

*Ababilova N. M.,**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,**Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English  
Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University*

## REVISION AS A KEY STAGE OF THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

**Summary.** Being a part of professional translation, translation revision is considered to be a means of translation quality assessment. A translator should never call the translation finished if it has not been checked. Quality in translation is assessment of its strong and weak points and, therefore, it cannot be taken for granted. Revision and translation have many common features and at the same time these processes are different. In foreign literature translation revision is characterized by lack of consensus regarding its terms and definitions. The majority of definitions may be explained by the fact that translation studies sphere is in a flux, so is the term “revision”. In the article revision is defined as operations used to check and improve the quality of the translated text by eliminating grammatical, lexical and stylistic mistakes through the comparison of the target text with the source one. The revision types are identified taking into account different criteria. The following types have been analyzed in the article: monolingual (or unilingual – a revisor focuses on the translated text itself) and comparative (or bilingual – a revisor constantly compares the target text with the source one); self-revision (when translators themselves reread and revise their own translations) and other-revision (a translation is read by a revisor); full and partial (the revision of only some parts of the translated text). Their peculiarities have been discussed. The number of steps of the revision process have been examined. Having analyzed the scientific literature on revision parameters those suggested by Mossop (2014) have been reviewed being detailed and systematic, used by revisors themselves and in the process of their training. The process of revision has no clear boundaries and can occur at any stage of translation, it is worth paying as much attention to as the translation of the text itself.

**Key words:** translation, revision, types of revision, revision peculiarities, revision parameters.

**Introduction.** Being a part of professional translation, and one of the biggest workloads of translation companies, translation revision is considered to be a means of translation quality assessment. A translator should never call the translation finished if it has not been checked. Quality in translation is assessment of its strong and weak points and, therefore, not something that should be taken for granted. Revision and translation have many common features and at the same time these processes are different.

**Related research.** A review of the scientific literature has shown that since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century there have been published some researches devoted to both theoretical and practical issues of translation revision: differentiating between translation and revision (Fordonski, 2014); introducing various methods of text revision, correlation of revision procedure with error detection (Ipsen and Dam, 2016). A few studies are devoted to different types of revision and their peculiarities (Mossop, 2007, 2014; Brunette, 2008; Gile, 2009); translators’ and revisors’ attitudes to

the translation revision (Scocchera, 2018). The impact of the revision procedure and strategies on the revision product quality has also been highlighted (Robert, 2014). There are practical researches analyzing the way revision is carried out at some agencies and firms (Rasmussen and Schjoldager, 2011).

**The article aims** at analyzing the essence of translation revision, its stages and peculiarities as seen by foreign researchers.

**Presentation of the main research material.** Lack of consensus characterizes translation revision if it goes about its terms and definitions as such of them are used to refer to this part of translation process: “linguistic revision/editing, copyediting and translation revision” [1].

Thus, Brian Mossop classified four broad types of the revised work: copyediting (correcting pre-set rules), stylistic editing (tailoring vocabulary and sentence structure to the readership, and creating a readable text), content editing, and structural editing. As for the first ones, the author emphasized that it is the tasks that translators are most likely to be asked to perform. Another frequently used term connected with translation revision is proofreading, which is often used for any kind of linguistic checking, or mechanical slips checking (typing errors, missing words, errors in page layout) [2].

Having reviewed the translation studies sources, we have concluded the term under study is most often is defined as:

- careful *analysis* of a text in order to bring it into generally accepted linguistic and functional criteria (Louise Brunette) [3];
- *function* of professional translators in which they find features of the draft translation that fall short of what is acceptable, as determined by some concept of quality, and make any needed corrections and improvements (Brian Mossop) [2];
- all-embracing *exercise*, including features of proofreading (layout, font, typos, punctuation), editing (rearranging and scrapping text, adherence to house rules), reviewing (terminology, correcting conceptual errors) and post-editing (machine translation) (Spencer Allman) [4];
- *checking* linguistic correctness as well as the suitability of a text’s style for its future readers and for the use they will make of it (Brian Mossop) [5];
- *the process of inspecting and correcting* that is done by a separate revisor (Daniel Gile) [6].

The majority of definitions may be explained by the fact that translation studies sphere is in a flux, so is the term “revision”.

We define revision as operations used to check and improve the quality of the translated text by eliminating grammatical, lexical and stylistic mistakes through the comparison of the target text with the source one.

The importance of the translated text being revised has been also emphasized by Peter Arthen who stated that the revision should be done by a person or persons other than a translator as “four

eyes are better than two" [7]. Brian Mossop supports the idea but adds that revision is beneficial if only a revisor does not worsen the translation by making wrong corrections [2].

