translations of these collocations requires the use of additional pieces of information because the concepts which they refer to are not necessarily known by the target readers who thus need some explanation. As an example, Hungarian people love eating beef stew which is not known by other cultures or at least not in the same form, thus it has to be explained what kind of a meal beef stew is. Finally, unusual strings of words can be used to create a new image. These are called marked collocations. The translator has to mark them in the target language to help the readers recognize them. For instance, “*pretty woman* is a typical (or strong) collocation, and so is *handsome man*. This does not mean that *handsome woman* or *pretty man* is impossible, just that they are very unusual or marked” (Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 249).

Translators have to face two main problems when it comes to idioms and fixed expressions. Firstly, they have to recognise them; and secondly, they have to give back the same meaning these lexical patterns convey. However, many translators will never be able to be so sensitive about manipulating an idiom or a fixed expression as a native speaker; thus, various problems may occur when an idiom is interpreted. First of all, the translator has to recognise idioms in order to interpret them properly. It is not always obvious whether an expression is an idiom as it has many types. Expressions which state impossible conditions such as *it's raining cats and dogs* or involve ill-formed stretches of language like *trip the light*

fantastic which means *to dance lightly* are likely to be idioms, and they are very easy to identify. If a stretch of words does not make much sense and is hard to understand, it is probably an idiom. They should not be interpreted literally. Expressions starting with *like* are also likely to be idioms, for example, *like an open book* meaning being very open, honest, and not hiding secrets. After recognising them, it is still easy to misinterpret them because they are misleading; that is, they have both a literal and an idiomatic meaning, like *going out with somebody* can mean “having fun with someone on a Friday night” or “having a relationship with this person”. Sometimes they can have a really close counterpart in the target language which looks similar but has a completely different meaning. For example, the English idiom *don't look a gift horse in the mouth* means that if somebody is given a gift, he or she should not be ungrateful, just be happy about it. The similar Hungarian idiom *ajándék lónak ne nézd a fogát* means that the person who receives a gift should not judge the gift based on its price.

After recognising and interpreting these frozen expressions, translators have to translate them, which also brings along problematic situations. An idiom or a fixed expression not always has an equivalent in the target language because it may be culture-specific, but it is the meaning it conveys that has to be translated not the expression itself. That is why translators may say *Boldog Karácsonyt* which equals *Happy Christmas* instead of the well-known formulae *Merry Christmas*. Sometimes they have a close counterpart, but they are not used in the same context. If somebody or something *goes to the dogs* then he, she, or it loses one's good qualities or becomes worse in character. If a German person *geht vor die Hunde*, he or she dies miserably. However, the latter one can be used only in connection with people, while the English version of the idiom can also refer to a place. In a few cases, both the literal and the idiomatic meanings of an idiom are used; however, the corresponding expression might not have both meanings. “He had sufficient influence to be able to *poke his nose into* the private affairs of others where less aristocratic noses might have been speedily bloodied”

(as cited in Baker, 1992, p. 70). This game with idioms is only meaningful in languages which have a similar idiom in form, such as the Hungarian *beleüti az orrát*, otherwise it loses its sense.

Paraphrasing collocations can be accomplished by changing word classes and word order at the same time. For instance, *photo shooting* can be changed into *taking pictures*. Reporting phrases, such as *According to Smith* or *Smith suggests*, which are kinds of collocations in the field of paraphrasing should be used to introduce the paraphrased passage (Keck, 2006). If they are found in the original text, they can be easily changed into a different reporting phrase. However, the words of an idiom or a fixed expression cannot be replaced by synonyms because as a result of such mechanical substitutions they would lose their meanings (Tankó, 2013). Anyway, *barking and meowing pets are pouring* instead of *it is raining cats and dogs* would not be only meaningless but also ridiculous at the same time.

Nevertheless, the following strategies can be useful for solving these problems. Translators can use an idiom which has similar meaning and form or which has similar meaning but different form, and thus the meaning is conveyed. For instance, *once upon a time* can be translated as *egyszer volt, hol nem volt* into Hungarian. If there is no equivalent in the target language, the translator can simply paraphrase the idiom or omit it if its meaning cannot be paraphrased simply. In all cases, translators have to keep in mind that they should use only typical expressions or the text will be unreadable. In a paraphrase, academic writers can also replace the problematic idioms with other ones, which have a similar meaning or they can simply express their meanings using straightforward language.

