

**Министерство Образования и науки Республики Казахстан  
Атырауский государственный университет им. Х. Досмухамедова  
Кафедра «Переводческое дело и иностранные языки»**

Допущен к защите  
Заведующий кафедрой  
Переводческое дело и  
иностраннне языки, к.ф.н.  
\_\_\_\_\_ А.Х.Хайржанова  
«\_\_\_\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_ж.

**ДИПЛОМНАЯ РАБОТА  
Тема: “Types of adoptive transcoding”**

**Специальность-5B020700 «Переводческое дело»**

**Выполнил:**

**Ш.Серікқалиұлы**

**Научный руководитель:**

**З.Н.Каримова**

**Норма контроль:**

**Д.Т.Кенжахметов**

**Атырау 2017**

## CONTENT

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
<b>I.MODIFICATION OF INFORMATION AS INTERLINGUAL COMMUNICATION</b> .....	5
1.1Theoretical and practical aspects of cross-cultural communication .....	6
1.2Transfer of anthroponymy in Interlingual and cross-cultural communication .....	8
1.3Personal names and their diminutive options .....	11
<b>II.TRANSLATION STANDARDS</b> .....	37
2.1Types of interlingual transformations .....	41
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	56
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	59

## INTRODUCTION

This diploma work is devoted to a research of lexical and stylistic features of the translation of texts in the sphere of literature.

Researches in the field of the translation — the important and urgent task directed to achievement of adequate translations, promoting the decision of many application-oriented tasks and an acceleration of information exchange in the field of the latest developments of science among experts and the scientific different countries.

**Subject of research** are the scientific texts of financial and economic subject which are of interest in respect of detection of lexical features of the translation of scientific and technical texts.

**Research question** - lexicon of texts of scientific subject and manifestation of its features in translation practice as means of cross-cultural communication in the sphere of language.

**Relevance** of operation is caused by increase in the significance of the translation of scientific literature as method of exchange and distribution of information in the world scientific community

**Goal of research** - Separation of lexical features of scientific texts within the tasks which are carried out by them as the communication medium in the sphere of science, and a study of influence of these features on translation practice of texts of economic subject.

**Goal of research** defined the following tasks:

- To specify general options of the scientific text as means of cross-cultural communication in the sphere of science.
- To select features of scientific style of English in comparison with the Russian and Kazakh languages.
- To research terminology on the example of the English scientific texts.
- To select the main difficulties of the translation of terminology of scientific texts and to plan ways of their decision.

**Study materials** are English and Russian texts of classic literature, and texts of Russian and western researchers

- theory of the text (Arnold I. V., Razinkina N. M., Strakhova of B.C, Ryabtseva N. K., Vlahov S., Parshin A., Komissarov V. N., Tolstoy S. S., Rubtsova M. G., Brandes M. P., Vorobyova M., Volodina M. N.)

- translation theory (Barkhudarov L. S., Borisova L. I., Breus E. V., Kazakova., Komissarov V. N., Latyshev L. K., Pumpyansky A. L., E.Nida., G.Toury. Slepovich.)

**Research method:** Work is performed by a complex technique on the basis of comparative and comparative and semantic analyses of the text.

The purpose and research problems predetermined the following **operation structure**: this operation includes introduction, two chapters and the inference.

**Part I** contains the analysis of features of scientific and technical texts as means of cross-cultural communication, also considers comparative stylistic features of the Russian, Kazakh and English scientific and technical texts, and also terminology

research problems.

**Part II** contains the analysis of problems of the translation of scientific terminology on the example of economic texts, and sentences according to their decision.

## **I. MODIFICATION OF INFORMATION AS INTERLINGUAL COMMUNICATION**

Language- means communication, and expression of thoughts. Certainly, it has also other functions, but these two — the most main. Language serves communication, it is principal, the most explicit, and the most official and socially recognized of all types of communicative behavior [1:211].

Language - the multivariate phenomenon which arose in human society: it both system and anti-system, and activities and a product of these activities, both spirit and matter, and spontaneously developing object and the ordered self-regulating phenomenon, it is also any and made, etc. Characterizing language in all its complexity from the opposite sides, we open its entity. [2:4]

Communication — the act of communication, the communication between two or more individuals based on mutual understanding; reporting of information by one person to another or number of persons.

