

ISSN 2616-9320

CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

№ 1(3) 2020

#1



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

EDITORIAL TEAM



Chief Editor:

S. S. Kunanbayeva - Professor, Academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages



Responsible editors:

A.T. Chaklikova, Professor, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

B. Mizamkhan, Ass. Prof., Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

N.A. Aubakir, MA, PhD candidate in Translation studies, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages



Editor's assistants:

G.S. Assanova PhD, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

K.M. Zhampeyis C.Phil.Sc., Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

A.B. Baidullayeva PhD, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

Sh. O. Saimkulova MA, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages



Technical editor and design:

R.A. Musataev MA, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

N.A. Aubakir MA, PhD candidate in Translation studies, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages



Consultants:

Anna Oldfield, University of South Carolina, USA

Christopher Baker, American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan

Uldanay Bakhtikereeva, PhD, prof., PFUR, Russia

Kim Chang Ho - PhD, professor, Pusan University of Foreign Languages, South Korea

Shabdiz Orang - PhD, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

V.I. Karasik, D.Ph.S., Professor, Volgograd Technical University, Russia

COMPETENCE OF A TRANSLATOR IN THE SELECTION OF RIGHT EQUIVALENCES

Kuandykova T.¹

¹2nd year student of master's degree

on translation studies,

KazUIRandWL after Ablai khan,

Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-Mail: tansulukandykovamasterts@gmail.com

Abstract: Translation is one of the complicated branches of human occupations. It may imply the process of conveying the meaning of a word, word-group, sentence or text from one language into another. If we follow the common belief, the basic form of translation is to find a group of words in the target language that correspond to the words in the source language, and then form the sentence using all these words. Such functions of translation usually make other people think that translation is simply about transferring words' meanings from one language into another one. They can't even imagine which problems translators face with and have to solve. Nowadays it is being said that translator is a mediator of intercultural communications. The reason for this is that translators don't only translate the words, but they also have to work under conditions of collision of cultures, ways of thinking, different epochs and evolution times, traditions and other such phenomena. Also, even if we can successfully identify a set of words that can have strictly the same literal meaning (namely the same character) between translating language and target language, the situation can be still more complex than we might expect. There can be moments in translation process such conditions when there are confusions in choosing proper equivalent or some difficulties in finding right equivalents. Considering that, such situations are inevitable in translation process. In this article we are going to try to determine some of approaches for solving it and use such at first looking detrimental situations even beneficially.

Keywords: literal translation, direct translation, selection of equivalents, lack of equivalents, translation process, compensatory competence, competence of translator.

The beginning of development of the translation studies.

The process of translation has existed for millennia, thus facilitating both linguistic and cultural transfer. As a discipline, however, it began to develop in the second half of the twentieth century under the name "translation studies" which was proposed by the scholar James Holmes (1972). This term was widely accepted because it envisaged translation as a broad discipline shifting emphasis to

neglected areas of translation such as interpreting and translator training. Perhaps, the biggest contribution of James Holmes (1988) lies in his attempt to draw the map of the «territory» of translation studies. In that period of time translation studies can be divided into two main areas; that is, pure and applied. There is a dual objective of pure translation studies; firstly, to provide a description of the various translation phenomena as these occur; and, secondly, to develop general principles

through which these phenomena can be adequately explained. The former objective falls under the rubric of descriptive translation studies (DTS) and the latter under the rubric of translation theory, both being subsections of pure translation studies.

Necessity of Equivalence as Implied in Definition of Translation

As we mentioned translation is such a complex kind of activity that to define it adequately is not an easy job. So far, various kinds of definitions have been given, some of which are quoted as follows:

(1) E. Tanke, the Director of the Translation Institute at Siemens, defines translation as "the process of communication in which the translator is interposed between a transmitter and a receiver who use different languages to carry out a code conversion between them." (Huang Long 1988: 1), and later he improves it as "transfer of a text from a source language into a text in target language, the objective being a perfect equivalence of meaning between the two texts." (Huang Long: 18)

(2) Peter Newmark defines translation as "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text." (Newmark 1988:) (3) Nida defines translation as "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style." (Nida 1982: 12)