3.3 Translation equivalence type three

The third subtype of translation equivalence is grammatical equivalence. According to Baker (1992):

Grammar is the set of rules which determine the way in which units such as words and phrases can be combined in a language and the kind of information which has to be made explicit in utterances. A language can, of course, express any kind of information its speaker needs to express but the grammatical system of the given language will determine the ease with which certain notions such as time reference or gender can be made explicit. (p. 83)

The grammatical system of each language differs in several categories, resulting in changes after translation. On the one hand, number is expressed in the lexical structure. Most languages distinguish singular and plural form; however, in some languages, such as in Fijian, singular, dual, trial, and plural forms can also be found. If the target language does not make distinction between many forms, translators must not overspecify this information. On the other hand, there are grammatical distinctions depending on whether a noun or a pronoun is ranked as masculine, feminine, or inanimate, like in German language there are *der Tisch*, *die Katze* and *das Kind*. In some languages where gender distinction is expressed not only by nouns and pronouns but also by verbs and adjectives connecting to them it is more problematic to change gender. For example, German people express gender with the definite articles and adjectives. If the noun *Haus* is changed in the phrase *in dem großen Haus* into *Klasse*, the result is *in der großen Klasse*. If it is put in plural form, it becomes *in denen großen Klassen*. Portuguese language also signals gender at the end of adjectives. The form of the adjective *Portuguese* has to be changed if the noun is *girl* instead of *boy*: *o rapaz português*, *a rapariga portuguesa*. Moreover, the category of person is also distinguished in first, second, and third-person singular and plural. In some languages, these can be further subdivided according to gender, social status, or formality. Portuguese language uses affixes to express person at the end of verbs. That is why the verb *have* has five different forms in present tense (second-person plural is not used in Portuguese): *tenho*, *tens*, *tem*, *temos*, *têm*. If

the distinction in the source language is not so detailed as in the target language, the translator has to decide which dimension to use. Furthermore, the tense and aspect system can also be problematic because the use of these grammatical categories may not express the same thing in various languages. For instance, Portuguese people use past continuous tense in different situations than English speakers do. If *When I was five years old* is said in Portuguese, it is in past continuous tense: *Quando eu tinha cinco anos*. Finally, voice poses several problems for translators. The use of the active voice emphasises the subject and the action at the same time; however, the passive voice puts the emphasis only on the action as sometimes it is “agentless”. Some languages use the passive voice really frequently while others use it rarely and many do not use it at all. In the latter case, translators have a hard task mainly when the sentence does not even mention the agent. Hungarian language can be a good example in this situation because it does not use the passive voice or if it is used accidentally, some says that it is ungrammatical and “unhungarian”. If the English sentence *The bank was robbed* is translated into Hungarian, the translator says *Kirabolták a bankot*, that is *(They) robbed the bank*.

Paraphrasing is also affected by some of these problems. For instance, a simple sentence can turn into a continuous one, like *She seems heart-broken* can turn into *She is being sad right now*, or the active sentence can be changed into a passive one or the other way around, but this latter change is not so useful because the emphasis is changed and therefore the new meaning differs from the original one: the meaning expressed by the original grammatical structure is partly lost (Tankó, 2013). In the sentence *My homework is done*, the emphasis is on the action, but essence of the sentence *I did my homework* is *I* and the status of *my homework* is not so important.

To solve the above mentioned problems, translators have to know the source and the target language very well in order to be able to decide which grammatical structures should be

used and which are not unusual in the target language's culture. At this level, cutting long sentences into short and more simple ones or merging very short sentences to create a longer one, and revising the order of information are very effective ways to paraphrase successfully.