Determination of culture there is a set. V. A. Maslova in the book «Linguaculturology selects only 11 basic approaches of culture understanding and determination. Culture it is any creative human activities, such activities as a result of which there is a certain product, or the result expressing the ideas, thoughts, beliefs, traditions and so on, available to others. The word «culture» is applied usually to high-quality and quantitative determination of this product.

The term culture is taken from the technical vocabulary of anthropology, wherein it embraces the entire way of life of members of a community insofar as it is conditioned by that membership [3:27].

Determination of cross-cultural communication is obvious from the term: this communication of the people representing different cultures [4:14].

The term «cross-cultural communication» is called adequate mutual understanding of two participants of the communicative act belonging to different national cultures [5:26].

It is slightly more difficult to explain the concept «cross-language communication», first of all, that in literature it not often is considered separately. We tried to find determination for this concept in this thesis.

Language is a culture component, and the culture is a meeting of traditions, ideas, and achievements of a civilization. As language – the means of communication, communication (communication, communication) between cultures can be carried out rather effectively on the basis of one or several languages. Today, when the international corporations carry out globalization processes, it becomes especially obvious – the huge number of languages dies out, they just become unnecessary. Cultural traditions show the highest ability «to be alloyed» under the uniform ideas. And for promotion of such ideas one language which is rather easily perceived by people of this region – a certain international and cross-cultural language usually serves. Presently English can be an example of such language. However there are several only one official options of English, and also a huge number of options on which speak in different regions of the world – up to dialects.

The similar situation develops also in those regions of the world where the language serving for communication between cultures is Russian or Chinese.

Thus, Interlingual communication consists of ability to speak language which is cross-cultural. It or officially established international language, or language which choice historically is also culturally caused for communication between representatives of different languages and cultures. And in most cases language is used exclusively functionally – for a household talk, for trade and other aspects of human activity. From this party there is especially obvious an importance of a role of the person assistant at implementation of cross-cultural communication who knows language more widely and understands his subtleties.

So, interlingual communication is

1. Direct communication of representatives of different cultures in one language, but at the same time this language changes under the influence of cultural features of native speakers;

2. Communication of representatives of different cultures in different languages, but through the intermediary having a certain set of knowledge of culture and language of parties concerned.

### **1.1 Theoretical and practical aspects of cross-cultural communication**

At a turn of the second and third millennia becomes more and more obvious that the mankind develops on the way of expansion interrelations and interdependence of various countries, people and their cultures. This process has captured various spheres of public life of all countries of the world. Today it is impossible to find ethnic communities which wouldn't be influenced by influence as from cultures of other people, and wider public environment existing in certain regions and in the world in general. It was expressed in rapid growth of cultural exchanges and direct contacts between the state institutes, social groups, social movements and certain individuals of the different countries and cultures. Expansion of interaction of cultures and the people does especially urgent a question of cultural originality and cultural distinctions. The cultural diversity of modern mankind increases and the people making him find more and more means to keep and develop the integrity and cultural shape. This tendency to preservation of cultural originality confirms the general regularity consisting that the mankind, becoming more and more interconnected and uniform, doesn't lose the cultural diversity. In the context of these tendencies of social development becomes extremely important to be able to define cultural features of the people to understand each other and to achieve mutual recognition.

The process of interaction of cultures leading to their unification causes in some nations aspiration to cultural self-affirmation and desire to keep own cultural values. A number of the states and cultures show the categorical rejection of the happening cultural changes. They oppose to process of opening of cultural borders impermeability own and hypertrophied pride the national originality. Various

societies react to outside influences differently. Range of resistance to process of merge of cultures is rather wide: from passive rejection of values of other cultures before active counteraction to their distribution and the statement. Therefore we are witnesses and contemporaries of the numerous ethno-religious conflicts, growth of nationalist sentiments, regional fundamentalist movements.

