



ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
МИНИСТЕРСТВО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И НАУКИ
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN



Л. Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ
ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ
ЕВРАЗИЙСКИЙ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМ. Л. Н. ГУМИЛЕВА
GUMILYOV EURASIAN
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY



Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«Ғылым және білім - 2015»
атты X Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
X Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2015»

PROCEEDINGS
of the X International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2015»

УДК 001:37.0
ББК72+74.04
Ғ 96

Ғ96

«Ғылым және білім – 2015» атты студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың X Халық. ғыл. конф. = X Межд. науч. конф. студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2015» = The X International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2015». – Астана: <http://www.eni.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie-2015/>, 2015. – 7419 стр. қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша.

ISBN 978-9965-31-695-1

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

УДК 001:37.0
ББК 72+74.04

ISBN 978-9965-31-695-1

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия
ұлттық университеті, 2015

яңа специфик алым(ТМА, №17) – яңа үзенчәлекле алым, яхшы перспективный кияү пәйда булды(ТМА,№23)-киләчәге өметле күренгән кияү пәйда булды.

Гульназ Сафарова – популярный диджей “Татар Радиосы”, известная телеведущая программы “Шоубез” на канале “ТМТВ”. В отличие от Айваза Садырова Гульназ не употребляет русские слова в татарской речи. Забыв конкретный эквивалент, она обращает внимание на семантику слова и передает словосочетанием: *бозау – сыер баласы (теленек – дитя коровы), жирный шрифт – бүрттерелгән шрифт*. В ходе исследования, мы обратили внимание, что речь Гульназ Сафаровой изобилует крылатыми выражениями, афоризмами и поэтическими строками. Например, в выпуске от 23.02.14 программы “Шоубез” телеведущая начала эфир со слов великого татарского поэта Г. Тукая *“театр яктылыкка, нурга илтә”*. В вопросительных предложениях Гульназ Сафарова часто употребляет пердикативное слово “әйеме?”- “да ведь”. Например: *тулы бер күргәзмә ачсаң була, әйеме?(«Шоубез», 05.05.13), Әле син эстрадага беренче адымнарыңны Асаф Вәлиев белән атлаган идең, әйеме?(“Шоубез”, 05.05.13), Илдар абый, менә инде сез уникал ел буена фестивальне җитәкләсез, әйеме?(“Шоубез”,15.12.13)*. Также следует отметить прием парцелляции: *Ә менә үзең турында дәрәс түгел мәгълүмат укыганың, ишеткәнең бармы? Массакүләм мәгълүмат чараларында?(«Шоубез», 05.05.13), Ул елларда сәхнәгә чыккан Лилия белән хәзерге Лилияне чагыштырсак, әлбәттә, аермалыклар бик күптер. Төп аермалыкларны әйтеп китә аласыңмы?(«Шоубез», 05.05.13)*.

Булат Байрамов, ведущий кулинарного шоу “Тәмле көрәш”-“Кулинарная борьба”, восхищает нас знанием татарских пословиц, поговорок, афоризмов. Каждую программу Булат начинает с пословицы на тему еды: *ит ашасаң-дәрт, шулпа эчсәң-шифа аласың* (“Тәмле көрәш”, 13.12.14); *азыгы мул хуҗаның эше кыска булыр* (“Тәмле көрәш” 08.03.14); *бүрене аягы ашата, икенче берәүне хатыны* (“Тәмле көрәш”22.03.14). Булат Байрамов ведет программу чисто на татарском языке, соблюдая все стилистические особенности языка. Следует отметить, что Булат Байрамов выступает и в роли переводчика. Названия блюд, рецепты, а также кухонная утварь дается им в татарском эквиваленте: *грудинка– тавык күкрәге; болгарский перец – татлы борыч, мясо по-арски – арчача ит,зажигалка –яңдыргалка, национальный стейк – милли эстәйк, кастрюля-кәчтрүл, пекинская капуста – кытай кәбестәсе*. На наш взгляд, речевой портрет Булата Байрамова является образцом подражания для многих других тележурналистов.

Роль телевидения в вопросе изучения родного языка очень велика. “ТМТВ”- “Татар музыкаль телеканалы” играет важную роль в воспитании любви к татарскому языку, к татарской песне. Вот поэтому так остро встает вопрос о знании телеведущим самобытности своего родного языка, всей образности его лексического состава. Для того чтобы речь телеведущего была правильной и красивой, важно строить словосочетания, предложения по установленным правилам и выполнять все грамматические нормы языка.