3.4 Translation equivalence type four

Fourthly, at the level of textual equivalence, linear pattern plays an important role in processing information and organizing text messages. A clause can have two kinds of structure: thematic and information structure. Baker (1992) claims, that an approach treats them as separate structures. In terms of thematic structure, a clause contains two segments: a theme and a rheme. This distinction is speaker-oriented. The theme that the clause is about has two functions. On the one hand, it is an orientation point which connects something back to previous stretches of text and thus maintains coherence. On the other hand, it is also a departure point which connects something forward and contributes to the improvement of further stretches of language. Rheme is what is said about the theme and thus represents the conveyed information. Moreover, information structure is hearer-oriented, and it is also divided into two parts: what is already known and what is new to the hearer.

According to another approach, theme includes context-dependent items and rheme includes context-independent items. The latter one can be subdivided into transition and rheme. Transition is the element which contains linking devices for binding parts of a clause (Baker, 1992).

Translators can make choices in textual analysis at this level. Sometimes they can keep the thematic pattern of the source text and not ruin the target text. If an item is in theme position in the source text, it can be easily placed in theme position also in the target text. It can happen that translators cannot keep the pattern in the target text without destroying the original one because there are many restrictions regarding the choice and ordering of themes. In this case, the target text might not look natural and it is better if they abandon the original

pattern. However, the solution they choose still has to maintain a sense of continuity, that is, it has to be coherent.

Same options are also available for paraphrasing. An academic writer should also preserve the pattern while paraphrasing, and if he cannot do it, he has to preserve the continuity of the text.

Possible solutions for translation problems have already been mentioned above: if the translator cannot preserve the pattern, he or she should use another one. In paraphrasing, the writer cannot replace words if the communicative organization of the sentence alters (Wanner, 2007), so the paraphraser should abandon the pattern.

3.5 Translation equivalence type five

Furthermore, at textual level cohesion is also important. Renkma (2004) states that “cohesion is the connection that results when the interpretation of a textual element is dependent on another element in the text” (p. 49). In other words, cohesion establishes a network of various relations, which link parts of a text.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are five different cohesive devices in English. Firstly, reference is the connection between a word and an earlier mentioned text element to which the word refers. It helps the reader to be able to mark participants or events in the text. Sometimes this link depends on personal knowledge; if the reader is not an educated person, he or she might not realize that two or more words refer to the same person or thing. A continuum of cohesive elements may refer to the same entity, for instance, the range of a hyponym, a synonym, a superordinate, a general word, and pronominal reference, such as a list including *boy*, *lad*, *kid*, and *child*. This pattern is called anaphora and can vary across languages. In English the most used reference items are pronouns while in other languages they are rarely used. The following two sentences are examples for this phenomenon. *Judith bought a car. She was very happy about it until it broke down.* In the

latter sentence, the pronouns *she* and *it* refers to *Judith* and the *car* which are mentioned in the first sentence. That is how pronouns can link sentences. The small differences which appear in many languages may cause some problems for translators. For instance, in Hungarian and mostly in Portuguese these linking pronouns do not appear in the sentences, thus an inattentive reader might lose the path.

Secondly, substitution and ellipsis are grammatical relations. Substitution includes replacing a word with another one, while ellipsis means omitting a word and not putting another word into its place. In the case of substitution there are nominal, verbal, and clausal references, while ellipsis also appears in the case of nouns, verbs and clauses. However, boundaries are not unequivocal between these devices. English often uses words like “one” or “do” for substitution, but translators should keep in mind that there are different devices in each language which vary. While translating a text, they should consider not only language but also text-type preferences. In *I’ll have a cup of coffee. – I’ll have the same.*, the words *the same* substitute *a cup of coffee* in the second sentence. If a translator translates these sentences into Hungarian, he or she might substitute the object the same way in the second sentence and leave out the subject and the verb from the translation: *Egy kávét szeretnék. – Ugyanez lesz.* In the case of ellipsis, word omission is a trait of the Hungarian language. The following sentences can work as an example: *Have you got a dog? – Yes, I have.* In the second sentence, the phrase *got a dog* is missing. In the German and Portuguese languages, the same phenomenon can be observed: *Hast du einen Hund? – Ja, ich habe.* or *Tens um cão? – Sim, eu tenho.* Hungarian people would leave out more than English, German, or Portuguese speakers because they might say only *yes* as an answer to this question.