There are some types of translation revision.

On the one hand researchers often mention monolingual (or unilingual) and comparative (or bilingual) revision. In monolingual (unilingual) revision a revisor focuses on the translated text itself, check it for language and logic and refers to the original if questions arise. In comparative (bilingual) revision a revisor constantly compares the translated text with the original. Though advantages of such revisions are obvious still there are some disadvantages. Thus, Brian Mossop supposes that comparative revision sounds unnatural as actually readers do not go back and forth between the original and translation. While going back and forth a revisor may not consider the translated text as a whole but concentrate on searching for inaccuracies and errors. So, the translated text may lose coherence and be illogically structured. Being more time-consuming than monolingual revision, nevertheless it allows the revisor to check for accuracy and completeness of transfer [2]. On the contrary Isabelle Robert partly agrees to the comparative revision taking more time, as after conducting her research she concluded that it takes a third more time than unilingual revision [8].

On the other hand, revision may be full and partial. Partial revision presupposes the revision of only some parts of the translated text (Mossop, 2014). This type is usually used when the time but not perfect linguistic quality matters. Louise Brunette also advocates for full revision [3]. In discovering errors full revision is more useful and efficient.

In accordance with Kristen Rasmussen and Anne Schjoldager a full revision comprises both comparative and unilingual revisions. The research shows that when deciding on revising the text such factors as translators' experience, difficulty of the text (terminology, complex language), text genre, sphere of the text usage (if the text is going to be seen by a large audience, published in some open sources) and the importance of the client are paid attention to. As for partial revision researchers list the following reasons of its usage: 1) the client does not want to pay for revision; 2) the translation is for informal use only or perfect translation is not required under the circumstances; and 3) a translator is highly experienced and unlikely to commit mistakes. We agree that using all available and necessary translation tools and a translator being experienced are definitely to minimize the amount of mistakes and thus eliminate the urgent necessity of translation revision [9].

In an attempt to describe an "ideal" revision process, Paul Horguelin and Louise Brunette identify a three-step activity consisting of source text reading, followed by a comparative reading of the source text and the target text (what they refer to as "bilingual revision"), and finally the target text correction and re-reading [3].

However, Brian Mossop favours "unilingual revision," that is, the revisor's reading of the target text alone, going back to the source text only when the revisor detects a problem and subsequently makes a change. Mossop says in this case it is well possible to produce a translation that is not quite as close in meaning to the source as a comparative re-reading will produce. On the one hand, it will often read better because the revisor has been attending more to the flow and logic of the translation. On the other hand, reading translation without comparing it with the source text

is risky as passages may be omitted or mistranslated and the revisor will not notice it [2].

Having conducted her research, Isabelle Robert suggests the following four types of revision procedure used as variables: one monolingual proofreading without consulting the source text, except in doubt; one bilingual proofreading; a bilingual proofreading followed by a monolingual proofreading; and a monolingual proofreading followed by a bilingual proofreading. Following data analysis and interpretation, Robert inferred that procedure may indeed affect revision quality, revision duration and its error detection potential [8].

Scientific findings of Hellen Ipsen and Helle Dam allowed them to summarize revisors' explanations of the process into the following revision procedures including different numbers of steps [10]:

1) comparative revision – a one-step procedure implying working on the source text and its translation. The portions of the original are read before the corresponding target portion;

2) comparative revision and monolingual revision – a two-step procedure comprising reading source text segments before the corresponding target segments and reading target text segments before reading the corresponding source segments;

3) partly comparative revision and monolingual revision – a two-step procedure. During the first stage a revisor deals with the target text referring to the source text only when doubts arise;

4) the combination of partly comparative revision and two comparative revisions – a three-step procedure. During the first stage a revisor deals with the target text referring to the source text when in doubt; target text segments are read before source segments during the second and the third stages;

5) the combination of source text monolingual reading, translated text monolingual reading, comparative revision and monolingual revision – a four-step procedure.

Moreover, revision may be classified into self-revision, when translators themselves reread and revise their own translations, and other-revision where a translation is read by a revisor who may be either a colleague, i.e. a translator, or a language professional as a revisor needs to consider the interference from the source language, check the omissions and mistranslations.

