TOBİDER

International Journal of Social Sciences

ISSN:2587-2591
DOI Number:http://dx.doi.org/10.30830/tobider.sayi.15.24

Volume 7/3
2023 p. 427-438

THE QUEST FOR EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DEFINITIONS AND APPROACHES

ÇEVİRİDE "EŞDEĞERLİK" ARAYIŞI: TANIM VE YAKLAŞIMLARIN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ

Sema ÜSTÜN KÜLÜNK*

ABSTRACT

The concept of equivalence in Translation Studies has been a subject of extensive debate due to varying definitions and interpretations. Scholars propose different understandings of equivalence based on their perspectives on translation. This paper explores the historical context of equivalence and its impact on the development of Translation Studies. Despite its fluctuating prominence, equivalence remains a fundamental aspect of the discipline. The definitions provided by Eugene Nida, Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, Gideon Toury, and Theo Hermans are analyzed to delve into the multifaceted nature of equivalence in translation. These different perspectives highlight the diverse conceptualizations and applications of equivalence. Nida takes a response-oriented approach, considering the reader and contextual reception of the translation. Reiss emphasizes a function-oriented approach, determining equivalence based on the text's function. Vermeer reduces the concept to special cases, while Toury argues that equivalence is always present. Hermans examines equivalence from a marginal viewpoint, focusing on cases of full equivalence. The paper concludes that although equivalence may not fully capture the complexities of translation, it serves as a valuable descriptive tool in comparing target and source texts. An awareness of these changes is crucial to appreciate the diversity inherent in the translational act.

Keywords: *Equivalence, Functionalist Approaches, Norm Theory, Skopos*

* Assist. Prof. Dr., Doğuş University, Translation and Interpreting Studies, E-mail: semaustunsema@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7447-2041, Istanbul, Türkiye.

ÖZ

Çeviribilim alanında eşdeğerlik kavramı, değişen tanımları ve yaklaşımlar nedeniyle sık sık bir tartışma konusu olmuştur. Alanda çalışan isimler çeviriye dair bakış açıları çerçevesinde farklı eşdeğerlik anlayışları ortaya koymuştur. Bu makalede eşdeğerlik kavramının tarihsel bağlamı ve Çeviribilim alanının gelişimi üzerindeki etkisi incelenmektedir. Görülmektedir ki, dalgalanmalara rağmen eşdeğerlik, alanın kurucu ve tanımlayıcı bir unsuru olarak varlığını sürdürmektedir. Eugene Nida, Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, Gideon Toury ve Theo Hermans tarafından sunulan tanımlar, çeviride eşdeğerliğin çok yönlü doğasını incelemek amacıyla analiz edilmektedir. Bu farklı bakış açıları, eşdeğerliğin çeşitli kavramsallaştırmalarını ve uygulama alanlarını gözler önüne sermektedir. Nida, kaynak odaklı bir yaklaşım benimserken çevirinin okuyucuya ve metne bağlamsal karşılığına odaklanır. Reiss metnin işlevine dayanarak eşdeğerliği belirlemekte ve işlev odaklı bir yaklaşımı benimsemektedir. Vermeer ise kavramı özel durumlara ve amaca indirgerken, Toury eşdeğerliğin her zaman mevcut olduğunu savunmaktadır. Hermans eşdeğerliği bir uç noktası olarak inceler ve tam eşdeğerlik durumlarına odaklanır. Makale, eşdeğerliğin çevirinin karmaşıklıklarını tam olarak çözümlemese de hedef ve kaynak metin karşılaştırmasında değerli bir tanımlayıcı araç olarak hizmet ettiği sonucuna varmaktadır. Bu değişikliklerin farkında olmak, çeviri eyleminde doğal olarak var olan çeşitliliği takdir etmek için önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Eşdeğerlik, İşlevsel Yaklaşımlar, Norm Kuramı, Skopos*

1. Introduction

The concept of equivalence has been a topic of extensive debate in Translation Studies. Its contentious nature arises from several reasons. Firstly, there is a lack of consensus regarding its definition. Different scholars propose varying definitions based on their understanding of translation. Given that translation itself lacks a universally accepted definition, it is not surprising that one of its key concepts is also subject to interpretation. Certain scholars define equivalence in terms of textual relations, considering it a relationship between texts in different languages. Others view it as the impact of the same texts in diverse languages. These differing approaches further complicate the concept and attribute it to distinct categories. Some argue that the concept of equivalence challenges Translation Studies by hindering progress and leading to endless debates without resolution. They suggest that it does not serve a useful purpose and impedes further advancements in the field. It is crucial to examine the subject matter within its historical context to provide meaningful insights into these different usages of the term. As Translation Studies is a social discipline, it is also influenced by societal, political, and economic developments, which affect other disciplines.

