Список литературы:

1. Баранов Х.К. Арабско-русский словарь. М., 1989.

2. Газета Al-Bawaba News от 06.04.2019. (شركات توظيف الأموال الوهمية)

3. Газета Al-Eshteraki от 03.07.2007.

4. Газета Al-Manara от 01.02.2020. (البيت الأوروبي)

5. Газета Al-Mujaz от 21.09.2010.

6. Газета Al-Wasat от 5.11.2003.

7. Газета Ash-Shark Al-Awsat от 02.03.2008.

8. Газета Ash-Shark Al-Awsat от 15.09.2009.

9. Газета Ash-Shark Al-Awsat от 27.09.2002.

10. Al-Sharif U. Musku bila abwab – ст. на сайте www.mediaarabia.com

11. Mulaifi I. Al-Aglabiyya As-Samita: Misr…Ana man yakulu la antum – ст. в газете Al-Jarida от 12.02.2011.

12. www.arabic.euronews.net – новость за 17.06.2009.

MODERN ISSUES OF GENERAL TRANSLATION THEORY

Bakenova Aigul Maratbekovna.
First-year doctoral candidate of Philology Department
Buketov Karaganda State University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – Professor,
Candidate of Philological science Mazhitayeva Sh.M.

Abstract

This article presents results of scientific research on translation studies and activity. Structure of translation and its study, types of translation in various spheres are also covered.

Аннотация

Данная статья дает четкое определение разделений структур и секций переводоведения и переводческой деятельности.

The object of studying the science of translation is translation activity, which is divided into several types depending on the pair of languages involved in bilingual communication, called the source and translating languages. Researchers in this field perceive the translation in various forms: interpretation and translation, technical, legal translation, translation of fiction, and many others.

Accordingly, translation and its studies can be divided into different sections. In the meantime, it is obvious that all types of translation have something in common that distinguishes translation from other types of language mediation such as liberal interpretation, free retelling of content, summarizing, etc. Therefore, in the science of translation, there is a discipline that treats the general feature that is common to all types of translation. This discipline is called the general theory of translation.

The general theory of translation always faces different significant problems. One of these problems is the linguistic-ethnic barrier, which separates the speakers of two or more different languages and cultures. So, some cultural-ethnic differences can a priori exclude the full equivalence of the source and translating texts. This evokes the problem of translation due to the contrast of the national mentalities. However, according to S.Yevteyev, the practice of translation confirms the possibility of overcoming intercultural differences due to the experience of intercultural interaction and the fact that any culture is not a completely isolated entity [1, p. 330]. Meaning that the representatives of all cultures contact with each other, exchange the information and influence on the languages of each other.

However, Wilhelm v. Humboldt believed that full-value translation is fundamentally impossible. However, his arguments are not consistent with facts that testify to the productivity of communication through translation or interpretation. Speakers of different languages successfully contact with each other in the field of foreign policy, fruitfully exchange technical and scientific experience, cultural values, etc. So, it refutes the pessimistic view of translation.

Meanwhile, if we use the statistical approach, we can say that translation is not always possible, but the number of cases when a full-value translation is possible overwhelmingly prevails over the number of cases when it is impossible. For example, we surely can say that translation of fiction is more complicated than technical translation, as sometimes it can be impossible to transfer the idea of the writer of fiction in a full value. In the meantime, technical translation is easier, as it is based on the usage of special technical terms and phrases that can be found in the dictionary. Also, the translator has no need to understand and transfer the feelings or emotions, as he does during the translation of fiction.

The other problem of the general theory of translation is deonyms and neologisms. Interaction of one culture with another frequently creates deonyms, i.e. words which were proper names but due to extralinguistic factors became common names, which can refer to other people, processes or actions [2, p. 51]. So, for instance, M.Chigsheva presents such examples of deonymization in the Russian language as pekhting; diesel; psaking and others [3, p. 43-47]. We can add obaming, merkeling, trampych, etc. We hardly ever can meet these words in the dictionaries. So, some people and even translators have trouble understanding the meaning of these words. Only the full situation connected with the original proper noun and deonym can help them. For example, pekhting is an expression made up by Navalny, widely used among the Russian non-systemic opposition, denoting a scandal involving

a deputy Pekhtin, and, in a broader sense, all such scandals related to exposing senior officials who violate statutory requirements related to their status [4].