Noted processes in a varying degree have found the manifestation and in Russia. Reforms of society have led to serious changes in the cultural image of Russia. For several last year's absolutely new public groups have appeared: businessmen, bankers, political leaders of different movements, Russian staff of foreign firms, etc. There is a formation of absolutely new type businesscultures, new idea of social responsibility of the business world to the client and society is formed, life of society in general changes. Process develops extremely difficult and painfully as faces a huge number of obstacles and restrictions from the state, mistrust to the authorities, incompetence and voluntarism. One of ways of overcoming the existing difficulties is adjustment of effective system of communication between various public groups and the power. This system has to be based on the principles of equal access to necessary information, direct communication among themselves, and collective decision-making and effective work of employees. It is necessary to add to it that versatile international contacts of heads and businessmen of all levels have shown that success in any kind of the international activity in many respects depends on extent of training of the Russian representatives in area of cross-cultural communication. And, at last, the end of «Cold War» between the East and the West has significantly expanded trade and economic relations between them; the number of the people having economic contacts outside the culture from year to year grows in each country. Now in the world there are more than 37 thousand. Multinational corporations from thousand. Branches in which several tens of millions of people work. For the effective activity they have to consider features of culture of the partners and countries of residence. Crisis situations of the last years in Russia (1998), Mexico and Brazil (1999) which have broken the existing economic order and have led to new alignment of forces on the world scene became the evidence of interrelation of world economy.

Wide availability of direct contacts with cultures which seemed mysterious and strange earlier became result of the new economic relations. At direct contact with such cultures of distinction are realized not only at the level of kitchen utensils, clothes, a diet, but also in various attitude towards women, children and old men, in ways and means of business management.

Becoming participants of any kind of cross-cultural contacts, people interact with representatives of other cultures often significantly differing from each other. Differences in languages, national cuisine, clothes, standards of public behavior, the relation to the performed work often make these contacts difficult and even impossible. But it is only private problems of cross-cultural contacts. A main reason for their failures lies outside obvious distinctions. They in distinctions in attitude that is other relation to the world and to other people. The principal hindrance hindering the successful solution of this problem consists that we perceive other cultures

through in case of the culture therefore our observations and the inferences are restricted to its frames. With great difficulty we understand word meanings, acts, actions which aren't characteristic of ourselves. Our ethnocentrism not only hinders cross-cultural communication, but also it is difficult to recognize it as it is unconscious process. From here the output arises that effective cross-cultural communication can't arise in itself, it needs to study purposefully.

Languages shall be learned in continuous unity with the world and culture of the people speaking these languages. Language structures sociocultural are the cornerstone of structure [4:28].

1) The culture, as well as language, is the forms of consciousness displaying outlook of the person;

2) The culture and language exist in a dialog among themselves;

3) The subject of culture and language is always the person or society;

4) A normative - general for language and culture;

5) Historicism - one of intrinsic properties of culture and language;

6) The antinomy «dynamics - statics» is inherent in language and culture.

Language and culture are interrelated:

1) In communicative processes;

2) In ontogeny (formation of language abilities of the person);

3) In phylogeny (formation of the public person).

These two entities differ with the following:

1) In language as a phenomenon aims to the masses whereas in culture to the individuals;

2) Though the culture - sign system (like language), but it isn't capable to self-organize;

3) As it was already noted by us, language and culture are different semiotics systems 5[20:60].

So, the theoretical aspect of cross-cultural communication consists in the current trends of world development leading to unification of cultures and increases in number of cross-cultural contacts. In these conditions it is necessary to differentiate the concepts «culture» and «language», to accurately understand a difference between various social and cultural groups. The practical aspect of cross-cultural communication means need of direct cross-cultural contacts up to the household level, systematic approach to cross-cultural contacts, establishing cross-cultural communications within the country, directly training of cross-cultural communication.