During the 1960s and 1970s, equivalence sparked intense debates, particularly with the emergence of linguistically oriented translation studies. However, its prominence waned in the 1980s and 1990s as ideologically oriented, post-structuralist, and post-colonial approaches gained dominance within the field. Nevertheless, the concept has never lost its impact or validity as a fundamental aspect of translation studies; it continues to exist

explicitly or implicitly. Over time, as discussions surrounding equivalence generate new perspectives, the field evolves and becomes more complex.

This paper aims to examine the diverse applications of the term "equivalence" within Translation Studies by sequentially presenting the definitions provided by Eugene a, Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, Gideon Toury, and Theo Hermans. Each scholar's perspective regarding the concept will be discussed and analyzed. By exploring these various definitions, a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of equivalence in translation will be achieved to contribute to the appreciation of the rich diversity inherent in the translational act.

2. In Quest of Equivalence Among the Scholars of Translation Studies

2.1 E. Nida & Equivalence: When It is More about Bible Translation

Eugene Nida offers valuable insights on the topic of "equivalence" in translation. It is essential to consider Nida's perspective in light of his role as a Bible translator, as his ideas are heavily influenced by his approach to translating the Holy text. Moreover, the examples he presents primarily pertain to the context of Bible translation. In his article "Principles of Correspondence," Nida (1964a) questions the potentials of correspondence and states that “ [...] it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence there can be no fully exact translations” (126). This initial acknowledgment underscores Nida's acceptance that complete equivalence in translation is unattainable. He recognizes that every translation necessarily involves a certain degree of interpretation by the translator (*ibid.*)

Nida (1964b) addresses various types of translations, which he defines about different factors influencing translation outcomes. These factors include: 1) the nature of the message being translated, 2) the intentions of both the author and the translator, and 3) the characteristics of the target audience (Nida, 1964b: 157). Based on these considerations, Nida (1964a) identifies two fundamental orientations in the translation process: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence (129). These orientations serve as frameworks for applying different translation methods and producing distinct translations. It is worth noting that the concept of equivalence plays a crucial role in understanding Nida's perspective on translation.

Nida's analysis of basic binary opposition in translation provides valuable insights into the field. His understanding of translation revolves around four factors: making sense, conveying the spirit and manner of the original, having a natural and easy form of expression, and producing a similar response. According to Nida (1964b), when a choice must be made between sacrificing translation elements, the priority generally lies with maintaining meaning over style. However, this generalization has exceptions, such as poetry translation (162).

The concept of formal equivalence is source-oriented. The main goal is to faithfully present the form and content of the original text (Nida, 1964b: 159). This means readers should recognize that they are reading a translation, a text produced in a foreign language and context. The degree of equivalence is assessed based on how well the message of the source text is conveyed in terms of both content and form in the target text.

A formal equivalent translation focuses on reproducing formal elements such as grammatical units, consistent word usage, and source-contextual meanings (Nida 1964b: 161). Equivalence, in this context, refers to the meaning units and the relationship between these units in both the source and target cultures. Therefore, it operates within an intertextual framework. Nida's approach to formal equivalence requires analyzing texts to determine the level of equivalence achieved.

However, this understanding of translation is open to scrutiny for several reasons. Firstly, it is not feasible to separate content and form, as they are intricately intertwined. Form cannot be analyzed in isolation from its accompanying content, and vice versa. Secondly, different languages possess distinct features, and adhering strictly to the structure of the source text in the target language may result in a seemingly meaningless arrangement of words. This would undermine the desired equivalence feature. It is important to acknowledge that strict interpretations of translation terms can lead to misleading conclusions.

Moreover, Nida's concept of meaning is quite strict, treating it as a fixed entity. However, meaning itself is open to interpretation, and readers from the source and target cultures may derive different understandings from the same or different texts in various languages. Therefore, a rigid approach to meaning may not fully capture the complexities of translation. Nida's analysis of binary opposition in translation and his emphasis on formal equivalence provide a basis for understanding the challenges and considerations inherent in the translation process. However, it is crucial to keep in mind the limitations and complexities associated with formal equivalence, particularly regarding the inseparability of form and content, the unique features of different languages, and the interpretive nature of meaning.