Literary language does not accept such words as deonyms and neologisms. The function of the filter that removes such products of the linguistic system that are not accepted by the literary language is fulfilled by the linguistic norm. The online article called 54 Great Examples of Modern-Day Neologisms gives the following examples of neologisms: "Coffee (n.), the person upon whom one coughs", "Chilax, to calm down or relax, it is a term used when someone is starting to get uptight about something that is happening"[5]. The norm is an idea of educated native speakers about what is right and wrong in their literal language. The norm is reflected in grammars, dictionaries, and other reference books.

The translator and interpreter must always try to follow the linguistic norm. But if the original text contains violations of the norm, for example, to achieve a humorous effect, the translating text should reflect (as far as possible) this feature of the original text.

The speech norm does not divide the products of the language system according to the principle "(always) right - (always) wrong ", but according to the principle of "appropriate - inappropriate" in the particular context. Accordingly, that which is inappropriate (rude) in one case may be appropriate (normal) in another. For example, the word "dude" is inappropriate in the text of a public speech but can be used in the familiar communication of two friends, and the phrase "all right?" is an appropriate greeting for people who know each other very well and inappropriate at a business meeting (How do you do?). In the aspect of speech perception, the speech norm determines not only the reaction of the addressee, but also how easy it is for the addressee or, on the contrary, how difficult it is to perceive the text.

The presence of unusual words, combinations, and constructions in the text can significantly complicate its perception - the perceiver is forced to mentally translate what he hears and reads from an unusual language to a familiar one. Therefore, A.D.Schweitzer said that it would not be a big deal if the translator occasionally, for the sake of greater accuracy, uses the less familiar way of linguistic expression, however, if the text is overfull with unusual phrases, the translated text can be perceived with difficulty [6, p. 182].

According to the introspection (examination of own translated texts) of A.D.Schweitzer, the translator arrives at the final (optimal) option of the translation after the deep searching of the necessary word or phrase in his mind and improving the "trial" options. In one of his speeches, the brilliant synchronist Schweizer said that such searching takes place even in synchronous interpretation. Mikhail Ya. Tsvilling clarifies: searching for the best options is not just a chain of trial and error. When the translator feels the dissatisfaction about some translated key phrases or words in the text, he focuses only on them.

Due to the limited instrumentation of linguistic translation studies and the insufficient objectivity of their results, the specialists ask the question - has the theory of translation exhausted its capabilities? [7, pp. 91-96].The most pessimistic conclusion is that the general theory of translation has stopped its development. Meanwhile, we can assume that, since this science is relatively young, we are currently faced with a search for new ways, more objective (for example, using neuro-linguistic methods). Therefore, we should expect discoveries, non-trivial results, and further promising studies.

Literature

1. S.Yevteyev Linguoculturological Translation Model // Vestnik of the Bryansk State University Academician Named After I.G. Petrovsky. 2014 №2. P. 329-331.

2. M.Chigasheva Deonims as a Peculiarity of the Media Political Discourse in Germany and Russia // Foreign Languages at School. 2014. P.51

3. M.Chigasheva Word-building abilities of anthroponyms in the German and Russian languages and semantic content of new lexical units // Foreign Languages at School. 2015 № 12. P. 43-47.

4. http://wikireality.ru/wiki/%D0%9F%D0%B5%D1%85%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B3

5. https://www.vappingo.com/word-blog/great-examples-of-neologisms/

6. A.Schweizer Translation and Linguistics // Military Publishing. P.280

7. Mikhail Ya. Tsvilling. Has the theory of translation exhausted its capabilities? // M.Ya.Tsvilling About the Translation and Translators. 2009.P. 91-96