

ISSN 2616-9320

CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

№ 2(1) 2018

#2



KAZAKH ABLAIKHAN UNIVERSITY OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND WORLD
LANGUAGES



PUBLIC FUND
"TRANSLATORS OF KAZAKHSTAN"



THE JOURNAL IS REGISTERED WITH THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

CERTIFICATE № 16822-Ж ASTANA, 2017

АБЫЛАЙ ХАН АТЫНДАҒЫ
ҚАЗАҚ ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАТЫНАСТАР ЖӘНЕ ӘЛЕМ ТІЛДЕРІ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ
ҚАЗАҚСТАН АУДАРМАШЫЛАРЫ ҚОРЫ

**ОРТАЛЫҚ-АЗИЯ
АУДАРМА ІСІ ЖУРНАЛЫ**

**ЦЕНТРАЛЬНО-АЗИАТСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ
ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИЯ**

**CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF
TRANSLATION STUDIES**

2(1) 2018

**НАУРЫЗ-ШІЛДЕ 2018 Ж.
МАРТ-ИЮЛЬ 2018 Г.
MARCH-JULY 2018**

Журнал 2018 жылдың қантар айынан шыға бастаған
Издается с января 2018 года
Published since January 2018

Жылына 4 рет шығады
Выходит 4 раза в год
Published quarterly

Алматы 2018

Editor-in-chief

S.S. Kunanbaeva

Professor, Academician of National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of
Kazakhstan

Editorial board:

Supervising editors:

A.T. Chalikova - dr. ped.sc., prof., Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL,
Kazakhstan

B.Mizamkhan – cand. phil.sc., assoc.prof., Kazakh Ablai Khan University of
IR&WL

N.A. Aubakir - M.A. – Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL, Kazakhstan

Associate editors:

G.S. Assanova (Ph.D.), Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL, Kazakhstan

K.M. Zhampeiis (cand.phil.sc.), Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL,
Kazakhstan

A.B. Baidullaeva (Ph.D.), Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL, Kazakhstan

Sh.O. Saimkulova (M.A.), Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL, Kazakhstan

Editorial staff:

Consulting editors:

Anna Oldfield – Ph.D., South Caroline University, USA

Christopher Baker – Professor, American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan

U.M. Bakhtygereeva - Full Professor, RUDN University, Russia

Kim Chang Ho – Ph.D., Professor, Pusan University of Foreign Languages, South
Korea

V.I. Karasik - Full Professor, Volgograd Technical University, Russia

Shabdiz Orang – Ph.D., Kazakh Ablai Khan University of IR&WL, Kazakhstan

Central Asian Journal of Translation Studies. ISSN

Owner: Kazakh Ablai Khan University of international relations and world
languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan

The certificate of registration of a periodic publication in the Ministry of information
and communication of the Republic of Kazakhstan №16822-Ж issued in 2017 Astana

Editorial address: 200 Muratbayev street, Almaty, 050000

www.cajts.ablaikhan.kz

TRANSLATION PROCESS: COGNITIVE APPROACHES, CURRENT STATUS AND PROBLEMS

Smagulova M.M.,¹

¹MA, teacher Ablai khan KazUIR&WL Almaty, Kazakhstan

Nuradilova T.M.²

²MA, teacher Ablai khan KazUIR&WL Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract Throughout linguistic translation theory stage development it is distinctly traced several tendencies reflecting the most relevant directions of linguistics and a certain vector in consideration of various approaches to transformational and equivalent transformations in translation. Concepts of "staging" of the translation are replaced by the description of heuristic and cognitive nature of translation process and a research the of processes of the translator are set. The translator is considered as the mediator representing information of the SL in TL. Allocating the translator as the language personality given with cognitive functions of consciousness capable to perception, processing and representation of information, the translation science becomes on the way of the anthropocentric paradigm indicating the need of reconsiderations on the essence of the translation process and terminological scope allowing to express more precisely the processes happening at the level of interpreting in the mind of a translator. Besides, there is a need of further complex researches of a ratio of the translation and thinking, contextual formation of sense for the translation, criteria for evaluation of the translation and also introduction of new opportunities of the experimental analysis of thought process of the translator has emerged. The bases for cognitive consideration of translation process in the field of the interpreting from a position of an anthropocentric paradigm approach are presented in this article. Special attention is paid to the description of current trends in explaining the translation process.

