

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND TRANSLATION IN MODERN COMMUNICATIVE SPACE

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-208-1-10>

ANALYZING GENRE RESTRICTIONS AND CONVENTIONS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Aksiutina T. V.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays translation studies are experiencing a new round of its development in various areas: in theory, methods of teaching translation, in applied areas related to IT technologies, software, platforms of machine translation and complimentary services. In contrast to the numerous online and electronic “translator friends”, true and false, there is a growing scientific interest in studying anthropocentric phenomena of translation within the paradigms of functional linguistics as the relationship between language and context, language and genre, accounting for modern concepts of natural intelligence and its direct implementation in language. This suggests that linguistic translation studies, which emerged in the last century, is acquiring a new perspective on the study of translation problems, highlighting its cognitive, interpretive and creative aspects.

According to this approach, it makes sense to look differently at the interaction of translation and reflection, translation and genre, so we consider it appropriate to dwell on one of the above issues – translation and genre restraints.

The article under review aims to theoretically make a universal logical model of the translation process. Aiming to explore the concept of genre in different areas of translation process, the study gives a detailed account of various approaches, both recent and current ones, which have evolved over the last years, depending on the theoretical frameworks. Within translation studies, the analysis of the ‘genre and translation’ issues is made within the framework of functional linguistic, which attempts “to conceptualize language as a communication tool”. Adopting the model of speech variation by M. A. Halliday and J. Martin¹, the article analyses *genre and translation* issues within the systemic functional linguistic, and presents various approaches applied to studying the problem. In particular, it gives a

¹ Halliday M. A. K., Martin J. R. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. Pittsburgh, Univ. of Pittsburgh. Press Publ., 1993. 283 p.

comparative analysis of theoretical findings by B. Hatim and I. Mason² and J. House³ who, treating genre as a semiotic category within the socio-linguistic context, apply opposite approaches to particular examples. It also considers the simulated analytical operations regardless of differences in specific types of translation, such as interpretation and translation, and are based on the starting points cognitive theory, semiotics and theory of interpretation. Variants of interpretation of the meaning of the original and versions of its transmission in the language of translation are studied with emphasis on the presence and possible development of intuitive and creative skills of the translator, ways to initiate and update them in professional activities.

Following the objectives of the study, the article relies on different methodological models for studying the genre, including a contrastive analysis of genre systems, generic genre relationships, structural analysis of linguistic choices.

1. The problem's prerequisites emergence and the problem's formulation

The issue of "genre and translation" has been raised repeatedly. Historically, its study is related to issues of literary translation and, above all, to such phenomena as borrowing, modification and (re) adaptation of traditional genres in the process of literary and cultural contacts, interlingual and intralingual translation of literary sources remote in time. Theoretical research in this area is presented in certain articles⁴, in encyclopedic reviews on genre problems of literary translation in general, individual literary genres⁵, sacred texts⁶. This area is closely related to comparative literary criticism and cross-cultural studies⁷. One should mention that it was C. James who attempted to conceptualize translation as a "special genre"⁸.

² Hatim, B., and Mason, I. *The Translator as Communicator*. London : Routledge, 1997. Pp. 56–140.

³ House, J. *Translation quality assessment. Past and present*. London, Routledge Publ., 2014. 170 p.

⁴ Bassnet, S. & A. Lefevere. *Translation, History And Culture*, London, Frances Pinter, 1990. Pp. 123–134.

⁵ Swales, J. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990. Pp. 88–97.

⁶ Serban A. *Translation and Genre: Sacred Texts. Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford, Elsevier, 2006, pp. 47–50.

⁷ Snell-Hornby, M. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Revised Edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. P. 54.

⁸ James, C. *Genre Analysis and the Translator. Target*, 1 (1), 1989. Pp. 29–41.

Later this idea was developed in the works of B. Hatim⁹. The very possibility of existing pseudo-translations and imitations suggests that the translated text has special characteristics, exists as a “genre within the genre”. In Hatim’s words, translation has something that affects the reader; the translation language has something to do with the textural feel, and gives the impression of a remote relationship between the original and the translation². Such interpretation implies specifying the language of translated texts as their inherent property. This approach to the conceptualization of translation has not developed into any separate line of research.

Actually translation studies approaches to the study of the problem of genre and translation began to take shape with the expansion of the boundaries of a strictly linguistic theory of translation, which was associated with attempts “to conceptualize language as a communication tool”, according to G.Saldanha, and the realization that “language cannot be separated from the situational and cultural context, by which it is shaped”¹⁰.