Список использованных источников

1. Панова М. Н. Языковая личность государственного служащего: опыт лингвометодического исследования. – М., 2004. – 323 с.
2. Низамов, И.М. Уем тел очында/ И. Низамов.-Казан:Тат кит.нәшр, 1995. – 287 б.
3. Сковорцов Л.И. Теоретические основы культуры речи./Л.И. Сковорцов. – М.:Наука, 1980. – 352 с.
4. КнязевА.А. Основы тележурналистики и телерепортажа. – Бишкек: КРСУ, 2001. – 36 с.

УДК 347.78.034

THE CONCEPT OF ADEQUACY OF TRANSLATION IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Beisembayeva Zhanargul

The concept of adequacy is focused on post-structuralist ideology of language and appeals to the qualitative assessment of the observer. Adequacy assesses translation for an illocutionary goal, its expressive function; intention of adequacy is “to correspond to the goal”. Adequacy belongs to the cognitive space which is defined by the conceptual metaphor “text is a living organism”. Adequate translation provides pragmatic tasks at the highest possible level of equivalence, preventing violations of norms and standards of the target language, respecting the genre and stylistic requirements and corresponding to the conventional standard of translation [1]. The classic definition of an adequate translation is in the fact that an adequate translation is supposed to be a semantically and pragmatically equivalent one. Thus adequate translation is much wider than equivalent translation. However, the interpretation of this term in linguistic theory is complex and ambiguous. In this regard, it seems appropriate to study the adequacy of translation which is most fully described in the works of Kazakhstani and foreign linguists, both individually and in close relation with the notion of equivalence as there is a continuous close relationship between these concepts in most linguistic theories. The goal here will be to highlight the most functional approach to studying the issue of adequacy of translation.

According to the definition of the founder of Russian translation and interpreting studies A.V. Fedorov, adequacy is a comprehensive transfer of the semantic content of the original and complete functional and stylistic conformity to it [2]. In other words, adequacy is the ratio of the transfer of content and form of the original by means of the target language via reproducing features of the latter or creating functional equivalents to these features. The specified condition makes us resort to such language means which “would perform a similar semantic and literary function in the system of the whole” even without coinciding with the elements of the original in its formal content. To achieve adequate translation or interpreting for the author it is particularly significant to reproduce the ratio between a part, individual element or a section and the whole [2]. A.V. Fedorov attaches great importance to this relationship: those or other changes in the part of the text are unequal to each other in their value in the system of the whole text, some “are more important than others, and the degree of approximation to the original and deviations from it ... inevitably relate to the role of this section” with greater or lesser significance of an individual word. This idea allows A.V. Fedorov to argue that “adequacy may not require the same degree of verbal proximity to the original throughout the text”, i.e. a detailed accurate transfer of the individual elements of the original does not mean a full translation of the whole, which resembles a definite system rather than a simple combination of constituent elements.

A.V. Fedorov’s approach to the problem of adequate translation is, of course, interesting and important for a comprehensive study of the problem. However, there are some obvious contradictions. Besides functional and stylistic conformity with the original, adequacy of translation and interpreting is a complete transfer of its semantic content. At the same time we are talking about the need to sacrifice individual elements to transfer the whole, and these “victims” do not contradict the principles of full translation, and a compromise mention of them in the form of a reservation is unacceptable. But each of those non-essential elements, which are to be sacrificed here, is a particle of the author’s intention, i.e. “semantic content” without which there is neither pragmatic intention, no adequate translation. There is also another question whether such an approach will give the inexperienced or even unprincipled translator or interpreter a chance and theoretical basis to justify the shortcomings of their own translations with the “need to sacrifice small elements” for the sake of the whole.

Zh.K. Karakuzova calls adequacy of translation as a unity of the form and the content on a new language basis. Adequate (holistic or full) translation is the one which transfers information communicated in different languages, by equivalent means. “Translation must transfer not only what is expressed by the original, but also the way it is expressed in.” [3] This requirement applies

“to the entire translation of the text as a whole and to its parts. [3] The criterion of correctness of the choice of means to achieve adequate translation, according to Zh.K. Karakuzova, is the correspondence of an element to the reality described in the original. At the same time equivalence of means is determined not by identity but by the closest approximation of the achieved result – translation or interpretation – to the influence of the original. The author does not specify what impact it is. She seems to have in mind the degree of identity of perception (reaction) of receptors of the original and translated texts (messages). According to Zh.K. Karakuzova, the basis for the identification of equivalence of means can only be functional, rather than formal: “in the complex process of translation there too many factors involved to be able to establish formal compliance at the level of speech.” [3] However, the quantity and quality of factors that underlie functional correspondences cannot be the constant value for all genres of translated material; common is only the logical-semantic basis which determines the process of analysis and synthesis. Zh.K. Karakuzova states that precisely these processes form methods of translation and interpreting.