In discussing dynamic equivalence, it is important to note that it is neither solely source-oriented nor completely target-oriented. It acknowledges the significance and existence of the source text, while also aiming to achieve the same impact on the target reader as the source reader. Dynamic equivalence, as defined by Nida (1964a), is the closest natural equivalent to the message in the source language (159). Unlike formal equivalence, which focuses on preserving meaning and form between texts, dynamic equivalence prioritizes eliciting the same response. This definition encompasses three key terms: "equivalent," "natural," and "closest." Here, equivalence is intertwined with naturalness and proximity, resulting in a translation that reads as an original work, with a focus on cultural

equivalence through the elimination and naturalization of cultural and linguistic differences.

However, dynamic equivalence encounters certain challenges. Firstly, reader response is not fixed and varies across different contexts. Defining the response of the source reader as the basis for evaluating translations can be difficult. Whose response should be considered? Does the same principle apply to the target reader's context? Readers with different backgrounds may react differently to the same text within the same culture. Additionally, the pursuit of naturalness can lead to extremes, as translators may excessively exploit their language's opportunities, potentially resulting in limitless and distorted translations. Is there a limit to this naturalization?

Moreover, there are some problematic aspects related to the usage of the term "equivalence" throughout the article. The author interchangeably uses the words "correspondence" and "equivalence" without providing a specific reason for this choice. Are they intended to have different meanings and refer to different situations? Additionally, the term "equivalence" is employed to categorize translations into distinct types, such as formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence translations. This implies that these translations are subcategories of "equivalence," whereas the focus of the article is on equivalence being the determining factor in describing translations with different orientations. Furthermore, there may be cases where these different understandings of equivalence overlap. For example, translations prepared for linguists often aim for formal equivalence, but they can also be analyzed as dynamic equivalence translations within the limited context of the readers being linguists.

In conclusion, Eugene Nida presents two different types of "equivalence" and uses this term as a fundamental characteristic when describing the nature of translation in various contexts. He favors dynamic equivalence, considering it achievable in different degrees and features. It is crucial to bear in mind that Nida's examples and discussions on "equivalence" predominantly revolve around Bible translation, as his mission is to facilitate the understanding and belief of the holy book across different languages. Consequently, translation is approached with a cultural filter, focusing on naturalness and ease of comprehension. While these ideas may be justified within the context of Bible translation, applying them to a wider range of translations with the same grounds remains a topic open to debate, as the term "equivalence" itself is subject to interpretation.

2.2. K. Reiss & Equivalence: When Functions matter

Reiss, known for her Functionalist approach along with H. Vermeer, bases her understanding of equivalence on the concept of function. She defines translation as a form of written communication between languages, aiming to produce a text that is functionally equivalent to the source language (SL) (Reiss, 1971: 160). Acknowledging the inevitability of discrepancies arising from linguistic and cultural disparities, the distinctive nature of the translator, and varied intended purposes, Reiss (1971) classifies

these modifications as both unintentional and deliberate, thereby distinguishing between them. Unintentional changes arise from linguistic differences, while intentional changes occur when translations and source texts are created to fulfill different functions. Due to this intentional change, seeking functional equivalence between texts is deemed futile by Reiss (1971), who advocates for adequacy of target language (TL) verbalization in accordance with the foreign function (161).

Furthermore, Reiss discusses language, temporal, spatial changes, and cultural dynamics in relation to translations and the decision-making process involved. She proposes a methodology for achieving functionally equivalent translations, which involves determining the source text type as a crucial step. Reiss heavily relies on text type as a determinant of translational decisions. Drawing from Buhler's work, she identifies three types of text: informative, expressive, and operative, each serving a specific function. Additionally, Reiss introduces a fourth type, called "multi-medial text type," expanding the range of textual categories.

In summary, Reiss defines equivalence primarily at the text level, focusing on intertextual relations. However, her main emphasis is not on linguistic equivalence but on equivalence at the function level. She connects her ideas on text types and the resulting translation strategies based on language functions. (Reiss, 1971: 160)

In her article, Reiss (1971) presents certain points that can be subject to questioning. The first concern concerns mixed forms, where texts exhibit more than one basic text type characteristic. Although the author acknowledges this, she does not suggest achieving functionally equivalent translations of such source texts. This raises the question of whether translators should determine and base their translations on the dominant text type, and whether this approach would be appropriate.

