

EQUIVALANCE IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

Morena Braçaj

Abstract—Translators try to make translations suitable for particular readers. Literary translators, during the translation process, strive to achieve "equivalence" at one or more levels of translation. It must be admitted, however, that 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, 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. Some theorists explain that the translator must take into account the problematic nature of the term and the fact that producing a completely equivalent to the source text is quite impossible. Some others examine literary translation as both a re-productive and a creative work, which aims at the same aesthetic effect. "Completely equivalent" translation is not possible because switching from one language to another inevitably brings about changes. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to review the theory of equivalence as interpreted by some of the most innovative theorists in this field as Nida and Taber, Catford, House, Baker etc. These theorists have studied equivalence in relation to the translation process, using different approaches, and have provided fruitful ideas for further study on this topic. Moreover, some examples are provided to illustrate better some specific concepts which impose problems to the translators during translation process.

Index Terms— Equivalence, translation, source language, target language, production, translator, meaning.

1 INTRODUCTION

When a word or phrase means exactly the same thing in both languages, we call that an equivalence, and it's understandably one of the first things professional translators look for. This requires a deep understanding of both cultures, not just the language. Translational equivalence is the similarity between a word or expression in one language and its translation in another. This similarity results from overlapping ranges of reference. A translation equivalent is a corresponding word or expression in another language. The main purpose of most literary translators is to convey meaningful ideas and concepts and to make the translated material appealing to the target readers. This can be done by trying to achieve a similar effect on the target readers and create a target text that is partially equivalent to the source text rather than producing a completely equivalent copy of the source text. Baker underlines the fact that although equivalence can usually be maintained, in a way it is always relative, as it is influenced by a host of linguistic and cultural factors. Similarly, House says that equivalence should never be thought of as absolute, but rather as relative in itself. Whereas, Catford defines translation as: "the replacement of the textual material of one language with the textual equivalent of another language". So, according to Catford, translating means transporting meaning from one language to another by breaking down the structure of the original text into constituent elements and building a new structure, through the same elements, but of the target language. By replacing these elements with the same ones, but which belong to the target language, the meaning of the original text can "arrive" in the target text unchanged. In this way the text was provided with the semantic identity of the original, from the moment that an absolute equivalence relationship was created between the source and the target

text. Indeed, both languages source and target, include a range of equivalents ranging from the morpheme, which is the smallest meaningful unit, to the larger units such as the sentence. In the translation process these language levels are presented as equivalent levels between the source language and the target language. For example, if we have a word in the source language, it is translated to the target language at the word level. It turns out that translation is a matter of building equivalence between two languages and it is worth noting that equivalence is a concept that belongs to the field of translation. Indeed, in terms of languages, no two absolute synonyms are found in one language. Like, there are no two words in two languages that are identical in meaning. While, translation includes at least two languages and since each language has its own features in phonology, grammar, dictionaries, reflection of different cultures, we can say that to a certain degree of each translation occurs the loss of meaning of the source text. From this point of view, in translation equivalence should be perceived as a kind of similarity or approximation and this means that then it is possible to create equivalence between the source text and the host text at different linguistic levels. It is often said that the main purpose of translation is to achieve an equivalent effect, where the translator must achieve to the reader an effect similar to that of the original. However, as there are cultural and syntactic differences between the two languages, this is not easy to achieve. Often the translator encounters concepts or words of a specific culture which have no direct equivalents in another language. So it seems that the way to achieve the "equivalent effect" with cultural substitutions is difficult to translate. Eugene Nida, one of the theorists, who has contributed a lot in the field of translation, is of the opinion that in the term "equivalence effect" there can be no

