THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TRANSLATION

Nizhny Novgorod Dobrolyubov
State Linguistic University,
PhD, Associate Professor,
Department of the English Language and Translation Theory and Practice
e-mail: sdobnik@lunn.ru

V.V. Sdobnikov

TRANSLATION TACTICS AS MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY OF TERTIARY TRANSLATION

In the article a definition of the tertiary translation strategy is given and tactics of implementing the said strategy are analyzed as exemplified by the Russia translation of Abraham Lincoln's «Gettysburg Address». As means of implementing the tertiary translation strategy, the tactics are used in integration.
Key words: communicative situation; tertiary translation strategy; translation tactic; tactic of cognitive information transfer; tactic of stylistic features reproduction; tactic of individual style-forming features reproduction.

According to the communicative-functional approach to translation which I strongly support and which is very close to functionalists' approach yet is somehow different from it, translation process is affected by both lingual and extralingual factors and is effected in conformity with the selected translation strategy. Though some scholars insist that "translation strategy" as a term must be abandoned since it is ambiguous [1, p.15], I still believe there must be a program of performing a translation activity, and the program can be termed as a "strategy". Moreover, it is extralingual factors that are taken into consideration first and foremost when translation strategy is being chosen by a translator/interpreter. I define *translation strategy* as a general program of the translator's activity worked out on the basis of the general approach to translation in a specific communicative situation (CST), determined by the particular parameters of the situation and the translation goal (translation brief, in skopos-theory terminology) and, in its turn, determining the character of the translator's professional behavior [2, p. 90].

In various communicative situations different strategies may be used: strategy of communicatively equivalent translation, strategy of tertiary translation or strategy of redirection.

In the theory of translation there assumed, as an axiom, the statement that the communicative effect produced by translation should correlate with one produced by the original to corresponding recipients. So, A.D.Shveitser points out that translation is the process characterized by the intention for imparting the communicative effect of the primary text [3, p.75].

It is generally believed that the communicative effect produced by the target text (TT) must be similar to the effect produced by the source text (ST). The idea is rooted in Nida's theory according to which functional equivalence manifests itself in the equality of reactions of recipients of ST and TT. Yet it should be noted that in his later writings Eugene Nida was more cautious in defining the equality of reactions: "The translation process has been defined on the

basis that the receptors of a translation should comprehend the translated text to such an extent that they understand how the original receptors must have understood the original text." [4, p. 36]. Yet, approximate equality of communicative effects produced by ST and TT is still believed to be a criterion of translation adequacy.

But we should remember that the equality or similarity of communicative effects is possible only in *some* communicative situations and is impossible or even undesirable in other situations. K.Reiss and H.Vermeer, authors of skopos-theory, stated that a translation is a success when the goal of translation is achieved. K.Nord cites H.Vermeer as saying that "The Skopos rule should read as follows: translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function" [5, p.29]. The statement can be treated as a general requirement to translation/interpreting produced in *any* communicative situation. Yet it is possible to differentiate between situations in which equality of communicative effects is a must and those situations in which such equality or even similarity is utterly impossible. In the latter the strategy of tertiary translation is employed.

Strategy of tertiary translation is a general program of the translator's activity the result of the implementation of which is to satisfy the needs of the TT recipient who plays another communicative role than that of the ST recipient. The translation is expected to help achieve a goal that is different from that of the ST author. The translator in this situation is not expected to produce a text functionally equivalent to the ST.

It was Mikhial Zwilling who was the first to state application of so call tertiary translation, or translation in the interests of third persons. [6, p. 84]. "Translation is not integrated into the communication chain [in such a situation]; it is an independent activity aimed at extracting information from the communication between the partners in the interests of some outside observer who is not involved in the communication" [6, p.83].

It is hard to believe how numerous are situations in which strategy of tertiary translation is implemented. For example, can we expect that a translation of Obama's address to the Congress will produce the same effect on TT readers as the ST has produced on the congressmen? Undoubtedly, it is next to impossible. And a translator is supposed to understand this. Thus, strategy of tertiary translation, translation in the interests of third persons, is used. As means of implementing this strategy certain tactics are employed. I define a translation tactic as a systematized combination of translator's actions, or operations, aimed at solving a certain translation problem or task.