The most significant theoretical contribution to the study of the problem of genre and translation was the theory of text genres by K. Reiss, according to which text types, representing the main communicative functions of the text, and text genres, linking conventionally fixed linguistic and speech characteristics of the text with typical communicative situations largely determine the methods of translation. The theory of text genres became part of the general theory of translation by K. Reiss and Vermeer¹¹, but, as repeatedly noted, it is generally normative in nature, limited to indicating the features of the genre without revealing its essence, and is inconsistent with G. Vermeer’s theory of *scopos*¹¹.

Questions concerning the problem of *genre and translation* were raised in the works of J. Holz-Mänttari [Holz-Mänttari] and G. Höning [Höning], as well as in the articles of A. Trosborg, K. Nord, D. Seiger, P. Kussmaul, V. Bhatia and other authors, collected in the monograph *Typology of texts and translation*¹². One cannot mention the narratological concept of translation by M. Baker¹³, influenced by the American psychologist D. Bruner’s research, considering narrative as a tool for constructing reality. M. Baker

⁹ Hatim, B., *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Harlow: Longman, 2001. Pp. 155–156

¹⁰ Saldanha G. P. *Linguistic approaches*. *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York, Routledge, 2009, pp. 148–152.

¹¹ Reiss K., Vermeer H. J. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen, Niemeyer Publ., 1984. 253 p.

¹² *Text Typology and Translation*. Ed. by A. Trosborg. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publ., 1997. 264 p.

¹³ Baker, M. *Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research*. *Target*, 7 (2), 1995. Pp. 223–243.

describes the narrative as a basic and integral way that determines our experience of the world¹³. Narratives are represented by stories that we invent “while making sense of reality”, and that determine our behavior and our interaction with others”. In line with this approach, M. Baker defines the genre as “conventional types of narrative that form the structural forms of the story. <...> Assigning a narrative to a certain genre endows it with coherence, cohesion, a sense of delimitation, and allows identifying the narrative as a special case of a common communicative practice”¹³.

2. The analysis of existing methods for solving the problem and formulating a task for the optimal technique development

Systemic functional linguistics has had the most significant impact on theoretical and applied approaches to the analysis of genre problems in translation. Corresponding translation studies adopted M.A.K. Halliday’s register model of speech variation¹ which included categories of field, mode and tenor, and was later supplemented by the category of genre. If the register characteristics are determined by the immediate situational context where the speech activity is carried out, then the genre of the text is conditioned by the socio-cultural context, a set of typical situations with which the subjects of communication associate different types of texts.

Structurally, a genre is a potentially infinite number of texts created in typical communicative situations, and can be referred to as “generic structure potential”, according to M. Halliday¹, R. Hasan¹⁴. Considering a speech production, the genre can be defined as a “phased goal-oriented and goal-directed activity”, where the author of the text appears to be a member of a particular culture. J. Martin regards genres as the ways we act and use language “to achieve goals”¹⁵. In the light of the speech variation, genre is a combination of register characteristics, which is realised by typical register linguistic means.

Almost all functionally oriented studies in the field of translation studies directly and indirectly have referred to the above-mentioned context model or to its modified versions¹⁶. The most complete theoretical justification for this approach was received in the framework of the corpus project *Text*

¹⁴ Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. *Language, context and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford, Oxford University Press Publ., 1989. Pp. 63–69.

¹⁵ Martin, J. R., and Rose, D. *Genre relations. Mapping culture*. London : Equinox, 2007. p. 25.

¹⁶ Manfredi, M. *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics*: in 2 vols. Vol. 1: Translation Theory. Bologna : DU Press Publ., 2008. 97 p.

genres for translation, where the genre is seen as an integrating concept of translation studies¹⁷.

B. Hatim and J. Mason², J. House³ referred to the functional-linguistic model of the context, including its genre component in their studies in the field of theoretical translation studies.

According to B. Hatim and J. Mason², the functional and stylistic model of language variation is a three-part context model that includes communicative, pragmatic, and semiotic dimensions. Communicative measurement practically coincides with M.A. Halliday's register model of speech variation¹. The pragmatic dimension includes speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, and textual acts. The category of genre, along with the categories of discourse and text, is part of the last, semiotic dimension.

Genre as a top-level socio-semiotic category is a link between the context model and the social occasion, and is defined, according to the functional linguistics, as "conventionally conditioned forms of the text that reflect the functions and goals of specific social events and their participants", according to B. Hatim². B. Hatim and J. Mason² state that the semiotic dimension is actualized at the level of socio-cultural context, allows interpreting "communicative units" and "pragmatic meanings as macro-signs in the system of social and cultural conventions.