equivalence between different languages.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Thus, we see that translation is an operation or process, but at the same time, it is a product: It is an abstract concept consisting of the process and the product (Bell, 1991, p. 13). This means that translation is a process of transference operating among languages, that is, it is an interpretation of the verbal symbols in one language via the symbols of other languages. It is also an intra-language process: the translator often resorts to interpreting the source text by using the tools of the source language itself (vocabulary items and structure) when facing some difficulty in absorbing the message. He or she may look for the synonyms of a vocabulary item, paraphrase a text, or simplify it in order to grasp the meaning and then render it in a proper form in the target language. Translation must be reliable and valid: The meaning should not be changed regardless of the number of times it has been translated and should be valid as long as the translator translates what he is supposed to translate. In other words, he should not add or delete anything of the message in target language. Thus, translation consists of several diverse dimensions: It can refer to the process, the product, or the abstract concept of translation. The process focuses on what a translator does in turning the source text (ST) into a target text (TT) in another language. The sense of product centers on the outcome of the process. The sense of abstract concept of the general phenomenon compromises the subject field. In fact, translation is a process and a product: In the process, the translator renders the message in the target language. The outcome message should be complete, clear, and accurate fulfilling the objective of the source text. The translator should be concerned about the effect of the outcome translation on the receiver of the translation. So, translation can be a process of transferring the message of the source text into a target text. The outcome should be an acceptable translation as long as it carries with it all the meanings and objectives of the source text. We have seen that the definition of translation, according to Zaqani, is the transfer of speech with all its meanings and objectives into the speech of the second language. Having seen the definitions of translation above, I will now proceed to a review of the opinions of some notable scholars in the field. In *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Catford maintains that translation is concerned with a specific type of inter-language relationship and therefore, it is a branch of comparative linguistics. In other words, Catford sees translation as an operation performed on language: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another (1965, p. 27). Therefore, the concern of this study is to answer the following question: Is translation really a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another? The answer to this question will take into account two things: The first is a review of related literature and the second will be the provision of real examples that prove or disapprove the idea of text substitution. There is no adequate research about the topic of equivalence texts in translation. Nonetheless there are some theoretical (not based on practical experience) articles and studies that highlight certain problems in translation. In some cases, the reserachers indicate that lexical knowledge and

meaning insufficiency have a significant effect on translating texts from the source language to the target language or vice versa in the field of Applied Linguistics. They recommend that further research be conducted to i
investigate the effect of the translator's lexical knowledge on translating texts from SL to TL. They maintain that at the beginning of teaching and learning translation, few translators assume that translation is a process of doing things with words not in context. Translation is therefore a human activity that involves transferring not only the meaning of words but also the style, emotions, impression, and the effect of the writer in the source language into the target language. That is, a translator should be imaginative enough to convert the different techniques that are created by the SL writer into that of the TL audience. There have been many studies carried out to examine the difficulties and the factors influencing the translation process in its various facets sometimes as a contribution to the enforcing of a translation theory and a language teaching methodology as well as to identify the factors influencing the process of converting meaning from one language into another within a certain historical and cultural context. However, there has been limited research that seeks to probe the effect of lexical knowledge on translation and how this factor affects or hinders the translation process.

3 TYPES OF EQUIVALENCE

As In this section, I will focus on presenting a few types of equivalence which are used in the field of translation studies. As already mentioned above, the different types of equivalence that exist derive mainly from the importance given to one of the significant elements of a verbal production.

Koller proposes a five-type classification of equivalence:

- denotative equivalence, i.e. equivalence of the extralinguistic realities;
- connotative equivalence, i.e. lexical equivalence;
- text-normative equivalence, i.e. text type equivalence;
- pragmatic equivalence or communicative equivalence, i.e. effect equivalence;
- formal equivalence, i.e. form and aesthetics equivalence.

Baker discusses five cases of equivalence too:

- denotative equivalence, i.e. equivalence of the extralinguistic realities;
- connotative equivalence, i.e. lexical equivalence;
- text-normative equivalence, i.e. text type equivalence;
- pragmatic equivalence or communicative equivalence, i.e. effect equivalence;

Moreover, Baker also points to the fact that sometimes there is a lack of equivalence between the source and the target language, in other words some concepts do not exist in the target language. In such a situation, one speaks of non-equivalence.

A Romanian researcher, R. Superceanu indicates that there are three types of equivalence:

- communicative equivalence, i.e. equivalence in

terms of text function, communicative purpose and effect;

- cognitive equivalence, i.e. equivalence in terms of content;
- linguistic equivalence, i.e. equivalence at word, phrase, clause, sentence and text level.

3.1 FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE

In *From One Language to Another* published in 1986, Nida mentioned "functional equivalence" for the first time, which not only retained the essence of "dynamic equivalence" translation theory, but also made its meaning clearer and more accurate. The "functional equivalence" theory amended the previous "formal equivalence tends to emphasize fidelity to the language structure of the original language". It holds that in translation, attention should be paid not only to the meaning and spirit of the language, but also to the form as much as possible, because form also has meaning. If formal equivalence can be preserved without affecting the appropriateness and natural transmission of meaning and spirit, it is the best.