Another issue is the Reiss' treatment of function as concrete and predetermined. However, determining the function of a source text and producing a functionally equivalent translated text is not a straightforward task. Even if the function of a source text is identified, it is worth considering whether the same function can be achieved in different cultures with their distinct circumstances. Additionally, Reiss (1971) overlooks the role of pragmatics – the fact that a text produced for a specific function, such as expressive, may be used for a different function, such as operative, depending on the interpretation of different individuals. This raises doubts about whether claiming functional equivalence between the translated text and the expressive source text is still valid.

Furthermore, Reiss (1971) does not address the challenges of translating multi-media texts involving audio and visual elements. Is it truly achievable to establish functional equivalence when these complex communicational tools are involved? Besides, Reiss (1971) categorizes translation cases as normal, problematic, and special. The definition of special cases generated controversy from the beginning, as these cases are referred to

as instances where there is a difference between the original text's function and the function of the translation. According to Reiss (1971), the text typology relevant to translation and the establishment of the given text variety is insignificant in determining the mode of translation needed to achieve functional equivalence. However, labeling these cases as special is questionable, considering the inherent differences in text function across languages and cultures. This perspective suggests that Reiss' ideas regarding normal cases reflect more of an idealized world of communication rather than real-life instances. Consequently, the issue of equivalence becomes irrelevant for the special cases that are, in fact, quite common.

2.3 H. J. Vermeer & Equivalence: When Skopos Defines the Rest in Translation

In contrast to Reiss and Nida, Hans J. Vermeer (2000), the proponent of the Skopos theory with a Functionalist approach, offers a different perspective on the concept of equivalence in translation. Vermeer (2000) does not view equivalence as essential when comparing the source and target texts. This is because Vermeer challenges the conventional notion of the source text, instead considering it as a source of information. For Vermeer, the primary focus in translation lies in the Skopos, which refers to the aim or purpose of the translation. The Skopos is viewed as an active process, emphasizing the translation as an action. Rather than being concerned with the realities of the source culture, Vermeer prioritizes the realities of the target culture. The ultimate goal is to achieve the intended aim of the translation.

However, this does not mean that Vermeer entirely disregards the concept of equivalence. As previously mentioned, everything is determined based on the Skopos, and equivalence becomes relevant when the aim is to produce a linguistically equivalent text for linguistic study purposes. Equivalence can also extend beyond intertextual relations and be applicable when the aim is to realize functionally equivalent texts. Even in these cases, the concept of equivalence is contingent upon fulfilling the requirements of the translation's purpose.

In summary, Vermeer's Skopos theory liberates translators from the strict confines of equivalence, confining this concept to specific scenarios. Although equivalence was a topic of intense debate and formed the basis of certain translation theories in the 1960s and 1970s, Vermeer's approach limits its significance. Nonetheless, the question remains whether the evaluability of equivalence in terms of function is justified. While assessing linguistic orientation and evaluating the degree of equivalence may be easier, the hermeneutic aspect of meaning and its relativity pose challenges. Determining a stable function for a text that remains valid across all contexts is questionable. Similarly, achieving the same function in vastly different cultures and contexts raises further concerns. Consequently, it becomes necessary to consider the ambiguities surrounding the concept when discussing texts written with similar aims.

2.4 G. Toury & Equivalence: When Norms Govern the Translational Definitions

Gideon Toury (1995), the advocate of the Norm Theory and a prominent figure in Descriptive Translation Studies approaches the concept of "equivalence" in a distinct manner. His perspective revolves around the idea that translation is governed by norms, which are defined as specific regulations that influence translational decisions and ultimately shape the end product of translation. Norms are categorized into three types: preliminary norms, which encompass translation policy and the directness of translation; operational norms, which include matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms; and initial norms, which determine the acceptability or adequacy of the translation in relation to the target and source cultures, respectively.

For Toury, translations are reflective of the norms within the target culture. In isolation, he is not primarily concerned with the relationship between the source and target texts. Instead, he adopts a culturally contextualized viewpoint on translation, asserting that "Translation activities should rather be regarded as having cultural significance" (Toury, 1995:198). In other words, translation is studied from a broader intercultural perspective that encompasses intertextuality.

In this manner, Toury (1995) relativizes translation by recognizing that all translational activities occur within different historical, temporal, and spatial contexts, each guided by its own set of norms. Consequently, various translations are produced. In his descriptive approach to translation, evaluations of translations are conducted based on these norms. If a translation adheres to the norms of the source culture, it is deemed adequate, while if a translation aligns with the norms of the target system, it is considered acceptable.