Thirdly, conjunctions link clauses, sentences, and paragraphs to each other, signal how these parts of a text are related to each other. There are four types of conjunctive relations: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Formal markers which bind clauses, sentences,

and paragraphs together specify the type of conjunction. For instance, *I like tea and milk* illustrates an additive relationship, *I like tea but I do not like milk* is an example of adversative relationship. *I like tea because it tastes great* is an example of causal conjunction, while *After I drink milk, I put my cup into the dishwasher* illustrates the temporal type of conjunctive relation. Subordinators also belong to this type of cohesion. They connect one part of the sentence to the other part, but do not link the sentence to another one. For example, in the sentence *After I put down my cup, somebody rang the bell*, the word *after* joints the clauses but does not establish any connection with another sentence. Some languages use some words or simple structures to establish this link while others use subordinators and very complicated structures. For instance, English greatly relies on the punctuation system to mark links and breaks between pieces of information. It uses commas to separate the items of the list, thus semicolon is used to separate the clauses: *I like cats, lions, and tigers; however, I hate snakes, spiders, and crocodiles*. In the Hungarian version of this sentence, semicolon would not be used because this kind of punctuation is not applied too frequently in this language: *Szeretem a macskákat, az oroszlánokat és a tigriseket, azonban nem szeretem a kígyókat, a pókokat és a krokodilokat*. Stylistic features make the translation of this device difficult apart from naturalness, logic, and accuracy.

Finally, lexical cohesion is also a cohesive device. It can be realized with the help of words related to each other within a text. These words can have a cohesive relation with any other item. Lexical cohesion has two main categories: reiteration and collocation (Halliday & Hassan, 1976). Reiteration means the repetition of a word or its meaning; that is, an earlier mentioned item is used again or its synonym, near-synonym, a related superordinate, or a general word is given. For instance, in *My father always tells jokes because he likes being funny*, the pronoun *he* refers to *my father*. It differs from reference because it can point to a different entity. That is, if the sentence *Fathers are so foolish* is added, one cannot say that

fathers is a reference to *my father* because *fathers* include more people; that is, this noun does not imply only that one person who was mentioned above. Collocation includes a few lexical items that are linked to each other in some way; for instance, they are the opposite of each other, such as *good* and *bad* or *dark* and *light*; they are in part-whole relation, like *book* and *sheet* or *house* and *room*; or they are co-hyponyms, as *blue* and *red* of which subordinate is *colours* or *rose* and *daffodil* under the subordinate *flower*. Their meanings depend on these relations with other items; translators have to trace this network. A good translator makes sure that after finishing a translation, the new version of the text is cohesive enough.

However, other languages use other devices or different combinations which do not necessarily match the cohesive devices that create relations in English language. Each language has its own network, so the translator cannot select from the same ranges of lexical items in the target language, only from others which are also just as cohesive as the webs in the source language. For instance, English does not use any cohesive devices to link the following clauses; it uses only the gerund form of the verb: *Pouring some milk into my cup, a few drops landed on the table*. However, in Hungarian, people would use some linking words such as *like*, *as*, or *just as*: *Amint öntöttem a tejet a csészémbe, néhány csepp az asztalon landolt.* / *Ahogy öntöttem a tejet a csészémbe, néhány csepp az asztalon landolt.*

Cohesive devices, such as conjunctions, should not be paraphrased because they are grammatically dependent so they will be paraphrased automatically according to the new version of the passage. In the following examples it can be seen that as the writer changes the type of the sentence, the transition word changes along with it: “*Boys learned competition, but girls learned cooperation at school.*” → “*While boys learned competition, girls learned cooperation at school.*” → “*Boys learned competition; however, girls learned cooperation at school.*” → “*Unlike girls, who learned cooperation at school, boys learned competition*” (Steer, 1995, p. 104).

Translators and academic writers have to know the languages that they work with very well to be able to find the accurate cohesive devices and thus create a cohesive text in the target or in the same language.