The "function" in Nida's "functional equivalence" refers to different pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and discourse, but with the same or similar expression function. This is the "reader's response theory" frequently mentioned by Nida, that is, the readers of a translated text should be able to understand and appreciate it in potentially the same manner as the original readers did. The target readers can comprehend the spirit and meaning of the original author from the lines in the translated text. However, it should be noted that, general readers cannot respond the same way in the original text and the translation at the same time, because most general readers cannot master both languages at the same time. Only those scholars who can understand the original text and appreciate the translated text can respond the same way after reading. It can be seen that the translator plays an extremely important role as a bridge in translation. The translator's knowledge, culture and professional qualification have an important influence on the translation quality of the work, and at the same time they also put forward high requirements for the translator.

Whereas, Raymond van Broeck (1978) and Munday (2008), consider the equivalence effect to be impossible (how can the "effect" be measured and on what criteria? How can a text have the same effect and be expected equally in cultures and different times?). This is difficult, especially when the time and environment of the source text bring distance. So, the translator must be careful to convey such a text in a cultural context that is far removed from the original and modern cultural context of the source text. Munday asserts that "*the whole question of equivalence inevitably requires subjective judgment by the translator or analyst.*" This leads to the subjective reaction of the reader. The interpretation of the texts depends on the readers' own subjective experiences. House argues that "*the most essential condition for equivalence in translation is that the translation has a function equivalent to that of the original and that this equivalent function of can be established and evaluated by referring to the original and the translation in the context of the situa-*

tion surrounding it both texts, as well as examining the interaction of different contextual factors as reflected in the text or how they shape it", in its various forms and types; a variety of different readings". Nord, concerning this issue, emphasizes that a specific part of the function of a literary text is to cause a particular aesthetic or poetic effect on its readers. This effect gives the text a special aesthetic value of its own, influencing the interaction between the writer and the reader. Nord explains that the specific effect of a literary text also depends on cultural and individual (culturally determined) factors. The production of a satisfactory translation, which in function is equivalent to the original source text, can be achieved by aiming at functional equivalence, which can be achieved through formal or dynamic equivalence, semantic or communicative translation. The important thing is that a suitable translation should attract the readers of the target text. However, it should be borne in mind that the principle of equivalent effect does not imply uniformity. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2002: 20) suggest that it would be better in the translation process to "avoid an absolute ambition to increase the similarity between TB and TS, in favor of a relative ambition to minimize the difference: not to look for what should be included in the TS, but for what can be maintained by the TB." Translators must be realistic and accept that loss in translation is inevitable when returning a literary text from one language to another, due to the differences between the source culture and the target culture. To achieve this, the concept of pragmatic equivalence is the key.

3.2 PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE

The concept of "*pragmatic equivalence*" "relates to the way expressions are used in communicative situations and the way we interpret them in context". This paragraph examines some of the pragmatic issues related to translation theory. Baker defines pragmatics as "the study of language in use." Pragmatics is the study of meaning, not as it is extracted from the language system, but as conveyed and manipulated by the participants in a communication situation. "During the study on the theory of Relevance, Gutt points out that the greatest difficulties the translator faces are the pragmatic ones: the fact that a translation differs, not only in language but also in context and, of course, from the participants, including readers. The translator's knowledge of pragmatic concepts - such as meaning, context, text type, etiquette, coherence and cohesion - enables him / her to choose the most appropriate translation strategies / procedures when faced with a translation problem in relation to any issues whether stylistic, linguistic, semantic or cultural. We will focus mainly on the cultural ones. For example, when the translator is aware that the implication is a way of implying more than what is being said literally, he / she should try to convey that implication in order to preserve the meaning of the original and avoid loss in translation. The procedures chosen by the translator must be consistent with the pragmatic issues involved in the translation process, to produce TT that is pragmatically equivalent to ST.

Pragmatic equivalence is concerned with the way utterances are used in communicative situations and the way they

are interpreted in context. It comes under semantic study. It carries much importance while translating the mood and feel expressed in the source text. Though it is highly complex, it can be considered as the most fascinating subject in translation. It is concerned with the study of meaning conveyed by participants in a communicative situation. Bringing the original intensity of the mood and feeling along with the context from the source to the target is a kind of an art in the field of translation. No translation can be faithful but to some extent pragmatic equivalence can be achieved. Understanding and concentrating on pragmatic equivalence will help translators to reflect the original beauty and mood in the target text.