(4) The traditional definition: "the process of transfer of message expressed in a source language into a message expressed in a target language, with maximization of the equivalence of

one or several levels of content of the message...." (Huang Long: 19)

As can be easily seen in the above, no matter how translation is defined, the concept of equivalence is inseparable and is implied in one way or the other. In a sense, each of the above definitions is constructed round the basic concept of equivalence, or as Marry Snell-Hornby points out that definitions of translation may be regarded as variations of the concept of equivalence. (Snell-Hornby: 15) The essentiality of the concept of equivalence in any definition of translation demonstrates adequately the necessity of equivalence in translation.

The concept of equivalence has been of particular concern to translation scholars since it has been inextricably linked with both definitional and practical aspects of translating. Becoming an essential feature of translation theories in the 1960s and 1970s, equivalence was meant to indicate that source text (henceforth ST) and target text (henceforth TT) share some kind of „sameness“. The question was as to the kind and degree of sameness which gave birth to different kinds of equivalence. In what follows, an attempt will be made to critically analyze the equivalence paradigm as was conceptualized by the following scholars in the field, namely, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida and Taber (1969), House (1997), Koller (1979), Baker (1992), and finally, Pym (2010).

1) Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) consider as a necessary and sufficient condition for equivalent expressions between language pairs to be acceptable to be listed in a bilingual dictionary "as full equivalents" (p. 255). Nevertheless,

they realized the utopia of such a statement by admitting that glossaries and collections of idiomatic expressions are non-exhaustive (p. 256). In other words, the rendering of an equivalent of an expression in the SL text in a dictionary or glossary does not suffice or guarantee a successful translation since the context surrounding the term in question plays an equally important role in determining the translation strategy employed. They conclude by stating that the situation is what determines the need for creating equivalences. So translators are encouraged to firstly look in the situation of the ST in order to come up with a solution (p. 255).

2) The contribution of Eugene Nida in the field of translation studies cannot be overstressed, with his two famous books in the 1960s: *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964) and the co-authored *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Nida and Taber, 1969), attempting to give a more “scientific” sense to translation. With regard to equivalence, Nida maintains that there are two basic types of equivalence: (1) formal equivalence and (2) dynamic equivalence. In particular, Nida argues that in formal equivalence the TT resembles very much the ST in both form and content whereas in dynamic equivalence an effort is made to convey the ST message in the TT as naturally as possible. It could be argued that Nida is in favour of dynamic equivalence since he considers it to be a more effective translation procedure. This comes as no surprise given the fact that Nida was, at the time at which he proffered his views about equivalence, translating the Bible, and hence trying to produce the same

impact on various different audiences he was simultaneously addressing.

3) Adopting pragmatic theories of language use, House (1997) has come up with a translation model in which the basic requirement for equivalence of ST and TT is that original and translation should match one another in function. This function should be achieved by employing equivalent pragmatic means. The translation is only, therefore, considered to be adequate in quality if it matches the «textual» profile and function of the original. In more detail, carrying out contrastive German-English discourse analyses, House has distinguished between two basic types of translation, namely, overt translation and covert translation. As the term itself denotes, an overt translation points to a TT that consists of elements that „betray“ that it is a translation. On the other hand, a covert translation is a TT that has the same function with the ST since the translator has made every possible effort to alleviate cultural differences. In conclusion, it could be argued that House’s theory seems more flexible than Catford’s since it incorporates the pragmatic aspect of translation by using authentic examples.

4) In an effort to answer the question of what is equivalent to what, Koller (1979) distinguishes five different types of equivalence: (a) denotative equivalence involving the extralinguistic content of a text, (b) connotative equivalence relating to lexical choices, (c) text-normative equivalence relating to text-types, (d) pragmatic equivalence involving the receiver of the text or message, and, finally, (e) formal equivalence relating to the form and aesthetics of the text (p.