In terms of language, the genre is realized by its typical linguistic means with no rigid genre attachment. B. Hatim and J. Mason note that "there is no direct unambiguous connection between the elements of vocabulary, grammar, etc. and social situations related to a particular genre"¹. However, at the level of speech practices, genres are associated with typical text formats and genre structures, which can be described as sets or combinations of linguistic, rhetorical, pragmatic units.

Opponents still argue that the study does not exemplify specific genres and means of their linguistic manifestation. B. Hatim and J. Mason² operate with the concepts of genre restrictions (generic constraints) and genre conventions, or norms (generic conventions), which determine the translation strategy. These concepts are not defined in the study, their meaning is explained when analyzing the ways of translating specific speech correlates of the genre – culturally connoted components ("cultural signs"²), thematic text structures, principles of text composition and more.

Thus, genre conventions of literary and news texts determine differences in the ways of translating culturally connoted components, such as politeness

¹⁷ Ordóñez-López, P. Integration in Specialisation. The GENTT Research Group: Genre as an Integrative Concept in Translation Studies. *Scientific Bulletin of the Politechnical University of Timisoara. Transactions on Modern Languages*. 2009, vol. 8, no. 1–2, pp. 43–58.

formulas, names of social and religious statuses, realities. If literary translation involves their preservation, no matter how exotic they are for the target audience, then in cultural texts cultural signs are regularly omitted or neutralized in news texts. The issue of transferring cultural signs in translation is also related to differences of genre conventions in various languages.

Thus, the genre of official news, typical of the Arabic language, is characterized by the use of detailed names of official and religious titles, official addresses and socially significant formulas that serve as markers of social status (for example: "...in order to greet His Highness and enquire about his health..." – "... in order to greet His Highness and inquire about his health"²). When translated into English, these genre markers are not transmitted, as they do not correspond to the genre norms of news texts in the receiving language.

Some argue that in news translation, it is difficult to distinguish between the influence of genre conventions and ideological and technological factors that determine the final form of the target text¹⁸. Moreover, the connection of culturally connoted elements with the norms of a particular genre ("genre conventions"¹) is not always obvious, since social status markers can be a cross-genre characteristic and characterize a whole group of news or information genres (editorial, interview, reportage).

The study also does not clarify the question of how the omission of these components in translation is related to the *genre restrictions* imposed by a specific genre of the receiving language, and whether such omission does not indicate contrasts at the level of cross-genre functional and stylistic norms.

The analysis of examples in the study of B. Hatim and J. Mason² is carried out mainly by pointing to the connection of individual elements of the text with specific genres, without taking into account the characteristics of the genre structure as a whole and a systematic description of the elements of its speech implementation. So, for example, B. Hatim and J. Mason note that the topic-rhematic counterargumentary structures do not actually perform the function of argumentation within the genre of debatable news ('the scoop'), the communicative task of which is to draw attention to the event².

The study does not clarify the question of whether the omission of these components in translation is related to the "genre restrictions" imposed by a particular genre of the target language, and whether such omission does not indicate contrasts at the level of cross-genre functional and stylistic norms.

¹⁸ Schaffner C. Rethinking Transediting. *Meta: Translators' Journal*. 2012, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 866–883.

The authors limit themselves to pointing out the most common genre characteristics of debatable news (presentation of facts and their assessment), which distinguish it from the editorial and “simple news” (“mere news reporting”²). The analysis of the translation of a specific debatable news in the study shows that the translation has undergone a genre transformation, the debatable news turned into an editorial in which counter-argumentative structures perform their inherent function. The authors’ opinion is generally clear: similar argumentative structure performs different functions in two different news genres. At the same time, the linguistic mechanism of genre shift remains concealed. The authors only note that the translation uses lexical units explaining and enhancing the value of the text, and the translator had neutral equivalents². Therefore, the function of argumentative structures in the two genres is determined by the degree of explication of the evaluative characteristics of the text. Given that the debatable news presupposes “statement and evaluation of facts”², the mechanism of genre distortion requires at least additional explanations.