Pragmatic equivalence in translation will analyse,

A. How the same kind of utterances may have different meanings in different situations.

B. How language is used in communication?

C. How the meanings are communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener?

The two important aspects in pragmatic equivalence are coherence and implicature.

When a translator tries to concentrate on pragmatic equivalence he deeply analysis the contextual meaning in the source and tries to replace that in the target language. More than textual equivalence, every translator should concentrate on pragmatic equivalence. Implicature is the beautiful factor in pragmatics. It is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TC reader to understand it clearly.

4 THE PROBLEM OF NON-EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

Equivalence is an essential concept in translation theory. It is seen as an important constituent and guiding feature in translation. Catford points out that the main issue of translation practice is finding equivalence in the target language. The study of translation took place mainly in the second half of the twentieth century; even the theory of equivalence has been studied scientifically since the beginning of the second half of the XX century to the present day, where many theorists have included and elaborated translation equivalence in their theories of translation. In this section, I will discuss the most common types of equivalence, which present the main difficulties for the translator and some strategies on how to cope with these difficulties. However, choosing an appropriate equivalent within a given context depends on many factors, some of these factors may be linguistic; whereas some others may be extra-linguistic. It is logically impossible to provide strict rules to deal with the problems of equivalence that exist between languages. There are many theorists who define translation through the notion of equivalence. Catford claims that he defines translation as "*the replacement of the textual material of one language with equivalent material in another language*".

Whereas Nida and Taber state that "*translation is about the target language of the closest equivalent of the source language message, in content, and then in style*". Indeed, both source and tar-

get languages contain a range of equivalents ranging from the morpheme, which is the smallest meaningful unit, to the larger units, such as the sentence. In the translation process, these language levels are presented as equivalent levels between the source language and the target language. For example, if we have a word in the source language, it translates to the target language at the word level. Accordingly, it turns out that translation is a matter of constructing equivalence between two languages, so it is worth noting that equivalence is an important concept in the field of translation. However, often, the concept of equivalence is distorted and perhaps this is why some do not see it as necessary in the translation process. To discuss this issue, one must first understand the meaning of the word "equivalence" itself.

According to Mary Snell-Hornby, in the last fifty years, the word "equivalent" in English has been used as a technical term in the exact sciences to refer to various scientific processes or phenomena. For example, in mathematics, it shows the ratio of absolute equality. On the other hand, it is used as a common word in English vocabulary, and in this sense it means of a "similar meaning". Thus, in English the word "equivalent" is used as a technical term, but also as a common word. As a basic concept in translation theory, "equivalence" is not used in scientific terminology, but only as a common word. Snell-Hornby does not recognize the validity of equivalence except in precise fields, such as technical terminology. From a philosophical point of view, no two objects are absolutely the same. Standing on the same idea, Nida (1986: 60)'s view of equivalence is laid down as follows: No two stones are alike, two flowers are alike, or two people are alike; although the structures of DNA in the nuclei of their cells may be the same, these individuals change as a result of several developmental factors. Just as two sounds are not the same, so the same person who utters the same words fails to pronounce them in the same way.

Therefore, there are different opinions about the nature of translation; such as "*translation is a science*", "*translation is an art*", "*translation is a linguistic activity*". Basically, translation is a way of communicating. Translation over the centuries has acted as a bridge between people who did not speak the same language with each other. Indeed, translators and translation theorists have long understood that translating means communicating. Thus, since translation is a kind of communication, in essence, the equivalence between the source text and the host text turns into a necessity, that is, into purpose. In general, the necessity in any kind of communication is to ensure that the message is sufficiently transmitted from the original to the recipient. So, in translation, the translator must do his best to give the message as close as possible to the equivalence of the original text to the incoming text, so that the reader can understand the source message sufficiently, otherwise the translation as communication will fail. Consequently, we can say that the need for equivalence is required in the translation process. Often, the word "equivalence" carries with it the meaning of ambiguity in the field of translation.