186-191). Having identified different types of equivalence, Koller (1979) goes on to argue that a hierarchy of values can be preserved in translation only if the translator comes up with a hierarchy of equivalence requirements for the target text (p. 89). Although the hierarchical ordering of equivalences is open to debate, Koller's contribution to the field of translation studies is acknowledged for bringing into translators' attention various types and ways in which the then fashionable desideratum of equivalence may be achieved.

5) Mona Baker in her influential book *In Other Words* (1992) addresses the vexing issue of equivalence by adopting a more neutral approach when she argues that equivalence is a relative notion because it is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors (p. 6). In particular, the chapters of her book are structured around different kinds of equivalence, that is, at the level of word, phrase, grammar, text and pragmatics. Hence, terms such as grammatical, textual and pragmatic equivalence come up. In more detail, a distinction is made between word-level and above-world level equivalence. Adopting a bottom-up approach, Baker acknowledges the importance of individual words during the translation process, since the translator looks firstly at the words as single units in order to find their equivalent in the TL. Baker goes on to provide a definition of the term word referring to its complex nature since a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages. Consequently, parameters such as number, gender and tense should be

taken into consideration when translating a word (p. 11-12).

6) Lastly, Pym (2010) makes his own contribution to the concept of equivalence by pointing out that there is no such thing as perfect equivalence between languages and it is always assumed equivalence (p. 37). In particular, for Pym (2010) equivalence is a relation of "equal value" between an ST segment and a TT segment and can be established on any linguistic level from form to function (p. 7). He goes on to distinguish between natural and directional equivalence. Natural equivalence exists between languages prior to the act of translating, and, secondly, it is not affected by directionality (p. 7). On the other hand, theories of directional equivalence give the translator the freedom to choose between several translation strategies which are not dictated by the ST. Although there are usually many ways of translating, the strategies for directional equivalence are reduced into two opposing poles; one adhering to SL norms and the other to TL norms. Perhaps, the most important assumption of directional equivalence is that it involves some kind of asymmetry since when translating one way and creating an equivalent does not imply the creation of the same equivalent when translating another way (p. 26).

Concluding all the mentioned opinions it could be argued that many translation theories are based on two opposing ways of translating. For example, Nida distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence, Newmark between semantic and communicative translation, Catford between formal correspondence and

textual equivalence, House between overt and covert translation and Pym between natural and directional equivalence. These bipolar views of equivalence soon faded away and more attractive translation paradigms came to the forefront. Contrary to linguistic-oriented approaches to translation which assume that the source text occupies a supreme position and that it is considered to be of crucial importance in determining not only the translation process but also the extent to which it has been successful, target-oriented approaches view the source text as the point of departure for the translation process and mostly focus on the cultural, historical, and socio-political factors surrounding translation, thus looking at it as a culture-bound phenomenon. Despite of its shortcomings, it should be stressed that equivalence is still one of the pivotal definitory axes of translation since it functions as a reminder of the central problems a translator encounters during the translation process [11].

Now, when it comes to conveying the sense of the text, it is really important to translate the content from the reader's point of view. Until and unless the reader understands what is being actually tried to convey. When the reader does not understand what the writer has actually written, all effort to get the things done perfectly become useless. More than just translation, it is more important to convey the sense of the text and it should always be kept in mind that the actual meaning of the original text should never be played with. And even if it is done, the meaning and the flow of the sentences should be framed in such a way that the flow of the

sentence should always be maintained and that too in an artistic way. What is more important in this regard is that the actual meaning of the original article should never get deviated and even if there is any addition or deletion to the modified matter, it should be done in strict accordance with the subject. As we know this translation provides and gives us more chance to select equivalents. Conditions of lack of equivalents requires us to use to be of this opinion in translation process.

Inevitable lack of equivalents occurs because of the divergent system of the two languages. So, first of all translator need to distinguish between full and partial, absolute and relative equivalents. By full equivalent is meant a correspondence that completely covers the meaning of a single-digit word. For example, onion, queen, bicycle. As usual there isn't any problems in transferring such words in basic using. But our next type of equivalents – partials are known for being bit dangerous for translators: it is easy to fall into error here because of the confusion of different meanings of English words. When a word as a whole does not have a single correspondence in Kazakh, but only its individual meanings have it, such equivalence will be partial. For example, there is the word bold in the sentence she is bold today. The word «bold» doesn't relate to her no hair portraiture, but it means that she is daring and brave.