Under this approach, any micro- or macro-level translation transformation can be interpreted in terms of genre restrictions or conventions, and any genre modification in translation – in terms of individual lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, etc. transformations. In later research, B. Hatim introduced the concept of *genre shift*, which covers both the result of misinterpreting the genre characteristics of the source text, and motivated or unmotivated “transition” to an alternative genre during translation. The methodological principle of the analysis of specific examples, however, remained the same. So, B. Hatim lists typical mistakes in translations of news texts: “It is worth mentioning (when the news item in question is least noteworthy); On the other hand (when no ‘contrast’ is stated or implied, and something like meanwhile should have been used); In parallel (when ‘also’ is intended)”². In his opinion, “a cursory glance at examples of translations of news texts into English shows that the cause of numerous errors lies primarily in insufficient awareness of the genre characteristics of the text (genre awareness), and in translator’s grammatical or lexical incompetence” that causes numerous errors in translating the news texts into English¹⁹. The research does not explain why the above list of speech errors is associated specifically with the genre characteristics of news texts.

The described methodological approach to the analysis of specific examples (from pointing to a specific translation error or transformation to generalization at the level of genre conventions, restrictions or displacements) is based on the researcher’s intuitive ideas about the genre

¹⁹ Munday J. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London, New York : Routledge Publ., 2008. p. 89.

relation of specific language means. The nature of the relations between lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, compositional, etc. elements, on the one hand, and the genre characteristics of the text, on the other hand, is defined by B. Hatim and J. Mason through the category of “appropriateness” – “correspondence of linguistic characteristics context”². Genre characteristics we perceived “as appropriate (appropriate) to a specific social event”¹⁹, and specific linguistic characteristics as appropriate or inappropriate to a particular genre.

B. Hatim² and I. Mason in their study justify that the analysis of the actual genre aspects of translation is not its main task². The authors’ efforts are largely aimed at explaining the components of the context model, the nature of their relationship and interaction. Compositionally, the research is a series of examples illustrating the impact of different aspects of context on translation. In this regard, A. Pym ironically noted that the authors have so much to say about discourse and related terms that the word “translator” in the title of their work has become a simple pretext for theoretical reasoning that could be provoked by any what artistic or political text...²⁰.

A fundamentally different approach to the study of genre issues of translation is manifested in the models for assessing the quality of translation by J. House³. On the whole, J. House’s concept is a register model of context that covers linguistic and situational (communicative and pragmatic) aspects of text functioning and provides an assessment of the “relative coincidence” of the original and translated texts, taking into account these parameters³.

There are two versions of J. House’s model – “original” and “revisited”³. The main interest for this article is the second, “revisited” version, since the genre category has become its fundamentally new component, which makes it possible to explain the choice of register “configuration” of specific texts by their communicative functions. It is the category of the genre that determines the course of modification of the original model³.

The “revisited” context model is a hierarchical system of semiotic levels “genre – register – language / text”, which are related in D. House’s model as plans of expression and content: genre is a plan of register content, the register is both a plan for expressing the genre and a plan for the content of the language, language / text is a plan for expressing the register³. The fourth component of the model is the individual textual function, which represents the genre. The category of genre links the register that implements the genre, and the individual function of the text³.

²⁰ Pym A. Limits and Frustrations of Discourse Analysis in Translation Theory. *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de La Laguna*. 1992, no. 11, pp. 227–239.

Modernized original concept also affected the category of the register. The first version of J. House's model adapted D. Crystal and D. Davy's²¹ registry model, which did not include the genre category, the registry model of the "revisited" version, according to D. Mandei, is "openly Halliday's". J. House really adapts M. A. K. Halliday and J. Martin's "classical" model of the register²², which includes three "situational variables" (field, tenor, mode), supplemented by the category of genre.

Within the model, J. House defines genre as "a socially conditioned category characterized by an event that determines the use of a text, its source and communicative purpose, or any combination of these parameters"³. This definition contains all the basic features of the functional-linguistic interpretation of the genre category. Just as the functional-register model was once supplemented by the semiotic category of the genre, J. House³ supplements the category of the genre with his original model for assessing the quality of translation.

At the level of describing the categorical apparatus of analysis, J. House³ briefly explains the role of the category of genre in assessing the quality of translation: the original and translated texts are "associated with "certain general knowledge" about the nature of other texts of the same type, that is, with the concept of genre. In one of the latest studies, J. House explains the nature of this connection: while "the description of the register comes down mainly to fixing the features of surface language structures" or to a systematic description of the microcontext, the genre category connects specific texts with classes of texts that have common communicative goals and functions, with "the macro-context of the linguistic and cultural community in which these texts are embedded" and which they serve³.