It is noteworthy that strategy of tertiary translation is most applicable when texts of publicistic style are translated. That is why I shall use as examples translations of A.Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" pronounced by the 16th president of the United States at the consecration of Gettysburg cemetery on November 19, 1863. In Russia four translations of the address made by Vladimir Nabokov, Alexander Dranov, Pavel Palazhchenko and Victor Lanchikov are known.

Possessing all the characteristics of such a variety of publicistic style as a public address, this speech has some features defined by its belonging to the anglolinguistic culture, in particular, to the protestant one. Being the text of a civil speech it has also the feature of church sermon, as indicated by M. Berdi and V.K. Lanchikov [7; 8][1].

---

[11] In particular, V.K.Lanchikov writes: "It is not difficult to imagine in what typical situation the Biblical associations immersed the listeners (during the ceremony of the consecration of the cemetery) − what genre they remind about. Surely, about the sermon. A speaker being a statesman acquired the traits of a preacher" [8, p.31-32].

Inevitably, a question arises: why did the translators, on their own initiative, take the trouble of translating this masterpiece of eloquence from English into Russian? What was their goal or goals? Certainly, the idea that they wanted to produce the same effect on the readers as was produced on Lincoln's audience should be dismissed since such mission is impossible. It is hard to guess with what purpose in mind Nabokov and Dranov made their translations. But it is known that V.Lanchikov translated the address for encyclopedic dictionary "Politics and Winged Words" while Palazhchenko translated it for another dictionary. I can suggest that they both wanted to familiarize Russian readership with the history and peculiarities of the American political culture. The goal is noble and quite understandable when such literary masterpieces are concerned. As Sergei Alexeev noted, "unlike contemporaries of the 16th President, we discover Gettysburg Address due to our interest in history and literature. Besides, we want to receive aesthetic enjoinment from this text as from any other literary text, and expect the translator to give us this enjoinment" [9, p.165].

It is hard to guess with what purpose in mind Nabokov and Dranov made their translations. But it is known that V.Lanchikov translated the address for encyclopedic dictionary "Politics and Winged Words" [10] while Palazhchenko translated it for another dictionary [11]. I can suggest that they both wanted to familiarize Russian readership with the history and peculiarities of the American political culture. The goal is noble and quite understandable when such literary masterpieces are concerned. As Sergei Alexeev noted, "unlike contemporaries of the 16th President, we discover Gettysburg Address due to our interest in history and literature. Besides, we want to receive aesthetic enjoinment from this text as from any other literary text, and expect the translator to give us this enjoinment" [12, c.39].

Judging by the character of the publications that featured the two translations, I can suggest that both Lanchikov and Palazhchenko wanted to create a text that would be an illustration of the events of the Civil War in the USA, of people's attitude towards the events, of Lincoln's personal features, of the attitude of Americans toward their history and to Lincoln's address, of the atmosphere of the time. In my perception, such was the goal of the translations. Yet Sergei Alexeev's remark concerning "aesthetic enjoinment' is not incidental either. Gettysburg Address does have the aesthetic value and is duly considered a masterpiece of rhetoric in the USA[2] and elsewhere. Hence, demonstration of the aesthetic value of the text, of its stylistic peculiarities might be one of the tasks set by or to translators, if not one of the goals.

Presumably, it is not the only task being solved by the translator. No less important is reproduction of those peculiarities of the given text that make it similar to a text of a church sermon, and we can be sure that Victor Lanchikov, indeed, set himself this particular task. His own statements are unequivocal: "…nothing prevents us from translating so that the reader would feel (let it be not at once but over time) that Gettysburg Address is not a political statement only, it has something of a sermon" [8, p.36]. The task can hardly be seen as a mandatory one in the given communicative situation and with regard of the translation goal. It's a kind of "extra" task, and the peculiarity of Lanchikov's translation is most obvious on the background of other translations of Gettysburg Address where features of a sermon are not reproduced.