## **1.2 Transfer of anthroponymy in Interlingual and cross-cultural communication**

Anthroponymy is the proper name (or a set of names, including all possible options) which is officially appropriated to the certain person as his identification mark. Anthroponymy calls, but doesn't attribute any properties. Anthroponymy have



conceptual value which cornerstone idea of category, a class of objects is. The following signs are inherent in this value, as a rule:

- a) The instruction that the carrier of an anthroponymy — the person: Peter, Lewis unlike London, Thames;
- b) The instruction on belonging to a national linguistic community: Robin, Henry, William unlike René, Henri, Wilhelm;
- c) The instruction on a sex of the person: John, Henry unlike Mary, Elizabeth [6:39].

It is clear, that each person can't have unique, only to him one inherent name. Both personal names and the surnames taken in it have a set of carriers.

Out of a concrete situation or the sphere of communication the names John, Elizabeth, Thomas, etc. don't indicate any specific person. We will call multiple anthroponymy such names which in language consciousness of collective don't contact preferably any one person. Other anthroponymy also belong to many people, but one is connected with someone first of all. These are names of the people who have become widely known (Plato, Shakespeare, Darwin, Einstein и.т.п.). Such IS we will call single anthroponymy[6:39]. V.P.Berkov has suggested to differentiate the specified groups respectively as the general and single IS [7:107]. The term «general IS», however, is submitted not absolutely successful as can suggest an idea that it something more general, abstract, than single names. The principle of differentiation of these two types of anthroponymy in another: in absence or existence of an object to which anthroponymy points first of all. For example, Churchill proper name used in the text without explanations most likely will be understood as a surname of the British prime minister 40 — the 50th years (Churchill was a heavy smoker). Only when the context or a speech situation contradicts such understanding, the name will be apprehended as multiple: Churchill, my next-door neighbor, has just come from Africa. Thus, multiple anthroponymy are characterized by the fact that the communicative sphere in which they unambiguously define one reviewer is limited. Therefore at their introduction to wider sphere of communication the specifying context surely has to accompany them, for example: I heard somebody coming through the shower curtains. Even without looking up, I knew right away who it was. It was Robert Ackley, this guy that roomed next to me. Not even Herb Gale, his own roommate, ever called him «Bob». (J. Salinger) Single anthroponymy, on the contrary, don't demand such specifying context as their communicative sphere — all language collective. It is shown, in particular, by those cases when by anthroponymy it is entered into the text without any explanations and when on the basis of the text it is impossible to establish who possesses this name. For example: That characteristic romanticism of the Victorian mind the sea represents something mysterious, boundless, reaching out wider and wider into eternal truths and eternal progress.

Charlotte Bronte, seeing the sea for the first time, was «quite overpowered so that she couldn't speak», and Hazlitt's reaction was no less awestruck at the «strange ponderous riddle, which we can neither penetrate nor grasp in our comprehension». (International Herald Tribune)

In article from where the given fragment is taken, it isn't specified anywhere that Charlotte Bronte (1816-1855) and Hazlitt (1778-1830) - prominent English writers. It is supposed that they are rather well-known to readers. A factor extra linguistic — wide popularity of the person in society — finds linguistic expression that single anthroponomy don't need the accompanying context of the specifying character, and their reviewers don't depend on the narrow communicative sphere.

From this it follows that the known information on the carrier of a name is included into value of a single anthroponomy as language units. For the translator it is important to know what volume of this information and whether it is possible to equate it to the encyclopedic information about the person to whom the name belongs. As it was already specified, there is an opinion according to which single IS have «infinitely rich» content and their value joins all encyclopedic information on an object. Fairly objecting to this point of view, A.B. Superanskaya notes: «Speaking about infinitely rich contents of Cervantes, we substitute the language analysis of this name for the biographic information about the author of Don Quixote, forgetting that a name Cervantes also other people could be called just as also there are a lot of people by the name of Churchill». And nevertheless the author of Don Quixote holds special position among all persons by the name of Cervantes. This surname really belongs to many people, but additional information that one of these people — the great writer and the author of the famous novel, apparently, is imprisoned in this name not only for the whole language collective, but even for many language collectives. In this regard, when it is about this person, the name Cervantes doesn't need additional explanations. The minimum idea that Cervantes — «the famous writer, the author of the novel «Don Quixote»», strongly enters the characterizing component of value of this name. Of course, not each member of language collective has all completeness of information about the particular person therefore value of a single anthroponomy in language is the known abstraction corresponding to the average level of knowledge of the name carrier. Aesop's fables, Albert Einstein's works or the biography of Lincoln were read, certainly, not by all, however all (or almost everything) own the known sum of information about these people, having got these data from other persons, from books, the periodical press, radio - and telecasts.