Describing the categorical apparatus of analysis, J. House briefly explains the role of the genre category in assessing the quality of translation: the original and translated texts contain certain general knowledge "about the nature of other texts of the same type, i.e. the concept of genre"³. In a recent study, J. House explains the nature of this connection: while "register description comes down mainly to fixing the features of surface language structures"³ or to a systematic description of the microcontext, the genre category connects specific texts with classes of texts that have common communicative goals and functions, with the "macrocontext of the linguistic and cultural community in which these texts are embedded" and which they serve³.

²¹ Crystal, D., Davy D. *Investigating English style*. London : Longman Publ., 1969. 265 p.

²² Halliday, M. A. K., Martin J. R. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press Publ., 1993. 283 p.

The introduction of the genre category into the translation quality assessment model required a reassessment of the equivalence category associated in J. House's concept with the dichotomous pair of overt translation and covert translation. Overt translation assumes that the target audience is not the direct recipient of the translated text, so it has clear signs of translation and does not claim to be a "second original". Texts that require overt translation are especially related to the language and culture of the target language community³. A covert translation has the status of the original in the target culture; it "is not pragmatically marked as a translated text"³. Texts that require covert translation are not intended for the target audience of a particular linguistic and cultural community: "... the original text and its hidden translation have equivalent purposes ... they are based on the concurrent common needs of comparable target audiences"³. To mark the difference between covert and overt translation J. House introduces the concept of primary and secondary function of the text. Covert translation implies the need to recreate an equivalent speech event, which allows organically integrating the translated text into a new cultural frame. The communicative function of the translated text in this case does not differ from the communicative function of the original text (first level function). Overt translation, on the other hand, can only perform a second-level function, since it is related to a new speech event, cannot be imperceptibly "embedded"³ in a new cultural frame, and inevitably refers to the original cultural frame.

Two types of translation involve achieving equivalence at different levels of the J. House's model³. Covert translation should be equivalent to the levels of the primary textual function and genre, but not at the levels of the register and its implementing language structures. Overt translation assumes equivalence at all levels of the model, except for the text function of the primary level, as it can perform only the "referencing" function of the secondary level³. Thus, the genre is the only equivalence constant for different types of translation. If there is no equivalent genre in the target culture, translation as such is not possible, and the translated text can only exist as an overt or covert versions.

The category of genre has a unique status in the context of J. House's model, and at the same time reveals its internal contradictions. Equivalence at the genre level is a prerequisite for translation, but J. House does not explain exactly how it should be achieved. Based on the general structure of the model and the nature of the relationship between its levels, genre equivalence should be ensured at the level of register equivalence, because the combination of register characteristics is the plan of expression of the genre. However, genre equivalence, as follows from J. House's concept, does not depend on the equivalence of the original and the translation at

other levels of the model, including the equivalence at the register level. That is, we can assume that the equivalent genre in the target language can be implemented by an alternative combination of register characteristics.

This contradiction is due to the fact that the category of genre adapted by J. House, is not so much linguistic as socially semiotic. According to J. House's concept³, the "genre equivalence" makes it possible to do the translation, and is provided by the "pre-translation" equivalent social events and communicative situations in the original and receiving cultures, which determine the use of a conventionally fixed texts, and structurally, the common potential of genre structures³. If we consistently develop this thesis, the procedure for establishing genre equivalence will require including into the translation analysis model the section contrasting the analysis of the genre (sub) systems in the original and host cultures, both at the level of genre boundaries and at the level of genre structures.

The universal nature of genre equivalence in J. House's model allows expecting that when analyzing specific examples, the formulation of genre affiliation of the original and translated text should be common. J. House follows this principle in full, expanding or narrowing the set of genre characteristics depending on the level of analysis. For example, she defines the genre of the scientific and historical article *Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* as "... a scientific text that offers a provocative hypothesis and rethinks the causes of historical events"²³. Comparing the original and the translation, J. House repeats this wording, specifying that the article is characterized by a strong emotional appeal²³. The genre of the translated text, in J. House's opinion of, coincides with the genre of the original text, although it is implemented differently: in translation, the author's position and rhetorical strategies are significantly softened²³. These changes in the genre realization are due to significant modifications of the text only at the register level. Much of the key concepts and terms for the original text are omitted in the translation, which makes the position of the author less involved, leveled the "provocative and emotional text". The translation does not convey intensifiers, superlatives, "... emotionally colored vocabulary", etc., which systematically changes the intellectual, emotional and the author's ethical attitude to the content of the article. J. House summarizes stating that these changes significantly affect the genre realisation: "... translation is a serious scientific document rather than a provocative text that appeals to the minds and hearts of the readers"²³. However, the very genre of the text, according to J. House, remains unchanged. In this regard, the question arises: how to establish the genre

²³ House, J. *Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited*. Tübingen : Narr Publ., 1997. 207 p. Pp. 151–165.

equivalence of a serious scientific document and a provocative text? The criteria that determine the genre affiliation of the two texts remain outside the scope of J. House's research; the question of whether changes at the register level can affect genre characteristics is not clear. Finally, it is unclear why J. House characterizes the genre of the original and the translation separately, if the genre of the two texts is identical.