3.6 Translation equivalence type six

The last type of translation equivalence discussed by Baker is pragmatic equivalence. “Pragmatics is the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning (...) as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation” (Baker, 1992, p. 217). A text should be not only cohesive but also coherent. Charolles (1983) claims that there are two types of coherence: supplemental coherence, which is a minimal coherence that does not provide detailed explanation, and explanatory coherence which is a bit broader. For instance, the reader after reading *I went to school. Our conversation was great.* might think that the person met somebody in the school who he or she talked to; however, nothing suggests in the sentences that the subject had the conversation at school. This is supplemental coherence. If the speaker tells that he or she met somebody at school who he or she had a conversation with, then it is explanatory coherence, as the connection between the sentences is explained. Another process of interpretation is implicature, which allows the reader to understand more than is stated because further meaning is implied. An example is the following: *Do you want to have dinner with me later? – I am still working.* The answer is not a real answer to the question because it is not asked whether the questioned person is still at work or not. The respondent might imply that he or she does not want to have dinner with the questioner and does not want to hurt his or her feelings as he or she does not give a straightforward answer. Implied meaning is never marked and it originates from the Co-operative Principle and a number of maxims such as Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner (Grice, 1975). They are not strict rules to which the writer has to adhere; they only help the writer to orient.

A translator cannot figure out the implied meaning of a text if he or she does not understand the meanings of words or structures. If any words or structures are mistranslated from the source text, the implied meaning in the target text can be easily affected. Furthermore, if the translator cannot identify references to participants and entities, he or she cannot draw conclusion and preserve coherence.

The same problems might appear while paraphrasing a text because the writer also has to understand the meanings of words and the implicatures in order to create an accurate paraphrase, otherwise the new version of the text will have a different meaning. For example, the sentence *I told him that it was raining when he asked me whether I wanted to take a walk* cannot be paraphrased in the following way as it would lose the implied meaning of the last clause: *It was pouring at the time when he wanted me to go for a walk with him outside.*

Nevertheless, there are some strategies which can help writers to figure out implicatures, and they can answer the question of coherence. First of all, the writer has to understand the conventional meaning of words and structures in order to figure out the implied meaning. For instance, if *I am tired* is the answer to the question *Do you want to take a walk with me?* then the translator has to understand that the respondent is tired and does not want to take a walk. Each language has its conventional associations between linguistic patterns and deduced meanings, which might help the translator or the paraphraser understand implicatures. Furthermore, a reference which the reader might not know can ruin the continuity and hide the relevance of the sentence. Writers should use cultural substitution to make sure that a particular reference will be known by the reader. Paraphrasers should also pay attention whether they paraphrase the implied meaning in the right way or whether the implicature would disappear in the new version of the passage. If they recognise the implied meaning then the paraphrased piece of text will convey the same meaning as the original.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, after defining types of translational equivalences, this essay has discussed potential problems which might occur during translation and paraphrasing at different grammatical levels. These mediation processes coincide mostly at word level, above word level, and at grammatical level but slight overlap can be found at textual level in connection with cohesion and at pragmatic level. It also presented some possible solutions and strategies which can help writers to cope with these problematic situations in the course of translation and paraphrasing. The examples illustrating the upcoming problems in the paper might help the reader with understanding the problems and ways of solutions better in the hope of easier reading and better understanding.

References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London and New York, UK & NY: Routledge.
- Bruce, L. (1995). *Helps for lexical semantic analysis*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved on 11.11.2014 from SIL International. <http://www-01.sil.org/linguistics/glossaryoflinguisticterms/WhatIsTranslationalEquivalence.htm>
- Council of Europe (2001). *The common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*. Volume 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41–58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York, UK & NY: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. London and New York, UK & NY: Routledge.
- Heltai, P. (1988). *Hierarchical lexical relations in English and Hungarian*. In T. Magay & J. Zsigány (Eds.), *BudaLex '88 Proceedings: Papers from the 3rd International EURALEX Congress* (pp. 121–128). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 261–278.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 317–345.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 134–148.

- Steer, J. (1995). *Strategies for academic communication*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Tankó, Gy. (2013). *Paraphrasing, summarising and synthesising skills for academic writers: Theory and practice*. Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
- Wanner, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Selected lexical and grammatical topics in the meaning-text theory*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins Academic Publishers.
- Ya, L. (2012). *Theory of Hyponymy and Its Application in English Writing*. (Unpublished bachelor thesis). Zhejiang Wanli University, Ningbo.