Brian Mossop singles out three separate stages, two of which are specifically carried out through reading, in self-revision. At the first stage the monolingual reading of a small extract of the translation is performed. Such reading without looking at the source text can assist to identify general language and style problems. The second stage implies reading an extract of the translated text followed by a comparison with the source text thus identifying specific omissions and mistranslations and forming the overall idea of the translation quality. Self-revision makes it possible for a self-revising translator to reconsider choices previously made or adopt different strategies and solutions. The third stage is taking final decision on specific issues or translation/revision problems that are particularly hard to solve.

When performing self-revision, it is necessary to adopt alternative "distancing" strategies, which Andrew Chesterman and Emma Wagner define as a stepping back mentally from what you are creating to get a better perspective on it, and they advise on strategies that, when applied during self-revision, can produce a kind of artificial forgetting, a clearing of the mental screen in order to get a new and fresh view on the translated text. Also, researchers propose a set of efficient "reading strategies" for translators performing

self-revision, namely: changing the medium (i.e. from screen to paper), starting to read at some point in the middle of the document, reading the text aloud to someone else or pretending to be someone else while reading one's own translation [11].

To our point of view, self-revision may happen both throughout a process of text translation and as a separate stage of a translation process.

While revising translation three its aspects are to be checked: the degree of the original text formal consistency; the degree of formal consistency in the target language; and the degree of meaningfulness and acceptability for the target audience.

To Krzysztof Fordonski's point of view, when revising translation three major dangers may appear. Firstly, translating word for word as by preserving exactly as it is in the original one is likely to lose the spirit of the work, violate the syntactic norms of the language. The depth and meaning of a literary work cannot be reflected by a word-for-word translation. Secondly, it is translators' and editors' ignorance of the original meaning and language. Finally, it is an abuse of power when translators cannot influence corrections made to the text after their submitting it [12].

Having analyzed the scientific literature on revision parameters we have come to conclusion that those of Mossop's are detailed and systematic, have been used in revisors' training and other scientists (Kristen Rasmussen and Anne Schjoldager) used them when conducting their researches and questioning translators and revisers thus proving their efficiency.

So, speaking on the revision parameters, Brian Mossop points to their such four groups: transfer, content, language, and presentation. Mossop claims that all these parameters may be applied to all types of revisions and it is a reviser who decides which parameters are useful to meet the client's requirements. As for the first group, transfer, it means checking the translated text in terms of accuracy and completeness. A revisor is to examine whether the message of the source texts has been reflected in translation and whether a translator has avoided unnecessary additions and omissions. Checking the content is discovering logical and factual mistakes. There are two cases when logical mistakes may arise. Firstly, the original was illogical and the translator just followed the original. Secondly, translators' insufficient knowledge of the language may lead to making such mistakes. Factual mistakes are those connected with real facts, mathematics, notions, terms, and concepts. Language group parameters is the most numerous and comprises smoothness (correlation of the passages), tailoring (taking into account readers' education, ability to perceive the translated text, knowledge, motivation), sub-language, idiom and mechanics (proofreading). It is these parameters that influence the readability of the translated text. In general, this group parameters are aimed at checking the style, cohesion and linguistic errors. The last group includes layout, topography and organization as it is seen they are aesthetic aspects of translation [2].

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** Although the process of revision has no clear boundaries and can occur at any stage of translation, it is worth paying as much attention to as the translation of the text itself. To error is human, so such factors as inattention or fatigue can directly affect the quality of translation. The revision of translations by a second translator may be considered as necessarily beneficial to its quality at the same time revision by another person can only assure quality if this person is truly

competent and the translation/revision process is properly executed. Furthermore, the improvements to quality that revision may bring are not always worth the extra time, effort and cost. More importantly, when the revision process is poorly executed it can reduce and even destroy the quality of the translated text. We are sure that during performing professional duties translators develop and modify revision parameters considering customers' feedback and their professional experience. Without revision, the translated text may not match the original meaning of the source text.

Our further research presupposes carrying out a questionnaire for professional revisors in translation agencies aiming at finding out the most efficient revision method and possibilities to reduce the revision time.