Thus, we can speak of one major goal (see above) and two tasks: 1) to reproduce peculiarities of the author's oratorical style and 2) to reproduce those features of the text that make it similar to a sermon. It goes without saying that the translator had to render the cognitive

---

[2] M. Berdi writes: «Much has been written about Lincoln's art of rhetoric; indeed, the Gettysburg Address is used in American schools as a kind of textbook of the art of oration» [7, p.28].

information as well in order to reproduce the general meaning of the texts, to make the speaker's position and attitude clear and, in this way, to achieve the translation goal.

As an example Lanchikov's translation is very convenient since it is more tertiary as compared with other translations. I believe that the analysis of the ways and means used to achieve the main goal and to solve the complex of tasks set will enable us to investigate the tactics used to implement the strategy of tertiary translation.

Here is the original of the Gettysburg Address:

Fourscore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation: conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that this nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate – we cannot consecrate – we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us – that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Victor Lanchikov's translation:

Вот уже восемьдесят семь лет, как отцы наши на этом континенте дали жизнь новой нации – нации, зачатой в свободе и преданной тому убеждению, что все люди сотворены равными.

Сегодня мы ведем великую гражданскую войну, которая покажет, способна ли эта нация, а равно и всякая другая нация, так же зачатая и тому же убеждению преданная, выстоять в испытаниях. Мы собрались на поле, где гремела одна из величайших битв этой войны. Мы пришли, чтобы с почестями отвести часть этого поля для последнего упокоения тех, кто отдал здесь свои жизни ради жизни нашего народа. Так велит нам долг, так нам подобает.

Но мы бессильны воздать достойные почести – бессильны освятить эту землю – бессильны сделать ее поистине святыней. Её уже освятили сражавшиеся на ней герои, живые и павшие – так освятили, что не в наших слабых силах усугубить или умалить это освящение. Мир едва ли услышит произнесенные здесь слова и скоро забудет их, но свершенных здесь подвигов ему не забыть. Это мы, живые, должны принять здесь посвящение – посвятить себя завершению труда, ради которого выказали такую доблесть сражавшиеся. Это нам должно посвятить себя исполнению великой задачи: укрепить свою преданность делу преданностью тех, кто с честью пал здесь в беззаветном служении этому делу – исполниться решимости сделать так, чтобы

жертва их не стала напрасной, чтобы наша страна, с Божьей помощью, снова узрела рождение свободы, чтобы власть народа, именем народа, во имя народа вовек не исчезла с лица земли.

It is noteworthy that due to the integrated nature of the tasks being solved by the translator his approach is also integrated. He deals with the same language material, and the operations performed on the material are aimed at solving more than one tasks, i.e. may be performed within more than one tactic. In combination they ensure achieving the main translation goal.

The first tactic is ***the tactic of rendering the principal cognitive information (TRCI)***. The cognitive information makes up the content of the text and is used to express its main idea. According to S.Alexeev, the content of the address comes down to the following: "…a new nation was born in some time and in some place, now the nation is at the Civil War, and we should honor the dead and never forget their heroic deeds" [12, c.43]. But the text is not devoid of the expressive component: it is a text about dignity, courage, woe and hope; it is supposed to evoke the patriotic feelings and pride of the country in the audience [12, c.43][3]. In my opinion, Michelle Berdy was more precise in formulating the main idea of the Address: "Our ancestors founded a nation based on liberty and equality. We are now at war among ourselves over these issues. We came to dedicate the cemetery to those who died in a battle of that war. But those men who died have already dedicated it. We must instead dedicate ourselves to their cause and ensure that our republican government and others like it will continue to exist" [7. p. 26]. As we have noted, V.Lanchikov sees religious implications in the text: "We are doing what God intended us for, and if we do not do it God will judge us" [8. p. 32]. It is important that even predicatory component of the text is verbalized by means of certain lexical units (e.g., *under God, to conceive, to consecrate, to hallow, shall not perish from the earth*) that are bound to produce associations with the Bible. As a result, we have three planes of meaning: the content of the text is the first one, the next one is better formulated by M.Berdy, and the third one is the indication that ensuring liberty is intended by the God.