Unlike the exact or exact meaning it has in mathematics and logic, in the field of linguistics and translation this term is not used with the same accuracy. The problem in this area lies in

whether we can define translation equivalence with "the same". Standing on this idea of equivalence, Van Der Broeck (1981) states: "In mathematics there is a definition of equivalence that is very accurate, but constitutes a major obstacle in the theory of translation. The features of strict equivalence (symmetry, transferability, and reflectivity) cannot be applied in relation to translation". In this regard, Jakobson (1966) is of the opinion that equivalence cannot be defined as the same in translation theory. He thinks that no translation can be a complete version of the original, because the translation itself is nothing but "a creative shift". For Jakobson, the translation of poetry, according to him, is a creative shift from one poetic form to another in the case of formulation. In the case of translation, from one language to another, Jakobson considers it as an inter-linguistic shift; whereas in the case of the transfer of signs from one system to another, for example from verbal language to music, he calls it inter-semiotic. Indeed, the views of Van de Broeck and Jakobson represent an undeniable truth. Equivalence in language cannot be defined by the words 'same' or 'synonymous'. We are all aware that languages are very complex systems that are determined by various factors, some of which are directly related to the structures of these languages, while others are extra-linguistic, such as social or cultural contexts. The fact that two languages do not share the same structure or the same identical social and cultural overlaps, equivalence is almost impossible during the translation process.

Corjan (1969) states that translators try hard to get as close as possible to the original text, but they find it impossible to achieve the same identity in their translations. Indeed, no matter how great the world is the translator's desire to achieve a complete equivalent, what he will make possible may be like an unattainable mission for him, because the translator cannot happen as once the equivalent of the original. Therefore, no equivalence in the text is not defined as such, but should be seen as a rough translation of a text from the source language into the original one. Accepting this fact does not mean that it is enough for the whole problem of equivalence, because such conditions of "rough translation" have yet to be found. The question is often asked: When do we say that there is equivalence in translation? When a text is conveyed the way it is at the beginning or when we have an adaptation of the cultural context of the language to the perception of the spoken language readers's sources? Savory (1967) answers common questions in this way, based on his principles:

- 1- A translation must translate the words of the original.
- 2- A translation must translate the idea of the original.

These two principles are important for the very fact that they represent the dilemma of any translator who faces the translation process and which is more clearly formulated by Knox, (1957) who says "which should come first, the literary version or the literal meaning? But is the translator free to express the meaning of the original according to the style he chooses?"

In the book entitled "Principles of translation as Exemplified by Bible translating", indeed, all these issues have been widely discussed by many translation theorists, and despite many definitions of the word "translation", a common agreement has been reached to adhere to the manner and meaning of the

original translation. Nida (1966) also states that equivalence has to do with "the production of the source language in the natural equivalent closest to the message of the source language, first in meaning and second in style". The difficulty of the translation problem as a process, but also the work of the translator lies in the fact that the meaning of the original text must first be taken; and secondly lies in finding equivalent words, expressions and sentences that give the required meaning. Both are difficult to accomplish at the same time. Each translated text constitutes an individual creation in a given language. It consists of a series of words organized according to a certain linguistic structure, in accordance with certain literary norms, and conveys an idea or thought that is determined by the historical, social and cultural context of a given community. According to Nida, equivalence is achieved in two stages, one at the semantic level and the other at the stylistic level.

Based on what was mentioned above, we can present some of the most commonly used types of inequality, which pose difficulties for the translator during translation. Choosing a suitable equivalent in a context depends on several factors. Some of these factors may be linguistic and some extra linguistic. Thus, it is impossible to provide absolute guidance to resolve the various types of non-equivalence between languages. Choosing the right equivalent depends not only on the language systems the translator is dealing with, but also on how the source text writer and the host text producer choose to manipulate the language systems. The lack of equivalence at the word level means that the host language does not have the corresponding equivalent for a word used in the source text. The type and level of difficulty varies according to the nature of the inequality. Different types require different strategies, some are more direct, some are more difficult to solve.