Keywords: Translation, approach, cognitive, anthropocentric, model, communicative approach

The linguistic translation theory created in the middle of the 20th century represented first of all descriptive theoretical discipline which subject is "the scientific description of translation process as interlingua transformation, i.e. transformation of the text in one language in equivalent to it in other language" (Barkhudarov, 1975). During formation of contrastive or comparative linguistics the adoption of transfer as the branch of comparative linguistics which is engaged in studying of semantics in the context of equivalent compliances are most brightly presented by terms of "dynamic" and "formal" compliances of E. Nida (Nida, 1969). The concept "equivalence" borrowed from the field of the exact sciences is considered by scientists as transfer of separate words, offers and the text in general with application of certain rules of transition from SL units to TL units

(Catford, 1965). On this basis E. Nida has offered the classical scheme of the translation "analysis-transfer-reconstruction" or, using other terminology, "analysis-transfer-synthesis" which became basic for creation of new models further (Nida, 1969). From Barkhudarov's viewpoint, translation transformations represents the interlingual transformations for the purpose of achievement of translation equivalence which are carried out by the translator for the greatest possible completeness of information transfer of the text in SL into norms of TL (Barkhudarov, 1975).

The question of language compliances was particularly acute during development of the machine translation system and search of the automated replacement of the translator. However for several decades the scientists who are engaged in development of systems of

machine translation came to the conclusion that the main problem of impossibility to achieve high-quality machine translation consists that the machine isn't able "to understand sense of the message" (Hutchins, 1986). It has given an impetus to more profound studying of the concept "values" of the translation when accounting a number of extralinguistic factors. Further in a concept of translation equivalence extralinguistic factors when accounting communicative contents and a communicative task of a statement are put (Komissarov, 1980). In Newmark in his researches suggests to replace concepts of dynamic and formal equivalence with semantic and communicative, placing emphasis that a text aim of SL is to have the effect equal to that which arises when reading the text on TL by the native speaker (Newmark, 1981)

The development of translation studies as an independent discipline entails influential researches in all the three branches of Translation Studies pointed out by James Holmes (J.Holmes, 1972), which are the product-, function- and process-oriented studies. With a lot of research findings in the first two fields made in the second half of the 20-th century, the process-oriented research appeared in the first decade of the 21-st century, it borrows the latest theoretical models and research methods from the neighboring cognitive disciplines, such as cognitive psychology, cognitive linguistics, neurophysiology and computational linguistics.

Cognitive direction, which is quite relevant in the era of globalization has strongly changed the understanding of the language phenomenon, set a new questions and formed a new view of the nature of the linguistic sign. Within the framework of the cognitive approach human factors has become urgent in cognitive processes of knowledge acquiring.

New methods of gathering data about translator's behavior has emerged with findings about the underlying nature of translation as a cognitive activity. These findings are different in comparing with the traditional research methods. The exciting development in the process-oriented research is leading some researchers to propose the emergence of a cognitive translation studies.

However, before the new branch is established, some problems remain to be solved and some theoretical and methodological issues remain to be considered. This article attempts to sort out the problems in the cognitive research of translation process based on the review of the present achievements in the empirical researches of translation so as to suggest the potential direction of development in cognitive translation studies. We start with some cognitive theoretical models of describing translation process. Several theoretical models have been put forward by researchers to offer accounts of the mental processes occurring in the mind of translators or interpreters. At the beginning, we speak about the Interpretive Theory of Translation, then Psycholinguistic and Cognitive Psychology Models, and finally Cognitive Pragmatic Model.

Interpretive Theory of Translation is one of the earliest attempts to the account of the translation process, Seleskovitch and Lederer were pioneering researchers in taking a cognitive approach to translation process from the 1960s through the 1980s. They proposed the Interpretive Theory of Translation (ITT) to identify three interrelated phases of translation/interpreting process: understanding, deverbalization and re-expression. Understanding is the process of generating sense, involving not only the linguistic knowledge, but also some other cognitive inputs including encyclopedic knowledge and contextual knowledge. Memory plays an important role with the immediate memory to store words for a short time and cognitive memory to store the whole range of knowledge. The end product of understanding is non-verbal synthesis. ITT postulates the existence of an intermediate phase of deverbalization between understanding and re-expression. Re-expression is based on the deverbalized sense, or the non-verbal synthesis rather than the linguistic form. It involves also the work of both linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge, and is similar to monolingual communication in that the intended meaning is expressed in the target language.