According to the observations of M.Berdi and V.K. Lanchikov it is such components of the meaning that can, at least, be singled out.

Certainly, the translator focused on rendering the key cognitive information relevant to the general meaning of the text. Analysis made by Sergei Alexeev proves that Lanchikov did not significantly transform the text as far as syntax and vocabulary are concerned[4]. Concretization, modulation, descriptive translation, phraseologization, nominalization, and omission were more seldom used [13, p.139-140].

Certainly, the translator focused on rendering the key cognitive information relevant to the general meaning of the text. Analysis made by Sergei Alexeev proves that Lanchikov did not significantly transform the text as far as syntax and vocabulary are concerned. Upon the whole, the TT is very close to the ST lexically and syntactically. It may be explained by the abundance of concepts in the ST that are universal, they have no national coloring and are not associated with any culture. I shall adduce an example to illustrate the fact:

---

[3] Note once more that this emotionally valuable component cannot be perceived by the readers of the translation in the same way as it had been perceived by the A. Lincoln audience. They will be able, in the best case, to understand that Lincoln wanted his audience to learn why we speak about the tertiary translation.

[4] The analisys results are corresponded to our observations.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

Lanchikov: Сегодня мы ведем великую гражданскую войну, которая покажет, способна ли эта нация, а равно и всякая другая нация, так же зачатая и тому же убеждению преданная, выстоять в испытаниях.

Nabokov: Ныне мы ведем великую гражданскую войну, подвергающую испытанию вопрос, может ли эта нация или любая другая нация, так зачатая и тому посвященная, долго просуществовать.

Dranov: Сейчас, в дни великой Гражданской войны, испытывается жизненная стойкость нашего народа, как всякого другого народа, взращенного в том же духе и преданного тем же идеалам.

Palazhchenko: Сейчас мы проходим великое испытание гражданской войной, которая решает, способна ли устоять эта нация или любая нация, подобная ей по рождению и по призванию.

On the background of other translations, Lanchikov's version might seem as a word-by-word translation, which is not true. The quality of word-by-word translation is poor, it violates the norms of the TL and distorts the content and stylistic features of the ST. As for Lanchikov, he avoided transformations where they were *unnecessary*, while rendering the content and style precisely.

At the same time the text contains passages to translate which not only transformations must be used but the meaning and function of the given passage must be considered thoroughly. One of them is the sentence *It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this*. M.Berdy believes that the sentence must have been perceived by the audience as too simple and alien to the style of the Address [7, p.26]. But Berdy justifies it by the use of the structure typical of a funeral speech and rooted in the ancient rhetoric tradition. The structure consists of two parts: commemoration of the dead and address to the living ones. Besides, it contains reminiscences to "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori" [7, p.26].   (Death for the native country is a citizen's debt). Apparently, Lincoln meant to say that the listeners must commemorate the dead because they had died for the country.

The sentence was translated as follows:

Lanchikov: Так велит нам долг, так нам подобает.

Nabokov: Такое действие нам вполне подобает и приличествует.

Dranov: Вне всякого сомнения, этим мы выполняем наш долг.

Palazhchenko: И это, само по себе, вполне уместно и достойно.

It is obvious that semantically the four translations are quite different. Vladimir Nabokov comes farther from the interpretation we stick to: his statement implies that what is going on Gettysburg field is decent just because it does not go against the status and social position of those who came there. So Nabokov's translation is misleading. The version by Palazhchenko is

not accurate either: it implies that the situation itself dictates the action, and thus the activity of commemoration is not disgraceful. Besides, the idea is expressed matter-of-factly. In Dranov's version the word "debt" is used, but the phrase «вне всякого сомнения» ("undoubtedly") lessens the effect of the action that is being performed. In Lanchikov's translation the theme of the "debt" is more prominent; moreover, one can feel that the speaker perceives the debt not as a matter of course but as something that comes from above: «долг *велит*» (literary: "the debt orders"). In this way the cognitive information was rendered more precisely and in connection with the religious component of the meaning.