If the Kazakh word corresponds to English not only in the relation of meanings, then it will be an absolute equivalent. So, for example, all equivalents indicated at the beginning of this article can be considered absolute.

There are two categories of vocabulary correspondences: equivalent and variant correspondences. Since the equivalent is the only permanent and equivalent correspondence, in the presence of an equivalent, the translator is essentially deprived of the right to choose [12]. But the use of the equivalent cannot be made absolute. There are cases when, in order to avoid the tedious repetition of the same word or for other reasons of a stylistic order, it is necessary to abandon the existing equivalent and find a synonymous replacement in the translation. The word chosen by the translator must correspond to the whole setting of the statement.

Each translation process has its own issues and problems. Most common of it is choosing right equivalents, it becomes even harder especially when languages are from different families of language. Equivalence in translation cannot be interpreted as identity in terms of its scientific sense. As we know, there are no words that have exactly the same meaning in one language. Quite naturally, no two words in any two languages are absolutely identical in meaning. As far as the whole text is concerned, it is simply impossible to transfer all the message of the original text into the target text. Therefore, equivalence in translation can only be understood as a kind of similarity or approximation. This means that equivalence between the source text and the target text can be established on different levels and in different aspects. In conclusion, we come to the decision that to choose right equivalence translator at first, of course must be

well-educated and literate, also be able to feel some cultural moments of the material which are very common in every translation process and also try to find equivalent in each type of it.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Швейцер А.Д. Теория перевода: Статус, проблемы, аспекты. – М. Наука, 1988.
- [2]. Миньяр-Белоручев Р.К. Теория и методы перевода. – М. Московский лицей, 1996
- [3]. Olive Classe, Encyclopedia of literary translation into English, vol. 1, Taylor & Francis, 2000
- [4]. Nida, E. (1964). Towards a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- [5]. Nida, E. (1969). Science of translation. Language 45, 483-498 Комиссаров В.Н. Современное переводоведение. – М.2002, с.116
- [6]. Концептологические основы когнитивной лингвистики в становлении полиязычной личности. Учебное пособие С. С. Кунанбаева. Алматы, 2017
- [7]. Pym, A. (2010). Exploring Translation Theories. London and New York: Routledge.
- [8]. Vinay, J.P. and Darbelnet, J. (1958). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.)
- [9]. Koller, J. (1979). Introducing Translation Studies. London and New York: Routledge.
- [10]. Baker, P. (1992). Approaches to Translation. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- [11]. Malmkjaer, K. (2005). Linguistics and the Language of Translation. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [12]. Pym, A. (1998). Method in Translation History. Manchester: St Jerome.

ПЕРЕВОДЧЕСКАЯ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЯ ВЫБОРА АДЕКВАТНЫХ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТОВ

Куандыкова Т. С.¹

¹ магистрант 2-го года обучения

по специальности «переводческое дело»,

КазУМОиМЯ им. Абылай хана,

Алматы, Казахстан

E-Mail: tansulukuandykovamasterts@gmail.com

Аннотация. Перевод - одна из сложных отраслей человеческой деятельности. Это может подразумевать процесс передачи значения слова, группы слов, предложения или текста с одного языка на другой. Если мы следуем общему убеждению, основная форма перевода – найти группу слов на целевом языке, которые соответствуют словам на исходном языке, а затем сформировать предложение, используя все эти слова. Такие функции перевода обычно заставляют других людей думать, что перевод — это просто перевод значений слов с одного языка на другой. Они даже не представляют, с какими проблемами сталкиваются переводчики и что им нужно решать. В настоящее время говорят, что переводчик является посредником межкультурных коммуникаций. Причина в том, что переводчики не только переводят слова, но и работают в условиях столкновения культур, способов мышления, разных эпох и времен эволюции, традиций и других подобных явлений. Кроме того, даже если мы можем успешно определить набор слов, которые могут иметь строго одинаковое буквальное значение (а именно, один и тот же символ) между языком перевода и целевым языком, ситуация может быть еще более сложной, чем мы могли бы ожидать. Могут быть моменты в процессе перевода, такие условия, когда есть путаница в выборе правильного эквивалента или некоторые трудности в поиске правильных эквивалентов. Учитывая это, такие ситуации неизбежны в процессе перевода. В этой статье мы попытаемся определить некоторые подходы к ее решению и использовать такие, на первый взгляд, вредные ситуации даже с пользой.