The second wave of researches proposed the Psycholinguistic and Cognitive Psychology Models. Researchers have

borrowed ideas to propose some more models to theorize the mental process of the translator/interpreter from the angle of cognitive sciences, such as psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence and neuroscience. These models are here classified as a group as they share the hypothesis that translation is a process of decoding the source language and recoding the target language. One of the representative models is given by Bell (Bell,1991), who builds on the perspectives from systemic-functional linguistics and artificial intelligence to conceive translation as of the two phases of analysis and synthesis. The phase of analysis undergoes the specific stages of visual recognition of the words in the source text, syntactic parsing in combination with the structure analyzer, semantic and pragmatic processing to generate a semantic representation with the work of an idea organizer and a planner. The end product of the analysis phase is the semantic representation, which is then reprocessed at the phase of synthesis through pragmatic, semantic and lexico-grammatical synthesizers to be encoded in the target language and gives rise to the translated text. Different from Bell, Kiraly took a cognitive and a social perspective to propose two models of the translation process: a social model and a cognitive model. In the social model, translation is taken to be an activity in three interrelated situational contexts, namely that of the source text, that of the target text and a translational context. The translational context is particular as it cannot be observed directly due to its internal and mental traits, but is externalized by the translator's self-concept. In Kiraly's cognitive model, the translator's mind is "an information-processing system in which a translation comes from the interaction of intuitive and controlled processes using linguistic and extralinguistic information". His cognitive model consists of information sources, intuitive workplace and controlled processing center. At the intuitive workplace, the information sources are processed without any conscious control to produce translation. If problems emerge, they are reconsidered in the controlled processing center and a strategy is chosen to deal with these problems. If the

strategy failed to give a translation, the translation problem is sent back to the intuitive workplace for a second processing with the information yet not taken into account. If the problem remains unsolved, a tentative translation is given and accepted for lack of adequate information. Wilss argues that problem-solving and decision-making are the most relevant elements in translation. He takes a cognitive psychological perspective to view translation as a decision-making process involving knowledge-based intelligent activities. It requires the acquisition of organized knowledge. As schema is the representation of knowledge in mind, the central task of cognitive approaches to translation process is to investigate the way schemas operate. In problem-solving, the translator needs both declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge, and six phases are listed in problem-solving: identification of problems; clarification of problems; search and retrieval of relevant information; problem-solving strategies; choice of solution; and evaluation of solution. There is also the cognitive simplification to reduce inaccuracies in specific translators' acts. Translation process also involves translator/interpreter's cognitive efforts. Gile (J.Benjamins, D. Gile, 1995) 2 thus draws on the idea of processing capacity from the cognitive psychology to put forward a model of efforts for interpreting process. He argues that interpreting differs from monolingual communication in that it involves non-automatic operations that require three types of effort: efforts related to listening and analyzing, efforts related to discourse production in reformulation, and short-term efforts.

Then goes the Cognitive Pragmatic Model proposed by Gutt (E,Gutt, 1991) and this model built on relevance theory to develop a relevance model of translation. According to Sperber & Wilson, human inferential processes are geared to the maximization of relevance. Human cognition is either descriptive in the sense that it establishes resemblance between an object or state of affairs in the world and a mental representation, or interpretive in the sense that it is the resemblance between two mental representations. Gutt argues that translation is

a case of optimal interpretive resemblance in which “two utterances, or even more generally, two ostensive stimuli, interpretively resemble each other to the extent that they share their explicatures and/or implicatures”. The translator’s task is to transfer ostensively to the target readers or audience all relevant aspects ostensively and inferentially conveyed by the source text. Gutt suggests that the relevance translation theory is helpful in understanding and explicating the mental faculties of the translator/interpreter.

Critique of theoretical models.

These theoretical cognitive models share some fundamental views about the mental process of the translator/interpreter. Most of these models conceive translation as a cognitive process that is dynamic, interactive and non-linear in nature. It involves the work of both the uncontrolled and controlled, or automatic and non-automatic processing. Some consider it as consisting in problem-solving and decision-making. Information sources are regarded as most important, including internal and external resources with the work of long-term and short-term memory. However, most of the models remain as a theoretic hypothesis without much empirical evidence. With the newly-emerging empirical research methods, as the ones discussed later, there is an increasing need of models that are more relevant to the laboratory experiments to gather more specific information about the translator’s mental traits in translation. While these models offering only imaginary thinking about what is happening in the mind of the translator/interpreter, researchers are hoping to gather more specific evidence of the translation actions, including data or observations from experiments to justify the theoretic hypothesis. In cognitive researches of the translation the term "cognition" gets double interpretation. Cognition is often considered as knowledge process that is expressed in accumulation of knowledge by the translator during professional activity. At the same time the cognition as process of use of knowledge captures the essence of the most translation process consisting in performance of the difficult cogitative operations based on cognitive knowledge of the translator and cognitive knowledge of the recipient of the

translation. The cognitive essence of translation process consists of various forms of activation of cognitive structures of the translator defining both the course of the process, and result of adoption of translation decisions. The subjectivity of performance of tasks is explained by the heuristic nature of all set of actions, since accumulation of knowledge by practical consideration and finishing with use of necessary strategy for achievement of success in translation. Consideration of the translation from a position of cognitive psychology allows to open new sides of essence of translation process. Thus, there is a need for modification of models of translation activity, for specification and addition of psychological model in the field of transfer and allocation in translation process of the so-called intermediate stage, when accounting his pragmatical and epistemic characteristic.