The final sentence of the speech is, definitely, one of its most significant parts. It runs as follows: «…that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that <u>government of the people, by the people, for the people</u>, shall not perish from the earth». This is the expression of the main idea that Lincoln has been driving at, and the understanding of the text as a whole depends on whether a translator renders it into another language correctly. But here we have a problem: what is the meaning of "government" in this sentence (a Cabinet, a process of governing, a method of governing)? M.Berdy claims that plural form is implied in the word ("It is so clear that the plural is implied, this line is sometimes misprinted as "governments" [9. P.26]). If it is true, the word must be rendered as «правительство» or «правительства» (government*s*) [7, c.26]. I think Berdy's statement to be doubtful because it contradicts Lincoln's beliefs. The President believed that in democracy all people are equal in their unalienable rights to <u>Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness</u>. Could Lincoln think of just one government or several governments? No. It is not surprising that all translators but one decided that "governing" or even "power" is meant here, but not "a government":

Lanchikov: …чтобы наша страна, с Божьей помощью, снова узрела рождение свободы, чтобы *власть народа, именем народа, во имя народа* вовек не исчезла с земли.

Nabokov: …что эта нация, с помощью Божьей, обретет новое рождение свободы; и что *правление народное, народом и для народа* не сгинет с земли.

Dranov: …что наш народ по воле Бога еще узрит новое рождение свободы; что *правительство из народа, волей народа и ради народа* никогда не погибнет.

Palazhchenko: …что эта Богом хранимая нация обретет возрожденную свободу и что *власть народа, волей народа и для народа* не исчезнет с лица земли.

Dranov's translation is an exception we have mentioned. The translator used the word *правительство* in the meaning of "a Cabinet", and this contradicts to the common interpretation of the sentence. It is probable, though, that the translator thought he was using the word in the meaning of "form of governance" but in this case the word can not be combined with «из народа» (used for "of the people") as it will be a violation of the usage rule. Similar violations can be found in the translation by Navokov. And again translation by Lanchikov is a happier one (with its word «власть» literary meaning "power" and easily coming in all combinations).

Let me repeat that Victor Lanchikov, following the tactic of rendering the principal cognitive information, used transformations only when they were really required due to the disparity between the systems of the two languages.

While translating Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, a translator strives to reproduce the stylistic peculiarities of the text and, thus, to employ ***the tactic of reproducing stylistic***

peculiarities. Among the most significant expressive means used in the text we find multiple repetitions of words (dedicate, nation, birth, life, death/die) that are used as both an expressive device and means of rendering the principal cognitive information. Besides, M.Berdy notes the use of alliteration (poor power), a parenthetic structure (the world will little note *nor long remember* what we say here) and a climax, or gradation (we cannot dedicate – we cannot consecrate – we cannot hallow – this ground) [7, c.28]. Undoubtedly, the use of super-neutral, archaic, bookish vocabulary is also an important means of producing certain effect upon the audience. It imparts solemnity to the text and makes it similar to a church sermon. Apparently, the stylistic devices employed in the text perform two functions simultaneously: an expressive function and so-called style-making function. The latter is performed to create a typical yet, to some extent, individual style; and for Gettysburg Address, it is the style that combines peculiarities of both civic and ecclesiastical eloquence. Working with the same material, a translator employs two tactics simultaneously: the tactic of reproducing stylistic peculiarities and *the tactic of reproducing individual style-making features*. Individual style-making features are those elements in the text that ensure its conformity with a certain prototype, in our case it the text of church sermon. I treat such features as individual ones, characterizing the *given* text because not all public speeches in English are made in the form that resembles a church sermon. The example under consideration is a rare exception from the general rule. Hereafter I shall considered the means of implementation of these two tactics integrally, bearing in mind that the both are used in combination with the tactic of rendering the principal cognitive information.