What are some of the types of inequality that pose a problem in translation?

a) *Specific cultural concepts.* The source language can express a concept, which is unknown in the target culture. This concept can be abstract or concrete; may be related to religious belief, custom, or a type of food. An example is the word *speaker*, meaning the chairman of parliament, where in many languages, such as Russian, Chinese and Arabic, etc, this word has no equivalent. In Russian, this word in most cases is translated as *speaker*, which does not express the role of the speaker of parliament as a person who possesses authority and order in parliament,

b) *the concept of the source language that has no lexical compatibility with the target language.* In this case we are dealing with words, which do not have equivalence in target language. An example would be the word "standard", which means "common", expresses a concept understood by most people, but in Arabic there is no equivalent for it,

c) *the word of origin is complex in semantic sense.* It is not said that words are morphologically complex to be semantically complex. (Bolinger and Sears, 1968). Often, a single word, which can be a single morpheme, can express more complexity than an entire sentence. Sometimes, it happens that we do not understand how complex a word can be semantically, until we have to translate it into a language where its equivalent

does not exist,

d) the source language and the target languages make obvious differences in meaning.

In some languages it happens that target language can make more or less differences in meaning than source language. What one language calls a significant difference in meaning, another language does not perceive as such. This can be illustrated by taking an example from the Indonesian language. Indonesians distinguish between going out in the rain without knowing it is raining (**kehujan**) and going out in the rain knowing it is raining (**hujan-hujan**). Many other languages do not make this distinction. So, if an Indonesian translator translates a text referring to rainfall, he finds it difficult to choose the right equivalent, if the context does not make it clear whether the person in question knows or not about the rain falling.

(d) The target language lacks a specific term (hyponymy)

Generally, languages contain general words but have no specific words. There are endless examples of this kind, where it is difficult to find the equivalent. English has many hyponyms, which are difficult to find the exact equivalent in other languages. For example, in English, for the word house there are varieties of *bungalow, cottage,croft, chalet, lodge, hut, mansion, manor, villa and hall*, which, in many languages, do not have the corresponding equivalent. Similarly, for the word jump there are specific verbs such as *leap, vault, spring, bounce, dive, clear, plunge and plummet*.

(e) Changes in physical and interpersonal perspective

Physical perspective is more important in one language than in another. Physical perspective refers to where things or people are in a relationship with each other or with a place, as expressed in word pairs like *come / go, pick / bring, reach / depart*, etc. The perspective also includes the connection between the participants in the discourse. For example, Japanese has six equivalents for the word give, the uses of which depend on who gives to whom.

f) Changes in form

It often happens that in the host language there is no equivalent for a particular form in the source language. Certain suffixes and prefixes, which in English express different meanings, do not correspond to the full equivalent in other languages. English has many pairs like *employer / employee, trainer / trainee, and payer / payee*. In addition, in English, other suffixes such as: *-ish* e.g. *boyish, greenish*, and the suffix *-able*, such as e.g. *drinkable - conceivable - conceivable*.

In some other languages such forms do not exist to produce such forms and they are often replaced by appropriate paraphrases, based on the meaning they convey. The word *drinkable* would translate as appropriate for drinking. However, there are also words that express expressive meaning, such as *journalese* (journalistic style), which are more difficult to translate using paraphrase. The subtle contribution that these words give to the general meaning of the text is either lost or supplemented elsewhere by means of compensatory techniques. Therefore, it is important for translators to understand the contribution that prefixes make to the meaning of words

and phrases, whereas English suffixes are used creatively to produce new words for a variety of reasons, such as filling in language semantics and humorous situations. Their contribution is also important in the field of terminology.

(g) Changes in the frequency and purpose of using specific forms

Even when a particular form exists, which has the equivalent in target language; there may be changes in the frequency with which it is used or for the purpose for which it is used.

English uses the *-ing* form more often than other languages to join sentences that have its equivalent, such as German or Scandinavian languages. So, translate any form of *-ing* from a text in English with the equivalent of the form *-ing* in German, Swedish, etc. would result in an unnatural style

(f) Use of borrowed words in the original text

The use of borrowed words in the original text poses a particular problem in translation. Leaving aside their proposed meaning in each case, borrowed words are often used for stylistic purposes in the text and to add stylistic nuances and value to the original text, as they give the text, or its subject matter, a sense of complexity. These words are usually lost during the translation process, because it is not always possible to find a borrowed word in the translation language that retains the same lexical meaning as in the original text. Borrowed words can cause another problem for a translator who does not pay attention, a problem known in translation theory as "false friends". "False friends" are words or expressions that have the same form in two or more languages, but in different meanings. They are usually associated with historically or culturally related languages, such as English, French, or German, but they can also be found in other Indo-European languages as a result of the influence of Latin. Some words are easily discernible, and even the most inattentive translator can tell them apart. But some others are really problematic in translation. Below there are some "false friends" that are commonly encountered between English and Albanian: *Sensible* (reasonable or logical) - *sensible* in Albanian is used in the meaning of sensitive, *Sympathetic* (in English means a person who feels sorry for others); whereas in Albanian means charming. *Conditioner* (in English means a substance or appliance used to improve or maintain something's condition); whereas in Albanian means air conditioner.