Empirical attempts to reveal cognitive processes in translation.

As was argued above, cognitive approaches to translation process are not sufficient to explore all the cognitive processes. To solve this problem in the past ten years, the latest trends of the process-oriented translation studies are marked by the news ways of data collecting, more delicate research design, better control of variables in the experiments, and the deepening integration of multidiscipline.

The earlier use of methods in the process-oriented studies is mostly confined in verbal protocols, such as the most typical one, Think-aloud Protocols (TAPs) (Klings, 2001). Researchers used to rely on the assumption that “verbalizations reliably indicate cognitive behaviour”. Later, especially when it comes to the 1990s, researchers are gradually aware of the numerous flaws with the verbal protocols and the pool of available methods has been expanded. These methods are favoured for the data collected seem to be more scientific, reliable and closer to the translation practice as they are gathered real time as the translators are doing translation. Thus, understanding stage models to some extent reflect operation of cognitive mechanisms of the translator. The translator receives the text in the sounding or written form which then on the basis of

knowledge and experience which are conditionally presented by a set of static and dynamic frame structures appears in the form of the values and meanings finding the expression in the translation.

Also researches introduce methods from the neurosciences, such as EEG, and neuro-imaging techniques, such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRT) and positron emission tomography (PET). Another trend of methodological innovation is found in the change from the use of single method in a research to the integration of more methods, as each of the above-mentioned methods has its own advantages, disadvantages and specific focus or emphasis. According to Shreve & Angelone, the research of the past decade shows “an increasing reliance on multiple methodologies”, and the majority of the empirical studies in Translation and Cognition edited by him make use of one or more of the new methods. Angelone, for example, uses screen recording and think-aloud in the research of the problem-solving behavior of professional and student translators. Dragsted (Dragsted, 2010) employs keystroke logging and eye-tracking to explore source text comprehension and target text production. Fabio Alves (Alves, 2003) and his colleagues are more innovative in integrating process-based and product-based research methods, namely the combination of corpus analysis and keystroke logging, eye-tracking and retrospection to the research translation unit associated with cognitive effort during a translation task.

Different from the time when the imaginary theoretical thinking about translation process prevailed, the first decade of the 21-st century saw remarkable progress in innovative data eliciting methods, increasing interdisciplinarity in research approaches and formation of large-scale collaborative research communities. These exciting progress has led some scholars to argue in favour of establishing a new research framework, namely the Cognitive Translatology in Halverson’s (S. Halverson, 2010) terminology, or Cognitive Translation Studies in Munoz’s terminology. But before optimistically welcoming the establishment of that framework, we have to be fully aware of

the challenges that the cognitive approaches to translation face, including the theoretic model building, methodological evaluation, data documentation and subject matter specification. These challenges also point to the direction of the future development in the field of cognitive translation studies. The tendency of modern science of theory of translation consists in consideration of translation process from the point of view of the anthropological paradigm covering various scientific directions. Interest in a human being, its thinking and a psychological component activity finds reflection and in the thought of theory of translation paying more and more attention to a role of the translator in translation process, an essence of a cognition and thought processes. Withdrawal from linguistic bases of the translation, necessary for understanding of the nature of translation process, linguists are now at the new level of the analysis and modeling from positions of heuristics and not linear approach to the translation that creates new opportunities of consideration of specifics of thinking of the translator and creation of theoretical constructs on the basis of a cognitive component of translation process. The interpretation of a concept of a cognition is many-sided and presented in works of many Russian and foreign authors from the field of linguistics and related subjects.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Alves, Fabio. 2003. Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process-Oriented Research. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [2]. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: вопросы общей и частной теории перевода. М.: Международные отношения, 1975. 240 с.
- [3]. Bell, Roger. 1991. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London and New York: Longman.
- [4]. Catford J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- [5]. Dragsted, Babara. 2010. “Coordination of Reading and Writing Processes in Translation: An Eye on Uncharted Territory”. In Translation and Cognition, edited by Gregory Shreve & Erik Angelone, 41-62. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [6]. Ericsson, Anders & H. Simon. 1980. “Verbal Reports as Data”. Psychological Review. 3: 215-251.
- [7]. John Benjamins. Gile, Daniel. 1995. Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [8]. Gutt, Ernst-August. 1991. Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [9]. Halverson, Sandra. 2010. “Cognitive Translation Studies: Developments in Theory and Method”. In Translation and Cognition, edited by Gregory Shreve & Erik Angelone, 349-369. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [10]. Holmes, James. 1972. “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” Unpublished manuscripts, Amsterdam: Translation Studies Section, Department of General Studies, reprinted in Laurence Venuti. ed. 2000. The Translation Studies Reader, 172–185.
- [11]. Hutchins W.J. Machine Translation, Past, Present, Future. Chichester: Ellis Horwood, 1986
- [12]. Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke. 1998. “Logging Time Delay in Translation”. In LSP Texts and the Process of Translation, edited by Gyde Hansen, 173-101. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School.
- [13]. Krings, Hans-Peter. 2001. Repairing Texts: Empirical Investigations of Machine Translation Post-editing Processes. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- [14]. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистика перевода. М.: Международные отноше-113. ня, 1980. С. 5—6
- [15]. Nida E.A. The theory and practice of translation. Leiden, 1969. 220 p
- [16]. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. Oxford; New York: Pergamon, 1981.