We can often hear that repetition as a stylistic device should be rendered in TT by means of repetition, and in the same segment of the text. This is not an approach that should be used, and Lanchikov's translation of the Address proves that other means can be employed to reproduce the function of the device (not the form). Just one example: in the ST the verb *to dedicate* is used six times while in the TT four different contextual equivalents are used in the same segments. It does not mean that the TT is devoid of such important device as repetition. The translator uses repetitions in other segments as means of compensation («кто отдал здесь свои *жизни* ради *жизни* нашего народа», «ее уже *освятили* сражавшиеся на ней герои – так *освятили*, что…», «это мы, живые, должны принять здесь *посвящение – посвятить* себя…», «…укрепить свою *преданность* делу *преданностью* тех, кто с честью пал здесь…») and a means of reproducing the general stylistic coloring of the text. To be exact, the general stylistic coloring of the text is preserved by means of rendering the functions of the whole combination of stylistic devices employed in the text using appropriate means.

Among the stylistic peculiarities of the text we find, as it has been mentioned above, alliteration, parenthesis and gradation. Alliteration "**p**oor **p**ower" was happily rendered as «**с**лабые **с**илы». No less masterfully the gradation was restored: «…мы бессильны воздать достойные почести – бессильны освятить эту землю – бессильны сделать ее поистине святыней», though Michelle Berdy claims that no translator has managed to render it correctly [7, p. 28]. I believe that the translator was quite successful in reproducing the gradation (воздать почести – освятить – сделать святыней) and did not fail to render the meanings, the sense and the stylistic value of the device. As for the parenthetic structure (The world will little note, *nor long remember* what we say here…), it is not reproduced in the TT («Мир едва ли услышит произнесенные здесь слова и скоро забудет их»). I presume that the translator focused on reproduction of the meaning of the utterance without paying due attention to its form.

Yet the style of the translated text can hardly be characterized as neutral. It is expressive, lofty, saturated with solemnity. This was achieved, mainly, by means of compensation of the

losses that are due to the discrepancy between the languages and the systems of stylistic expression. At the same time, performing this operation the translator managed to make a text close to the prototype of church sermon.

It should be also noted that the Address is similar to the church sermon due to the use of biblical expressions and bookish words (four score and seven years ago, brought forth, to conceive, to dedicate, proposition, to endure, a resting place, to consecrate, to hallow, devotion, under God, to perish). Unfortunately, the biblical expressions used in the text (fourscore and seven years, brought forth) cannot be translated with the same stylistic effect as they have no correspondences in the Russian language. V.Lanchikov states that in the Russian text of the Bible there are used quite common, neutral means of chronology (семьдесят лет, седмьдесят лет) and neutral words instead of purely religious terminology [8, p.35; 37].. To restore the expressiveness, the translator resorted to inversion («отцы наши»). At the same time, the use of the name of God («с Божией помощью») is associated with the style of the Bible. One can assume that to solve the problem of complete reproduction of the individual, style-making peculiarities of the text archaic words and expressions could be used in the TT. But Lanchikov believes that the use of the most unambiguous signs of the genre, i.e. Church Slavonic words, is out of the question in this case [8, p.36]. It is explained by the fact that in the Russian tradition civil and ecclesiastical eloquences are more distant to each other than in the Protestant tradition, thus the use of Church Slavonic words would hardly help create a text that would be a public speech and a church sermon simultaneously [3, p.34]. To compensate for the losses, Lanchikov resorts to peculiar syntax with its rhythm-creating capabilities. The rhythmic pattern is made by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables, by the length of syntagms (alternation of short and long syntagms), by the regularity of repeating the same words, morphemes and grammatical forms [8, p.36].. Thus, compensation can be used at various language levels. As means of compensation, repetitions of words are used in those segments of the TT where there are no repetitions (as far as the ST is concerned). For example: «…дали жизнь новой *нации – нации*, зачатой в свободе…». Lanchikov explains that if the original syntactical structure is preserved, the theme of *birth* can be blurred by the nation's characteristic closely linked to the segment narrating about the birth. When the word нация (nation) is repeated, a pause is made between these two important ideas, the boundary between them becomes more visible, and the utterance acquires a more crisp rhythm [8, p. 37]. The same operation is used in other segments of the texts («Её уже *освятили* сражавшиеся на ней герои – так *освятили*, что…»). This operation ensures both a peculiar rhythmic pattern of the text and emergence of associations with the ecclesiastical eloquence [8, p.38].

