From equivalence in translated literature to adequacy and fluency in translated communication

Clara Montella
Università degli Studi di Napoli
«L'Orientale» - Italy
cmontella@unior.it

Johanna Monti
Università degli Studi di
Sassari - Italy
jmonti@uniss.it

Keywords: translation quality, equivalence, adequacy, fluency, machine translation

In the history of translation, since the classical age, the *munus interpretum* (the task of the translator) proposed by Cicero has to be considered as the departure point of the definition of the notion of equivalence. According to this point of view, the translator does not have to translate from a linguistic system to another, but he needs to reformulate the original text in the target language (in Cicero's case, in the Latin language) keeping its meaning independent of the source language (i.e. the Greek language). Thus, the translation is considered to be a rhetoric activity and therefore subject to the Aristotelic category of *aptum* ("suitable" in English), since the best translation can only be obtained using the expressive means of the Latin language which are adequate and coherent with the *ars bene dicendi* (i.e. the rhetoric). The translator becomes in this way an orator.

The notion of translation *ad sensum* by Cicero and therefore its adequacy in the western culture, during the centuries adapts itself to the various trends of the literary translation, more or less conditioned by the specific developments of languages and cultures, in particular in the Romance area. The typological pertinence of texts with aesthetic value in opposition to communicative text typologies is a division necessary to identify adequate translation criteria. In this way, the two text typologies, those with an aesthetic function, on one hand, and those with strictly communicative function, on the other hand, lead to the identification of different translation modalities, generally speaking, even though they both keep in principle the integrity of the original message.

The aim of our contribution is to find the point of discrimination between these two different translation modalities, which nowadays, is quite evident because of the technological developments. These latter, indeed, lead to very syncretic ways of communication, which tend to produce the maximum of communication with the

minimum effort on the expression level. As a consequence, the equivalence principle changes according to the different text typologies.

In our paper, we highlight the transition from the concept of equivalence or adequacy with respect to the aesthetic function, in which the expressive and stylistic modalities of the original text are emphasized, and how it has to be obtained in translation, to the violation of the standard expressive forms of the original text to achieve a pragmatic adequacy in translation: Machine translation (MT) is the most significant example in this respect, insomuch as the concept of pragmatic adequacy replaces the concept of accuracy in MT quality estimation metrics.

This shift is particularly clear in the Dynamic Quality Framework (DQF) created by TAUS, where "translation quality is considered dynamic as translation quality requirements change depending on the content type, the purpose of the content and its audience" (https://evaluation.taus.net/about).

In conclusion, the different way of conceiving translation with regard to cultural, spatial and temporal differences lead to a different interpretation of the relationship between source and target text, which is reflected in the way of considering the notion of equivalence.

References

Montella, C., 1986. La rivincita della latinitas: alcuni aspetti della riflessione sulla traduzione scritta nella latinità classica. In *Aion* 8. pp. 219- 233.

Monti, J., 2005. La traduzione automatica deve sempre essere trasparente? Spunti di riflessione su trasparenza e qualità nella traduzione. In: Guarino A., Montella C., Silvestri D., Vitale M. (a cura di) La Traduzione: Il paradosso della trasparenza. Napoli: Liguori Editore. pp. 299-318.