Such average sum of information steadily corresponds to a single name. This sum of data, this well-known minimum of information on the carrier of an anthroponomy can also be considered, apparently, value of single anthroponomy in primary nomination. So, IS value Homer is almost completely exhausted by the following definition; Ancient Greek poet, author of eposes «Iliad» and «Odyssey». First, it is that sum of data which is associated with this name in consciousness of most of native speakers, and secondly, it honors everything that is known of this person to historical and literary science. That is why the playful maxim so comically sounds: «It is established that «Iliad» was written at all not by Homer, but other Greek of the same name». The status of primary nominative value in cross-cultural communication happens different for different anthroponomy. Popularity of many people was beyond their country and a linguistic community, according to their names are single anthroponomy and in other languages. On the other hand, the glory

of other figures widely known in the countries doesn't come to the international level. If anthroponymy Einstein, Aesop, Newton, and Lincoln are single both in English, and in Russian, then William Hazlitt or Willa Cather's names have no such status in Russian. If the translator draws a similar conclusion concerning the text translated to them and that audience for which the translation is designed, he has bases to apply the specifying, descriptive or reformative compliances. Besides, the analysis of a context can show that single the IC realizes the value in the figurative nomination [6:39-43].

Thus, differentiation of the concepts «single anthroponymy» and «multiple anthroponymy» is necessary. Information on the name carrier is important for single anthroponymy, except the signs peculiar to both types. Besides, in a situation when in the text there is no object which specifies anthroponymy, and the text is expected, including, and the international audience, additional data on this object can be necessary.

### **1.3 Personal names and their diminutive options**

The concept of a personal name, i.e. the relation of members of language collective to the names, gradually changes, and it is carried to reorganizations by the anthroponomical of systems. For the modern Russian person the most naturally two-component naming. It can be: name + middle name (Ivan Petrovich, Maria Ivanovna); name + surname (Vasily Kudryavtsev or Vasya Kudryavtsev, Tatyana Smirnova or Tanya Smirnova); name + nickname: Olga Ryzhaya, Zhora Homyak. From 1990th years in Russia in a business and political community the two-component naming consisting of the complete form of a name and a surname began to extend: Galina Starovoytova, Sergey Kovalyov. During prior eras such method of naming was used only in the artistic environment: Isabella Yuryeva, Arkady Raikin [7:1].

For an anthroponomical categories of diminutive and affection (in the Russian grammars they sometimes integrate) are of particular importance. The words expressing diminutives are called diminutive, and hypocoristic express affection – when naming the person or any other animated or inanimate objects. For example, the mountain (big) – a hill (small), and a gorochka, a hillock – caressing words; a bear (big), medvedik, a bear cub (small), Medvedyushka, Medvedko – caressing names of a bear or the appeal to a bear. As a result of diminutive names of other objects can be created: a hand – the pen (doors), a leg – a pinch (beds), an eagle – орлик (a bird of other group). In the Russian anthroponymy since ancient times the denotative was used for naming of children: the parent in the diminutive form (a vertical structural of entitlement) was named them. For example, father Yury Grigoryevich Volk Kamensk (the first half 15 in) is the son: Ivan Yuryevich Blind Wolf cub Volkov son Kamensk. The affection– the special category reflecting the relation speaking to named, irrespective of family and other relations. Numerous caressing suffixes can be added both to complete, and to sectional bases: Ivan – Ivanushka, Ivanochek; Vanya -