We can conclude that both the TT and the translator's statements reveal his desire to reproduce the features of a church sermon, i.e. to implement integrally the tactic of reproducing stylistic peculiarities and the tactic of reproducing individual style-making features to the fullest extent. It means that the translator was trying to achieve a special goal that was possible only in the situation of tertiary translation.

In different communicative situations, trying to achieve different goals, a translator can implement the above tactics to a different extent. Tactic of rendering principal cognitive information is the one which is realized to the fullest extent in all communicative situations because reproduction of such information does not contradict the goals and tasks of the translator. The other two tactics may be implemented differently: the tactic of reproducing individual style-making features can be ignored if the translator does not want to demonstrate that the text being translated belongs to a certain prototype.

Bibliographic list

1. Vitrenko A.G. O «strategii perevoda» // Sopostavitel'naja lingvistika i vo-prosy perevoda: Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. Vyp. 536. Lingvistika. – M.: MGLU, 2008. – S.3-17.

2. Sdobnikov V.V. K probleme postroenija tipologii perevodcheskih strategij // Perevod v mezhkul'turnom dialoge: teoreticheskie i prikladnye voprosy: Vestnik Mos-kovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. Vyp. 9(615). Jazykoznanie. – M.: IPK MGLU «Rema», 2011. – S.89-99.

3. Shvejcer A.D. Teorija perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – 215 s.

4. Waard J. de, Nida T.A. From One Language to Another (Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating). – Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986. – 224 p.

5. Nord Christiane. Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Ex-plained. – Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997. – 154 p.

6. Cvilling M.Ja. O nekotoryh modifikacijah kommunikativnogo podhoda k ponja-tiju perevoda // O perevode i perevodchikah: Sbornik nauchnyh statej. – M.: Vostochnaja kniga, 2009. – S.80-85.

7. Berdi M. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: the Song of Abraham // Mosty. Zhurnal perevodchikov. – 2(5)/2005. – M.: R.Valent, 2005. – S.23-29.

8. Lanchikov V.K. Pamjatnik za jazykovym bar'erom // Mosty. Zhurnal perevodchi-kov. – 2(5)/2005. – M.: R.Valent, 2005. – S.30-38.

9. Postnikova L.V. Sovremennyj politicheskij diskurs: sociokul'turnyj i pro-sodicheskij aspekty (na materiale rechej amerikanskih i rossijskih prezidentov) / L.V. Postnikova // Nauchnyj vestnik Voronezh. gos. arh.-stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvis-ticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskie issledovanija. – 2009. – Vyp. 2 (12). – S. 162-172.

10. Kljukina T. P., Kljukina-Vitjuk M. Ju., Lanchikov V. K. Politika i krylatika. Vyskazyvanija vidnyh politicheskih, gosudarstvennyh i obshhestvennyh dejatelej Velikobritanii, Irlandii, SShA i Kanady — M.: R.Valent, 2004. – 232 c.

11. Palazhchenko P.R. Vse poznaetsja v sravnenii, ili nesistematicheskij slovar' trudnostej, tonkostej i premudrostej anglijskogo jazyka v sravnenii s russkim. 2-e ste-reotip. izd. M.: R.Valent, 1999. - 240 c.

12. Alekseev S.A. Gettisbergskoe «protivostojanie»: original vs. perevod // Mosty. Zhurnal perevodchikov. – 2(5)/2005. – S.39-45.

13. Alekseev S.A. Peredacha struktury obrazov hudozhestvennogo teksta v perevode (na materiale anglo-russkih perevodov): Dis… kand. filol. nauk. M., 2009. – 165 s.