As evident, Toury addresses norms within a cultural context and adopts a systemic viewpoint. By emphasizing the role of norms, he contributes to understanding translation as an intercultural and normative practice.

Toury (1995) adopts a different approach regarding the concept of equivalence. Rather than problematizing the issue, he treats equivalence as an inherent feature given in the translation process. According to Toury, a form of equivalence exists whenever a translational act occurs between two texts and thus two cultural groups. Instead of questioning whether the two texts are equivalent, Toury suggests analyzing their type and degree of translation equivalence. In this view, equivalence is not something to be discovered but rather an attribution. The equivalence analysis is conducted per the norms, which determine the concept's realization in different contexts.

Toury broadens the concept's scope, placing it within a broader and more complex network of relations. He clarifies that equivalence, rather than representing a single recurring type, refers to any relation that characterizes translations under specific circumstances. His intercultural perspective and relativistic approach contribute to a more comprehensive analysis of translational norms in different contexts.

However, there are some aspects of the concept of equivalence that warrant further discussion. Toury introduces three basic types of norms: initial, primary, and operational. Which of these should be applied in the analysis of equivalence? While all three types may influence translation equivalence, it remains unclear whether there is a systematic methodology governing their application. Are they addressed separately, or is there a unified approach? If they are considered independently, texts that are equivalent based on matricial norms may not be equivalent in terms of textual-linguistic norms. Additionally, the preliminary norms, preceding operational norms, may yield a different level of equivalence.

Another aspect to consider is whether acceptability and adequacy can be equated with equivalence. If a translated text adheres to the norms of the source culture and is considered an adequate translation, can it be considered equivalent to the source texts in terms of the norms governing their production? Similarly, if a translated text conforms to the norms of the target culture and is deemed acceptable, can it be considered equivalent to the norms governing the production of texts in that culture?

These questions raise important considerations regarding the systematic methodology of analyzing equivalence and the relationship between equivalence, norms, and acceptability or adequacy. Further exploration and clarification are necessary to fully understand the complexities of this issue.

2.5. T. Hermans & Equivalence: When the Target Overwhelms the Source

In his book *The Conference of the Tongues* (2007), Theo Hermans explores the notion of equivalence in translation and presents thought-provoking conclusions. Hermans takes a target-oriented approach to translation, focusing on the context and impact of translational acts in the target culture while acknowledging the existence of a source text. He provides various examples to illustrate different scenarios where translation is the focal point.

One such example is the translation of the Book of Mormon, wherein the translated version replaces the original text. In this case, the translation derives its authority from a divine source: "The divine utterance authorized the translation to serve in place of the original" (Hermans, 2007:3). Similarly, the translation of the Greek version of the Hebrew Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, exemplifies what Hermans terms "full equivalence." Equivalence, as defined by Hermans, refers to the equality of value and status between the translation and the original, rather than a textual comparison. Therefore, equivalence can exist even if the meaning differs, as long as they possess the same value or status.

When a text is deemed fully equivalent, Hermans argues that its status as a translation is eliminated and regarded as an original work. Multilingual treaties also exemplify this concept of full equivalence. When the same treaty is declared fully equivalent in different languages, the translated texts are no longer seen as translations, but as originals. This

concept involves authentication, creating a "fiction of total equivalence and correspondence" (Hermans 2007). Each authentic text is granted an equal force of law. The difference between the full equivalence of the Book of Mormon and the Vienna Treaties lies in the source of authorization. While God authorizes the former, institutional agents provide authorization in the latter.

Authentication plays a crucial role in transforming the reception and perception of a text. It reveals how the attributed status of a text could change based on the act of authentication. Hermans views equivalence as an attribution to texts rather than an inherent feature of their relationship. However, it is important to note that his examples primarily focus on full equivalence, where texts exist only in a particular form and are definitive translations. Although Hermans broadens the concept by involving authorizing or authenticating institutions, his emphasis on full equivalence restricts its application to the instances he exemplifies. He does not explore equivalence as a prerequisite for translation, nor does he problematize it as a feature of the translational process. Instead, he perceives equivalence as a functional term that influences the reception and status of a translated text, placing it either as an original or somewhere in between.

In conclusion, Hermans' treatment of equivalence as an attribution to texts rather than an inherent feature expands our understanding of the concept. However, his focus on full equivalence limits its applicability to the specific cases he presents. Additionally, he does not consider equivalence as a prerequisite to translation or problematize it in the context of the translational process. Nevertheless, his exploration sheds light on how equivalence influences the reception and status of translated texts.