Zh.K. Karakuzova indicates that the so-called “penetration into reality” that underlies the denotative theory of translation cannot be a criterion for the adequacy of translation. Even in cases where the translator “is fuller and deeper familiar with the segment of reality described in the original than the author himself”, he does not have the right to reproduce the situation in the way other than portrayed in the original, it will distort the very essence of the translation and the author’s idea and vision of reality [3]

Thus, Zh.K. Karakuzova defines the concepts of equivalence and adequacy of translation. Equivalent compliances belong to the sphere of language and are persistent and relatively independent of their environment; they serve to achieve adequacy which is the correspondence to the segment of reality, a maximum approximation to the functional identity of the information contained in the original and its translation.

L.S. Barkhudarov does not differentiate the concepts “equivalence” and “adequacy”. Speaking about the achievement of translation equivalence (“adequacy of translation”) Barkhudarov calls a prerequisite – the implementation of translational transformations (numerous and qualitatively different interlanguage reorganization) in spite of disparities in the formal and semantic systems of the two languages [4]

L.S. Barkhudarov notes the possibility of occurrence of a completely normal situation in which extralinguistic information available to speakers of source and target languages is not the same – that is “background knowledge” of speakers of source and target languages is different. As a result, the numerous, clear and obvious for source-language speakers becomes unclear and even incomprehensible to speakers of the target language (and vice versa). According to the author, the translator is obliged to take this into account in their work, because “even the most “accurate translation does not achieve the purpose if it remains incomprehensible to those to whom it is intended”. [4] As a result, consideration of pragmatic factors is a prerequisite for achieving full translation adequacy.

At the same time it is necessary to take into account the fact that not all types of translated materials require consideration of pragmatic factors to the same extent, and there are cases of preference for pragmatics compared with semantics. However, the concept of translation adequacy, defined by the author as “a requirement of equivalence of the text in the target language into the source language”, implies equal emphasis on pragmatic and semantic factors, and the latter should not under normal circumstances be sacrificed first. The maximum the translator can allow themselves in this case is a slight loss of information irrelevant to the context. An example of such losses there can serve the method of generalization, leading usually to minor semantic “victims” [4].

V.G. Gak in his “Comparative Studies and Translation Analysis” proposes to distinguish between the two “floors” while evaluating translation: equivalence and adequacy. At the top “floor” estimate is based on the adequacy of the response of the recipient of translation. However, this criterion cannot be formalized and is virtually never used. Different people have different responses not only to the original and translation, but also to the same text, especially if this text is literary, because a language has an inherent fundamental variation of expression means. In many cases, the

choice between the synonyms is not relevant in speech, it is impossible to find any objective criteria for assessment here. But at a less high “floor” translation can be estimated with its “technical” side, with respect to “the adequacy of employed means”. In this case, under the technical side we understand not only words and patterns, but also stylistic features, sound, text pragmatics in the social aspect. In assessing this level a comparative analysis can be of great benefit, because in many cases it can show that this decision of the translator is not accidental, but reflects cross-language patterns.

To eliminate the individual and subjective in determining the adequacy of translation the author proposes to use methods of questioning. However, here as usual, whenever a questionnaire relates to language norms, each of the respondents, according to V.G. Gak, will rely on their own linguistic competence, on their intuitive understanding of the differences between the two languages. But translators and editors in their work also rely on their language competence concerning the correlation of the two languages. Therefore, the analysis of methods of translation of similar phenomena in a number of different translations can be seen as a kind of questioning, where the object should be practitioners of translation themselves.

This approach correctly takes into account the reaction of the recipient of translation as a component of “the floor of adequacy”. At the same time the description “adequately used means” looks simplistic as equivalence of words and patterns is placed on the same level with the social pragmatics and stylistic features. The main factor for assessing translation is called the collection of statistical data and questionnaires. However, it seems unlikely that the translator, even the most responsible and experienced, will be looking in a large number of earlier performed translations for confirmation and justification for each element of their translation or survey hundreds of people to identify the adequacy of the response to the translation.

G.K. Kapysheva in her “Interlanguage Phraseological Equivalents of the Semantic Field “Fear” in different languages (German, English, Russian and Kazakh)” says that the essence of adequate translation is the use of replacements and correspondences. If the translator cannot transfer all elements of the original they may have resort to adequate substitutes which create an equal effect in translation. Thus, the problem of adequacy is to a large extent the problem of the proper use in the translation of lexical and phraseological, grammatical and stylistic correspondences. Adequacy should not be interpreted narrowly. This is a broad term that includes a dialectical approach to the question of the nature of translation accuracy and the correct understanding of the very definition of “accuracy”. Availability of adequacy also implies the possibility of substitutions (by which we recreate the original by the means of another language) that produce the same effect and perform the same function. It follows that the concept “adequate translation” includes three components: 1) a correct, accurate and complete transfer of the content of the original; 2) the transfer of the linguistic form of the original; 3) perfect correctness of the language into which the translation is done. All three components of adequate translation constitute an indissoluble unity. They cannot be separated from each other – a violation of one of them will inevitably lead to a breach of the other.