Both analyzed studies have a common functional and linguistic basis, however, they apply different approaches to the analysis of genre aspects of translation. B. Hatim² and J. Mason²⁴ proceed from the analysis of specific linguistic means, linking them with the genre characteristics of the text. Their attention is focused on the genre constraints that determine the choice for the translation strategy, and on the genre shifts that may be the result of both conscious "recontextualization of the genre"²⁵ (Bhatia's term) and translator's incompetence. In J. House's conception³, on the other hand, genre is the only inviolable constant of equivalence that distinguishes translations from "versions"³. It offers a holistic analysis of the text, and goes from the definition of the text genre to the analysis of its register configuration.

Such different, opposite in terms of analysis procedures, approaches have a fundamentally common characteristic. The basis for determining the status of the genre shifts and genre equivalence of the target and translated texts are researchers' intuitive ideas about the genre of the text. In the works of B. Hatim² and J. Mason²⁴, as mentioned above, this is the category of "compatibility" or "appropriateness". J. House, summarizing the theoretical part of the work, notes that he uses the category of genre in the everyday sense: the genre category is socially conditioned and pre-scientific "in the sense that its parameters can not be determined strictly scientifically"³; the idea of the genre can be formed only in the "everyday practice of specific linguistic cultures"²³. In fact, J. House²³ formulates the principle of "compatibility", which is based on intuitive ideas formed by social and speech practice about typical text forms and means of their language implementation. As a result, both approaches make it possible to arbitrarily interpret the genre status of the language means.

S. Magalhães notes that when translating scientific news from the New York Times into Portuguese, there is a steady practice of "genre normalization"²⁶. English-language news is characterized by "hybridization of the

²⁴ Mason, I. Discourse, ideology and translation. *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. Ed. by M. Baker. London, New York, Routledge Publ., 2010, pp. 83–95.

²⁵ Bhatia, V. K. *World of written discourse: a genre-based view*. London : Continuum Publ., 2014. P. 198.

²⁶ Magalhaes, C. *Discourse and Translation Studies: a Case Study of Genre Intertextuality*. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 2000, vol. 1(5), pp. 11–26.

genre” and includes elements characteristic of literary texts (personification, metaphor, syntactic means of expression, etc.). In translation, all these elements are not transmitted, and the news text is brought to a stereotypical academic standard. According to S. Magalhães²⁶, this practice is due to ideological reasons, namely – the lower status of popular science news in the hierarchy of cultural genres. A similar example is given by I. Mason. In the English translation of Freud’s fundamental work, the author’s terminological innovation was leveled by the Greek-Latin influence of the academic norm of the English language. The more abstract and scientific nature of the translated text ensures its “adequate perception by the Anglo-American scientific community”²⁴.

CONCLUSION

Within B. Hatim and I. Mason’s model²⁴, these transformations can be interpreted in terms of the genre shift (J. Mason uses the term “genre modification”²⁴). According to J. House’s³ concept, these transformations do not affect the genre status of the translated text and change only the way of linguistic realization of the genre. This contradiction is due not to differences in approaches to determining the category of genre – the definition of genre in the two studies have a common functional and linguistic basis – but to the lack of the stage of analysis of genre structures and genre systems in two models. This approach will significantly shift the focus of research to the field of contrastive analysis, however, if we follow the logic of systemic functional linguistics, only the analysis of potentials of the genre structures can provide the objective criteria for determining the scope of the genre constraints and genre equivalence. Otherwise, the analysis of the relationship of specific translation transformations with genre constraints or shifts leads to a paradox: on the one hand, none of the elements of linguistic implementation of the genre has a non-conditional genre status, on the other – any interlanguage contrast can be interpreted as an element of the genre implementation in the original and target languages, and any translation transformation is an element of genre modification.