4 CONCLUSION

Nowadays, knowledge of two languages is no longer sufficient for a good translation, since the differences between the terms that are considered equivalent are not simply at the level of their meanings, whose semantic areas are not superset. Consulting bilingual dictionaries, whose deficiencies are obvious, is not of much help, because the lexicon in most of these dictionaries is often presented in the form of isolated words, and the articles are not sufficiently exemplified.

However, in order to cope with the difficulties that arise during the translation process, we consider it necessary to carry

out in-depth linguistic analyses and differential comparisons in order to delimit the degree of equivalence between the terms in the source language and their so-called equivalents in the target language.

In fact, translating a text requires a thorough knowledge of the linguistic facts of the source and target languages, especially those that are closely related to the problem of equivalence. In order to give a precise idea of how the problem of equivalence arises during the passage from one language to another, we propose to explore the different problems concerning, in particular, the different levels of language (lexical, morphological and syntactic) and culture.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.S. M. Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- [2] W. Koller, *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg-Wiesbaden: Quelle und Meyer, 1979.
- [3] R. Superceanu, *Translating Pragmatic Texts*. Timișoara: Editura Orizonturi Universitare, 2004.
- [4] Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- [5] W.-K. Chen, *Linear Networks and Systems*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, pp. 123-135, 1993. (Book style)
- [6] H. Poor, "A Hypertext History of Multiuser Dimensions," *MUD History*, <http://www.ccs.neu.edu/home/pb/mud-history.html>. 1986. (URL link *include year)
- [7] K. Elissa, "An Overview of Decision Theory," unpublished. (Unpublished manuscript)
- [8] R. Nicole, "The Last Word on Decision Theory," *J. Computer Vision*, submitted for publication. (Pending publication)
- [9] C. J. Kaufman, Rocky Mountain Research Laboratories, Boulder, Colo., personal communication, 1992. (Personal communication)
- [10] D.S. Coming and O.G. Staadt, "Velocity-Aligned Discrete Oriented Polytopes for Dynamic Collision Detection," *IEEE Trans. Visualization and Computer Graphics*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-12, Jan/Feb 2008, doi:10.1109/TVCG.2007.70405. (IEEE Transactions)
- [11] S.P. Bingulac, "On the Compatibility of Adaptive Controllers," *Proc. Fourth Ann. Allerton Conf. Circuits and Systems Theory*, pp. 8-16, 1994. (Conference proceedings)
- [12] H. Goto, Y. Hasegawa, and M. Tanaka, "Efficient Scheduling Focusing on the Duality of MPL Representation," *Proc. IEEE Symp. Computational Intelligence in Scheduling (SCIS '07)*, pp. 57-64, Apr. 2007, doi:10.1109/SCIS.2007.367670. (Conference proceedings)
- [13] J. Williams, "Narrow-Band Analyzer," PhD dissertation, Dept. of Electrical Eng., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass., 1993. (Thesis or dissertation)
- [14] E.E. Reber, R.L. Michell, and C.J. Carter, "Oxygen Absorption in the Earth's Atmosphere," Technical Report TR-0200 (420-46)-3, Aerospace Corp., Los Angeles, Calif., Nov. 1988. (Technical report with report number)
- [15] L. Hubert and P. Arabie, "Comparing Partitions," *J. Classification*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 193-218, Apr. 1985. (Journal or magazine citation)
- [16] R.J. Vidmar, "On the Use of Atmospheric Plasmas as Electromagnetic Reflectors," *IEEE Trans. Plasma Science*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 876-880, available at <http://www.halcyon.com/pub/journals/21ps03-vidmar>, Aug. 1992. (URL for Transaction, journal, or magazine)
- [17] J.M.P. Martinez, R.B. Llavori, M.J.A. Cabo, and T.B. Pedersen, "Integrating Data Warehouses with Web Data: A Survey," *IEEE Trans. Knowledge and Data Eng.*, preprint, 21 Dec. 2007, doi:10.1109/TKDE.2007.190746.(PrePrint)