Ключевые слова: прямой перевод, выбор эквивалентов, нехватка эквивалентов, процесс перевода, компенсаторная компетенция, компетенция переводчика.

АУДАРМА ҚҰЗЫРЕТІ БАРАБАР ЭКВИВАЛЕНТІМЕН ТАҢДАУ

Куандыкова Т. С.¹

¹«Аударма ісі» мамандығының

2-ші курс магистранты,

Абылай хан атындағы ҚазХҚ және ӘТУ,

Алматы, Қазақстан.

Электрондық пошта: tansulukuandykovamasterts@gmail.com

Андатпа: Аударма – адам қызметінің күрделі салаларының бірі. Бұл сөздің, сөз тобының, сөйлемнің немесе мәтіннің мәндерін бір тілден екіншісіне беру процесін білдіруі мүмкін. Егер біз жалпы нанымды ұстанатын болсақ, аударманың негізгі нысаны – бастапқы тілдегі сөздерге сәйкес келетін мақсатты тілде сөз тобын табу, содан кейін осы сөздерді пайдалана отырып, сөйлем құрау. Мұндай аударма функциялары әдетте басқа адамдарды аударма – бұл сөз мәндерін бір тілден екінші тілге аудару деп ойлауға мәжбүр етеді. Алайда, аудармашының аударма процесі барысында қандай қиындықтарға тап болатындығын елестете де алмайды. Қазіргі уақытта аудармашы мәдениетаралық коммуникациялардың делдалы болып табылады. Себебі, аудармашылар тек сөздерді аударумен ғана емес, сонымен қатар мәдениеттің, ойлау тәсілдерінің, эволюция дәуірінің, дәстүрлердің және басқа да ұқсас құбылыстардың қақтығысы жағдайында жұмыс істеуге мәжбүр. Сонымен қатар, біз тіпті аударма тілі мен мақсатты тіл арасында қатаң бірдей әріптік мағынаға ие сөздер жиынтығын табысты анықтай алсақ та, жағдай біз күткеннен де күрделі болуы мүмкін. Аударма барысында баламаларды таңдауда шатасуы немесе дұрыс баламаларды іздеуде кейбір қиындықтар болуы мүмкін. Аталмыш жағдайлардың аударма процесінде орын алуы сөзсіз. Бұл мақалада біз аудармашының өтемдік құзыреттілігін анықтауға тырысамыз.

Түйін сөздер: тікелей аударма, балама таңдау, баламалықтың жетіспеушілігі, аударма процесі, өтемдік құзыреттілік, аудармашының құзыреттілігі.

CAJTS

Центрально-Азиатский Журнал Переводоведения

Рецензируемый научный журнал открытого доступа, где размещаются научно-практические статьи и обзоры, посвященные вопросам теории и практики перевода, а также истории, методологии и обучения переводу в высших учебных заведениях.

Журнал публикуется два раза в год и является **рецензируемым**. Редакторы планируют публиковать как регулярные, так и тематические/специальные статьи. CAJTS нацелен на быструю и простую публикацию передовых исследований, в том числе статей, результатов исследований/разработок по переводческой деятельности и межкультурной коммуникации, рецензии на книги, посвященные переводческой деятельности и многое другое.

1(3) 2020

ҚАҢТАР-НАУРЫЗ 2020 Ж.
ЯНВАРЬ-МАРТ 2020 Г.
JANUARY-MARCH 2020

Published since January 2018

050022, 200 Muratbayev st, Almaty, Kazakhstan
Central Asian Journal of Translation Studies
www.cajts.ablaikhan.kz