One of the possible and, apparently, the most productive areas for studying the genre issues of translation is to involve theoretical and empirical methods of systematic and cross-cultural analysis of genres and genre systems. Depending on the goals of the study, translation studies may be based on different methodological models for studying the genre. The contrastive analysis of genre systems²⁷ creates the preconditions for the

²⁷ Bazerman, C. *Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions*. Genre and the New Rhetoric. Eds. A. Freedman, P. Medway. Bristol, PA, Taylor and Francis Publ., 1994, pp. 79–101.

development of the substantive criteria for determining the categories of genre equivalence and genre shifts. This is especially true for areas of discursive practices characterized by the mobility of genre boundaries. Thus, it has been repeatedly noted that the systems of news genres in different linguistic cultures have significant differences²⁸. The contrastive analysis of the news genres is potentially able to become the basis for the genre comprehension of numerous transformations used in translating the news texts. The scope of these transformations is so significant that the practice of translating news has been termed *transsediting*²⁹. Directly related to the methodology of research on genre issues of translation are theoretical approaches that allow systematizing speech practices taking into account the different degrees of generalization of genre characteristics²⁵ (65) and to carry out the contrastive analysis of genre systems not only in the horizontal plane of genre boundaries, but also in the vertical projection of generic genre connections. Finally, translation studies can use methods for analyzing the structure and means of language implementation of individual area or disciplinary genres³⁰, developed within the empirical approaches to the study of languages for special purposes.

SUMMARY

Aiming to explore the concept of genre in different areas of functional linguistic, the paper gives a detailed account of various approaches, both recent and current ones, which have evolved over the last years, depending on the theoretical frameworks. So, following Cap and Okulska's theoretical findings, genre is viewed as a macrostructure in which required and optional elements are put in a predetermined order. Modern researches consider genre as a social process with a repeated use of stable and recognizable patterns to fulfil a specific communicative goal.

Within translation studies, the study of the 'genre and translation' issues began to take shape with the expansion of the boundaries of a strictly linguistic theory of translation, which was associated with attempts "to conceptualize language as a communication tool". Adopting the model of speech variation by M. A. Halliday and J. Martin, the article analyses *genre and translation* issues within the systemic functional linguistic, and presents various approaches applied to studying the problem. In particular, it gives a comparative analysis of theoretical findings by B. Hatim and I. Mason and

²⁸ Kornetzki, A. Contrastive Analysis of News Text Types in Russian, British and American Business Online and Print media. Berlin : Frank and Timme Publ., 2012. 378 p. (Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung: 102)

²⁹ Schaffner C., pp. 866–883.

³⁰ Swales, J. M. Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1990. P. 70.

J. House who, treating genre as a semiotic category within the socio-linguistic context, apply opposite approaches to particular examples. B. Hatim and I. Mason consider specific properties of micro-context, linking them with the genre characteristics of the text. Their attention is focused on genre restrictions and genre conventions that determine the choice of translation strategy, as well as on changing the genre status of the text during translation. J. House proceeds from formulating the genre of the text to analysing its register configuration and specific language means of register realization. In her concept, the genre is the only constant equivalent valency that delimits translations from versions, while the attention of B. Hatim and I. Mason is focused on the difference between the genre statuses of the original and the translation.

One of the most productive areas for studying genre issues of translation is involving theoretical and empirical methods of systemic cross-cultural analysis of genres and genre systems. Following the objectives of the study, the article relies on different methodological models for studying the genre, including a contrastive analysis of genre systems, generic genre relationships, structural analysis of linguistic means.

References

1. Baker, M. Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research, 1995. *Target*, 7 (2), 1995. 223–243. URL: <https://benjamins.com/online/target/articles/target.7.2.03bak.doi.org/10.1075/z.64.15bak>
2. Bassnet, S. & A. Lefevere. *Translation, History And Culture*, London, Frances Pinter, 1990. 133p. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/49617680_BassnettMcGuire_S_Translation_Studies_Revised
3. Bazerman, C. *Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions*. *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Eds. A. Freedman, P. Medway. Bristol, PA, Taylor and Francis Publ., 1994, 101 p. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269222539_Systems_of_Genres_and_the_Enactment_of_Social_Intentions
4. Bhatia, V. K. *World of written discourse: a genre-based view*. *Continuum Series Advances in Applied Linguistics*, 2004. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.02.007>
5. Crystal, D., Davy, D. *Investigating English style*. London, Longman Publ., 1969. 265 p. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/412181>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/412181>
6. Halliday, M. A. K., Martin J. R. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. Pittsburgh, Univ. of Pittsburgh Press Publ., 1993. 283 p.
7. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan R. 1989. *Language, context and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. URL: https://www.annabellelukin.com/uploads/1/3/3/6/13365891/halliday_1985_context.pdf