#### References:

1. Lieve Macken (UGent), Bram Vanroy (UGent), Luca Desmet and Arda Tezcan (UGent) Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation. 2022 P.101-110.
2. Mossop B. Revising and Editing for Translators (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2001/2014). URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315767130/revising-editing-translators-brian-mossop>
3. Horguelin P.A. et Louise Brunette: *Pratique de la revision*, 3 edition revue et augmentee. Brossard (Quebec). Linguatex editeur. 2008. 263 p.
4. Allman, S. Negotiating Translation Revision Assignments. In I. Kemble (Ed.), *Translation and Negotiation: Proceedings of the Conference held on 10th of November 2007 in Portsmouth* (pp. 35–47). Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth, School of Languages and Area Studies.
5. Mossop Brian, Jungmin Hong and Carlos Teixeira. *Revising and editing for translators* (4th edition). Routledge, Taylor and Francis: London; New York. 2020. 302 p.
6. Gile Daniel (2009) Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314566841\\_Gile\\_Daniel\\_2009\\_Basic\\_Concepts\\_and\\_Models\\_for\\_Interpreter\\_and\\_Translator\\_Training\\_Revised\\_edition\\_AmsterdamPhiladelphia\\_John\\_Benjamins\\_283\\_p](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314566841_Gile_Daniel_2009_Basic_Concepts_and_Models_for_Interpreter_and_Translator_Training_Revised_edition_AmsterdamPhiladelphia_John_Benjamins_283_p)
7. Arthern, P. 1987. Four Eyes are Better than Two. In: Picken, C. (ed.) *Translating and the Computer 8: A Profession on the Move*. London: Aslib, The Association for Information Management. 14–26.
8. Isabelle Robert and Luuk Van Waes, "Selecting a Translation Revision Procedure: Do Common Sense and Statistics Agree?", *Perspectives* 22, no. 3 (2014): 304–20.
9. Kirsten W. Rasmussen and Anne Schjoldager, "Revising Translations: A Survey of Revision Policies in Danish Translation Companies", *Journal of Specialised Translation* 15 (2011), [http://www.jostrans.org/issue15/art\\_rasmussen.php](http://www.jostrans.org/issue15/art_rasmussen.php)
10. Ipsen, A. Helene and Helle V. Dam. Translation Revision: Correlating Revision Procedure and Error Detection. *HERMES – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 55 2016. P. 143–156.
11. Andrew Chesterman and Emma Wagner, *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2002), 68–72.
12. Fordonski Krzysztof. The Art of Translation and the Art of Editing. "Komunikacja Specjalistyczna". Vol. 7. 2014. P. 167–173.
13. Mossop B. Empirical Studies of revision: what we know and need to know. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, Issue 8. 2007. P. 5–20.
14. Giovanna Schocchera "Translation Revision as Rereading: Different Aspects of the Translator's and Reviser's Approach to the Revision Process", 2018 URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323175145\\_Translation\\_Revision\\_as\\_Rereading\\_Different\\_Aspects\\_of\\_the\\_Translator's\\_and\\_Reviser's\\_Approach\\_to\\_the\\_Revision\\_Process](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323175145_Translation_Revision_as_Rereading_Different_Aspects_of_the_Translator's_and_Reviser's_Approach_to_the_Revision_Process)

**Абабілова Н. М. Редагування як ключовий етап процесу перекладу**

**Анотація.** Будучи складовою роботи над перекладом, редагування перекладеного тексту розглядається як один зі способів оцінювання його якості. Перекладач не може вважати переклад завершеним, якщо переклад не перевірено. Якість перекладу – це оцінка його сильних і слабких сторін, а отже, вона не може сприйматися як щось само собою зрозуміле. Редагування та переклад мають багато спільних рис, але водночас ці процеси відрізняються один від одного. Серед зарубіжних науковців все ще залишається дискусійним питання використання певного терміну на позначення процесу редагування перекладу. У статті «редагування» визначено як операція з перевірки та покращення якості перекладеного тексту шляхом усунення граматичних, лексичних та стилістичних помилок шляхом зіставлення тексту перекладу з оригіналом. В статті проаналізовано існуючі типи редагування, які визначаються з урахуванням різних критеріїв. У статті проаналізовано такі види редагування:

монолінгвальне (або унілінгвальне – редактор працює безпосередньо з самим текстом перекладу) та порівняльне (або білінгвальне – редактор порівнює текст перекладу з оригіналом); саморедагування (перекладач сам перечитує та редагує власний переклад) та редагування іншою людиною (переклад читає редактор); повне та часткове (редагування лише деяких частин перекладеного тексту). Окреслено особливості вищезазначених типів редагування. Розглянуто етапи процесу редагування. Проаналізувавши наукову літературу щодо параметрів редагування, встановлено, що запропоновані Mossop (2014) параметри є детальними та систематизованими, використовуються як в процесі роботи редакторів, так і у процесі їх професійної підготовки. Редагування не має чітких меж і може відбуватися на будь-якому етапі перекладу, йому варто приділяти не менше уваги, ніж власне перекладу самого тексту.

**Ключові слова:** переклад, редагування, види редагування, особливості редагування, параметри редагування.