I would like to address some of the points raised by Hermans in his book "The Conference of the Tongues." Firstly, he discusses the sequential order in the authentication process of translation. Hermans (2007) says a fully equivalent translation does not immediately change its status. Instead, it is initially perceived as a translation, and then through a proclamation from an authoritative entity such as divine authority or the force of law, it is transformed into an original. However, this sequential process raises questions about how much time should pass for a translation to lose its identity as a translation and how people come to perceive it as an original. It is not as easy or sudden as the examples Hermans presents might suggest to change people's perception of a text.

Furthermore, Hermans (2007) focuses on equivalence at extremes when discussing translation. He primarily refers to full equivalence and does not touch upon the various degrees of equivalence. This raises the question of whether non-equivalence is possible and if a text can be considered a translation while still being non-equivalent.

Additionally, Hermans' remarks on self-translation are noteworthy, particularly concerning self-attribution. Despite a bilingual writer claiming that the texts they write and rewrite in different languages are originals, there may be cases where these translations are not authenticated as originals. This demonstrates how achieving full

equivalence, which exists at an abstract cognitive level rather than a concrete one, is not an easy task even for the creator of the text. It underscores the challenge of establishing a clear mode of authority or power, whether through institutions or influential figures in politics or economics, that can determine whether a text is received as a full equivalent and therefore an original rather than a translation. These concerns highlight the complex nature of translation and the intricacies involved in establishing equivalence and authenticity in a translated text.

3. Conclusion

Formulating a conclusive paragraph for a term proves to be challenging due to the potential emergence of new inquiries and discussions with each statement. My investigation and extensive examination throughout this paper have highlighted that even seemingly straightforward terms can possess diverse connotations and find utility within various contexts. It is crucial to underscore the significance of adopting a critical and analytical stance as this approach enriches one's perspective and facilitates deeper comprehension.

To compare and contrast the approaches of the theorists analyzed in this paper, it would be helpful to organize them chronologically. Initially, the focus was on word-level equivalence in literal translation. However, over time, the scope of this term expanded to encompass sentence-level equivalences and other features.

Firstly, Nida takes a response-oriented approach, seeking equivalence in the translation that considers the reader as an agent and the contextual reception of the translation. Secondly, Reiss, a Functionalist theorist, emphasizes a function-oriented approach where the equivalence is determined based on the function of the text rather than the reader as an agent. In contrast, Vermeer reduces the concept to special cases and does not consider it a fundamental aspect of the translation process. Equivalence becomes significant for Vermeer only when the goal is to create a functionally equivalent text. Beyond such cases, Vermeer does not problematize the concept of equivalence.

Toury, a theorist of Descriptive Translation Studies, presents equivalence in a general sense, asserting that it is always present. To discuss whether equivalence exists between source and target texts is deemed fruitless by Toury. Finally, adopting a target-oriented approach similar to Toury, Hermans examines the issue from a marginal viewpoint, focusing on cases of full equivalence. Hermans does not address the question of whether full equivalence exists between source and target texts, but rather explores the term within the context of its function, which signifies the completion of translation when it reaches its fullest extent.

These different perspectives demonstrate that the concept of equivalence has been a topic of discussion in translation studies until the late 1990s, and it continues to be relevant regardless of its occasional decline in popularity. It provides analytical grounds for

comparing target and source texts on various levels. While it may not sufficiently explain the complexities of the translational process on its own, "equivalence" serves as a valuable descriptive tool in the field of Translation Studies to appreciate the diversity inherent in the translational act and have a broader perspective of the field.

References

Hermans, T. (2007). *The Conference of the Tongues.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Kenny, D. (2006). Equivalence. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 77-79). London: Routledge.

Nida, E. A. (1964a). Principles of Correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies* Reader (3rd ed., pp. 126-141). London: Routledge.

Nida, E. A. (1964b) *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Pym, A. (2010). Translation Theory Today and Tomorrow - Responses to Equivalence. In L. N. Zybatow (Ed.), *Translationswissenschaft - Stand und Perspektiven* (pp. 1-14). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Reiss, K. (1971). Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 160-172). London: Routledge.

Schäffner, C. (1999). The Concept of Norms in Translation Studies. In *Translation and Norms* (pp. 1-26). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Vermeer, H. J. (2000). Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 221-233). London: Routledge.