8. Halliday, M. A. K., Martin J. R. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press Publ., 1993. 283 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203209936>
9. Hatim, B., and Mason, I. *The Translator as Communicator*. London : Routledge, 1997. Pp. 56–140. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203992722>
10. Hatim, B. *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Harlow: Longman, 2001. Pp. 155–156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315832906>
11. House, J. *Translation quality assessment. Past and present*. London, Routledge Publ., 2014. 170 p. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315752839>
12. House, J. *Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited*. Tübingen, Narr Publ., 1997. 207 p. P. 151–165. URL: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/219/21901510.pdf>
13. James, C. *Genre Analysis and the Translator*. *Target*, 1 (1), 1989. Pp. 29–41. <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/target.1.1.04jam> <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.1.1.04jam>
14. Kornetzki A. *Contrastive Analysis of News Text Types in Russian, British and American Business Online and Print Media*. 378 p. Frank and Timme, 2012. URL: <https://www.bookdepository.com/publishers/Frank-und-Timme-GmbH>
15. Magalhaes C. *Discourse and Translation Studies: a Case Study of Genre Intertextuality*. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 2000. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307782704_Discourse_and_Translation_Studies_a_Case_Study_of_Genre_Intertextuality. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5007/5605>
16. Manfredi, M. *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics: in 2 vols. Vol. 1: Translation Theory*. Bologna, DU Press Publ., 2008. 97 p. URL: http://amsacta.unibo.it/2393/1/Manfredi_2008_Monografia.pdf. DOI 10.6092/unibo/amsacta/2393
17. Martin, J. R., and Rose, D. *Genre relations. Mapping culture*. London : Equinox Publishing Limited, 2008. 233p. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299534750_Genre_relations_Mapping_culture. DOI: 10.1017/S007404510000254
18. Mason, I. *Discourse, ideology and translation*. *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. Ed. by M. Baker. London, Routledge, 2009. 528 p. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.149>
19. Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London, New York, Routledge Publ., 2008. 222 p. URL: <https://dpsionline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Introducing-Translation-Studies-Theories-and-Applications-J.-Munday.pdf>.
20. Ordonez-Lopez, P. *Integration in Specialisation*. The GENTT Research Group: *Genre as an Integrative Concept in Translation Studies*.

Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnical University of Timisoara. Transactions on Modern Languages. 2009, vol. 8, no. 1–2, pp. 43–58.

URL:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339047689_Genre_Issues_in_Translation_Studies. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu09.2016.401

21. Pym, A. Limits and Frustrations of Discourse Analysis in Translation Theory. *Revista de Filologia de la Universidad de La Laguna*. 1992, no. 11. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28291951_Limits_and_Frustrations_of_Discourse_Analysis_in_Traslation_Theory

22. Reiss K., Vermeer H. J. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen, Niemeyer Publ., 1984. 253 p. URL: <http://traduttologiageneralenz.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/139448655/Katharina%20Reiss%2C%20Hans%20J%20Vermeer>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111351919>

23. Saldanha, G. P. Linguistic approaches. *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York, Routledge, 1998. 673p. URL: https://www.academia.edu/30815389/Saldanha_Gabriela_Baker_Mona_Routledge_encyclopedia_of_translation_studies_Routledge_2009

24. Serban, A. Translation and Genre: Sacred Texts. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford, Elsevier, 2006, pp. 47–50. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288153148_Translation_and_Genre_Sacred_Texts. DOI:10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00486-7

25. Schaffner, C. Rethinking Transediting. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 2012, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 866–883. URL: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1021222ar>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1021222ar>

26. Snell-Hornby, M. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Revised Edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.180 p. URL: [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffc255\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1824421](https://www.scirp.org/(S(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffc255))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1824421). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.38>

27. Swales, J. M. *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Pp. 576–580. URL: <http://www.sciepub.com/reference/108361>. DOI: 10.12691/education-3-5-7

28. *Text Typology and Translation*. Ed. by A. Trosborg. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publ., 1997. 264 p. URL: <https://pdfcoffee.com/text-typology-and-translationpdf-3-pdf-free.html>

Information about the author:

Aksiutina Tetiana Volodymyrivna,

Senior Lecturer at the Department of English Philology

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

72, Haharina ave., Dnipro, 49000, Ukraine