АУДАРМА ҮРДІСІ: КОГНИТИВТІ ЖАҚЫНДАСТЫРУ, АҒЫМДАҒЫ ЖАҒДАЙ ЖӘНЕ ПРОБЛЕМАЛАР

Нұрадилова Т.М.,¹

¹магистр,

Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ Халықаралық Қатынастар және Әлем Тілдері
Университеті
Алматы, Қазақстан

Смагулова М.М.²

¹магистр,

Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ Халықаралық Қатынастар және Әлем Тілдері
Университеті
Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа: Лингвистикалық аударма теориясы бойында даму сатысы бірнеше тілдік үрдістерден байқалады, ол лингвистиканың ең өзекті бағыттарын және белгілі бір векторды аударуға және аударуға түрлі тәсілдерді ескере отырып көрсетеді. Олардың ең маңыздысы

аударманың «қойылымы» деген түсінік. Аудармашы TL-дегі ақпарат туралы делдал болып саналады. Терапевтік, адам, адам денесінің тілі, қоршаған орта, қоршаған орта, қоршаған орта және қоршаған ортаны бөлу. аудармашының ойында түсіндіру деңгейінде өзін таныту. Бұдан басқа, аударма және түсіндіру процесін одан әрі кешенді зерттеу қажет, пайда болды. Осы мақалада антропоцентрическая парадигмадан ауызша аударма саласында аударма үдерісін танымдық қараудың негіздері келтірілген. Аударма үдерісін түсіндіруде ағымдағы процестің сипаттамасына ерекше назар аударылады.

Тірек сөздер: аударма, көзқарас, танымдық, антропоцентрилік, модель, коммуникативтік тәсіл

ПРОЦЕСС ПЕРЕВОДА: КОГНИТИВНЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ, ТЕКУЩЕЕ СОСТОЯНИЕ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ

Нурадилова Т.М.¹

¹Магистр, преподаватель

КазУМОиМЯ имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

Смагулова М.М.²

²Магистр, преподаватель

КазУМОиМЯ имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

Абстракт. На протяжении всего этапа развития теории лингвистического перевода четко прослеживаются несколько тенденций, отражающих наиболее актуальные направления лингвистики и определенного вектора с учетом различных подходов к трансформационным и эквивалентным преобразованиям в переводе. Понятия «постановки» перевода заменяются описанием эвристической и когнитивной природы процесса перевода и исследования процессов переводчика. Переводчик рассматривается как медиатор, представляющий информацию SL в TL. Распределяя переводчика как личность языка с когнитивными функциями сознания, способного к восприятию, обработке и представлению информации, наука о переводе становится на пути антропоцентрической парадигмы, указывающая на необходимость пересмотра сущности процесса перевода и терминологического охвата, позволяющего более точно выражать процессы, происходящие на уровне интерпретации в сознании переводчика. Кроме того, существует необходимость в дальнейших комплексных исследованиях отношения перевода и мышления, контекстуального формирования смысла для перевода, критериев оценки перевода, а также введения новых возможностей экспериментального анализа мыслительного процесса переводчика возникла. В статье представлены основы когнитивного рассмотрения процесса перевода в области интерпретации с позиции антропоцентрической парадигмы. Особое внимание уделено описанию текущих тенденций в объяснении процесса перевода.

Ключевые слова: перевод, подход, когнитивный, антропоцентрический, модельный, коммуникативный подход