Vanyushka, Vanechek. In addition to caressing, there can be also other suffixes of subjective appraisal, for example magnifying устрашительные: Ivanishche, Varvarishcha; neglectful: Ivashka, Maryashka. But there is no direct dependence between a suffix and the emotional characteristic of a name. In different parts of Russia of the Vanka form, Manka can be regarded differently: in the cities they are perceived rather as neglectful, in rural areas – as normal designation of young hard-working people. With development of documentation reflection of the related relations in names became optional, and diminutive forms adjoined caressing. All types of personal and family names belong to anthroponomy. In the different countries the set of names from which official naming of the person is formed isn't identical. In the English-speaking countries the system of names is difficult: everyone has a personal name (first name, given name) and a surname (last name, family name, surname); but also double personal names, double surnames, a so-called middle name are frequent. On the contrary, the Russian middle names have no analogs in the European languages. In case of a transcription of the Russian addresses on a name middle name into English of a middle name are quite often perceived as surnames. However in case of all distinctions it developed so that each person in any country has a personal name and a surname. The English-speaking countries refused the term «Christian name» as designation of the concept «personal name» distributed earlier now as in the last decades there the percent of the non-Christian population sharply increased [7:11].

The middle name is the special personalized word formed on behalf of the father of this person. Naming on the father is accepted at many people: Serbian. Mikhaylo – Mikhaylovich, English John John – Johns. At the people of Southern and Western Europe similar naming's in the Middle Ages turned into surnames and now are used as the stiffened heritable words without any of the immediate family was called Mikhaylo or John.

Russians have a middle name – still live personalized category, indispensable in case of official naming and in documents. The middle names formed both from Russians and from non-Russian names, met in the most ancient Russian written monuments Burchevich, Berendeich (from a Turkic patrimonial name Mutter also from the breeding name of a berendea). In case of numerous population censuses it was required to write all «on a name with fathers and a nickname»8[15:36].

The naming formula like Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov was worked out not directly. Before all middle names were created at representatives of the higher classes of society: boyar Yury Alekseevich Dolgorukov. They are called sometimes «semi-middle names» as it is not Grigoryevich and not Ivanovich.

In early middle names the yotovy suffix (Vyacheslav the son Yaroslavl (1057), a posadnik Kostyantyn the son Dobryn (1018), Ivanko Vyacheslavl (1127)), afterwards was involved in middle names not used. Now as relicts forms of some female middle names on - an inichna remain in case of men's on - ич: Ilyich – Ilyinichna, Kuzmich – Kuzminichna, Fomich – Fominichna, Lukiç – Lukinichna. In the past of a middle name with a suffix - nich could be at men: sir Ilyinich, deputy Smolensk (1498),

Raguil Prokopyinich, Novgorodian (1200), Ivanko Zakharyinich (1171), Yury Oleksinich (1216).

Official naming's of women were especially difficult: Ivanovo wife of Vasilyev son Korobkin widow Agafya Petrova daughter; Anna Ivanovna daughter Yakovlevsky wife of Ivanov son Chicherin (17–18 centuries). For naming of wives there were also special possessive educations on behalf of husbands: Nekrasye, Davyzhaya, Vasilyevaya, Pavlovaya, and Ivanvaya.

Since the Petrovsky era of the graph «Middle name» becomes mandatory in all documents 8[31:13].

The word «surname» was included into Russian from Latin without any essential changes and, according to M. Fasmer, was borrowed through Polish. [4]

The word «surname» at Russians appears during the Petrovsky era at first as designation of a family or the wife, only later – in 'family name' value. What is called now a surname in the past was called a family pro-rank. Families were big, and as naming of all family the name of the head of the family or ancestor was initial: Kuzma Maximov son Belyaev, i.e. Kuzma, Maxim Belyaev's son; Maxim is the head of the family, Belyay – the ancestor [9:27].

In historical documents names of the same people could be written differently. So, I. A. Koroleva found in different lists the tradespeople of the people defending Smolensk at the beginning of 17 century, the following writing: Mikhaylo Borisov the son Cherkas and he is Mishka Borisov the son Cherkasov; foreman Volodya Ignatyev son Prasol and foreman Volod'ka Ignatyev son Prasolov; tradespeople Trenka Semenav daughter Vysotskaya and Trenka Vysotskya[10:102].