This approach to the problem seems to be quite reasonable and logical: in order to save the pragmatic component during the translation to resort to replacements and correspondences in which elementary units of meaning, despite some inevitable transformations will cause an appropriate, “adequate” response of the translation receptor; lack in this definition of adequate translation of “the necessity to sacrifice a segment for the sake of the whole” also leaves a feeling of satisfaction. A certain contradiction is seen between the second and third principles of adequacy: the author points out that “no desire to preserve grammatical constructions, phraseological combinations or stylistic devices of the original cannot justify violations of the language norms, into which the translation is done” [5]; there are examples of literal translation to support this theory. Along with this, “transfer of linguistic form of the original” is called an integral component of adequate translation. Perhaps we should specify that an idiom should always be transferred as an idiom, and colloquial expressions must be reproduced by corresponding (equivalent) phrases in the target language, and the use of literalism is naturally unacceptable, and the preservation of the stylistic features of the original will not be a violation of norms of the target language.

Unlike foreign translation studies, where it is preferable to use the term “equivalence”, the category of adequacy has taken its place in the domestic theory of translation. Despite the identification of equivalence and adequacy in the works of individual authors, these are self-regulatory concepts, which, however, are interrelated and intertwined in translation theory and practice.

Category of adequacy is bigger than that of equivalence whereupon it is more difficult to formalize it. Adequate translation must be equivalent by definition, so it serves the implementation of the pragmatic task at the highest possible level of equivalence. On the other hand, a translation which is completely equivalent only at one of the level of equivalence is likely to be inadequate.

Adequacy is applicable to the process of translation, and primarily to the pragmatic component of this process; however, the authors of the largest translation-critic concepts recognize its assessment- normative character whereupon criteria of adequacy can be employed to analyze the results of the translation process

The essence of adequate translation is treated differently: it is defined as the execution of similar semantic and literary functions (A.V. Fedorov), as the correspondence to the segment of reality (Zh.K. Karakuzova), as correspondence to the communicative situation (A.D. Schweitzer), as the use of replacements and correspondences (G.K. Kapysheva), as providence of necessary completeness of cross-lingual communication (V.N. Komissarov). However, almost all the authors of the original concepts keep to the opinion that namely preservation of the content and form of the original is an integral feature of adequate translation; wherein the transfer of content with the pragmatic intention (the purpose of communication) is a priority and, subject to the objective necessity, can change the shape of the original message.

References

1. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). – М., 1990. – С.246
2. Федоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода. – М., 1983. – С.127
3. Каракузова Ж.К. Стилистическое единство оригинала и сохранение его в переводе с казахского языка на русский (на материале романа-эпопеи М. Ауэзова "Путь Абая"): Диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук. - Алма-Ата, 1984. – С.63, 74, 75
4. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод. – М., 1975. – С.190, 125, 132
5. Капышева Г.К. Межъязыковые фразеологические эквиваленты семантического поля «страх» в разносистемных языках: на материале немецкого, английского, русского и казахского языков: Диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук. – Алматы, 2006. – С.32

УДК 811.11-112

АУДАРМА ҮДЕРІСІНДЕ ҚОЛДАНЫЛАТЫН ӘДІСТЕР ТУРАЛЫ

Бейсенова Гүльназ Амангельдыевна

beisenova8890@mail.ru

Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ Филология факультетінің Жалпы тіл білімі және аударма теориясы кафедрасының магистранты, Астана, Қазақстан

Ғылыми жетекші – Л.Б. Киманова

Қазақ тіл білімінде аударматану мәселесі – өткен XX ғасырдың соңғы жылдарында ғана қолға алынған жаңа сала. Сол саладағы мәселелердің бірі – аударма әдістері.

Аударма үдерісінде қолданылатын әдістерді қарастыру алдында біз жалпы аударма анықтамаларын келтіруді жөн көрдік. Аударманы ғалымдар «аудару барысында оның тілдік жаңа бейнесі мен стилистикалық формасын тудырып, әрі бір мәтіннің екінші мәтінге түпнұсқаның стилистикалық және өзіне тән басқа да ерекшеліктерін басым түрде сақтай отырып, өзгертетін үрдіс ретінде тілдік мәтіннің қайта туындауы» деп қарастырады [1, 38].