The second and third components in a formula Kuzma Maximov the son Belyaev yet not a middle name (in the modern understanding of this term which developed by the end of 17 century) and not a surname, and specifying addressed to (names) of the father and/or farther ancestor. It is convenient to call them patronymics (from Greek pater 'father', in the plural of pateres 'parents, ancestors'). The patronymic is the type of an anthroponomy formed on behalf of the father or farther ancestor named, serving for his indirect (indirect) naming through a name of other person. Ancient patronymics are a germ of the modern middle names and the patronymic of surnames.

Standard structures of official passport surnames formed in 15 century when there was an elevation of the Moscow principality, and the Moscow offices defined whom and how «to write» though this official record often didn't match really being heard naming of the person or a family in the live speech. So there was a decomposition of naming of the Russian people on official and informal (street, rural). The Moscow offices at discretion added to family pro-ranks of one people suffixes - ova, - in(Kot– Kotov, the Grass – Traven; the choice between - ov and - in is defined by type of inducement of a noun) and truncated an ancient all-Slavic patronymic suffix - ich/-ovich in family pro-ranks of others (Fedorovich – Fedorov). So there was a standardization of documentary records. The Moscow samples of record were delivered over all country that promoted unification of writing in documents [11:118].

Some family pro-ranks didn't undergo similar processing and remained as rarities. Not always standardization the family pro-ranks which had the form of an adjective was exposed: Alexey Stepanovich Vesely Sobakin (1613); the prince Afanasy Ivanovich Dolgy Vyazma (the guardsman, is executed in 1570). From some patronymics which had the form of adjectives surnames on - oho, - oho/-ogo, the having forms of the stiffened adjectives of a genitive case of singular afterwards were formed

Boris Ivanovich Dolgovo (1495, Lukh, received Novgorod estate); Ivan Shemyaka Debt Saburov (1538, Yaroslavl); Vasily Luchaninov Cheerful (1567, landowner, Novgorod); Ivan Semenovich Hitrovo (1483, Small Resident of Yaroslavl); Ivanovic Blagovo's Fornication (1555, Novgorod), cf. also of Burago, Mertvago, Zhivago, Veselago (with the Church Slavonic termination - aha). Over time pro-ranks of many families of type Dry, Wet, Cheerful, Good were standardized as Sukhov, Mokrov, Veselov, Blagov.

In the modern surnames all structural types which arose several centuries ago remain. Surnames prevail on - ov/-ev, considerably concede to them surnames on - in/-yn. Restrictedly surnames on - enko, more typical for Ukraine, and on - ich/-ovich, more typical for Belarus and Poland are provided. The surnames having the forms of adjectives and participles (Red, Storming), and also the forms of diminutive nouns calling the descendant through a name of his ancestor are single and just nouns without any special design (the Lip, the Duma, Pitch, the Veil, the Band; Forehead, Horn, Guard, Prut, Full-sphere) [12:119].

Surnames on - skaya coexist parallel with many surnames on - ov/-in or with the surnames having the form of adjectives with suffixes - ov-y/-in-ovy: Molozhavy-Molozhavsky, Ogneva-Ognevsky, Nosachev-Nosachevsky, Neklyudov-Neklyudovsky, Punks Pankovsky, Eagles Orlovsky, Mikhaylov-Mikhaylovsky, Nadezhdin-Nadezhdinsky.

Along with official system in Russia still there is a live system of informal naming inherited of the remote past, the free from an artificial interference. In the ancient time, if the head of the family was called the Bull, this patrimonial pro-rank was transferred to the eldest son in an invariable look. Average sons were called Bychko or the Bull-calf, and the youngest son or the grandson – Bychonok. The wife was called Bychikh, the daughter – the Bull-calf. In a family also names Bynya, Bykonya, Bycha, Bychenya bearing a shade of the tender attitude of parents towards children were possible. With acceptance of Christianity church names were retracted in the same system. So, from an orthodox name Stepan (head of the family) the name of the wife was formed with a suffix - the ikh: Stepanikh. The husband could be called the reduced Step name, and then the wife was called Styopikh. Children were called by Stepanko, Stepanok, Stepanets, Stepanchik, and also Styopko, Styopik, Stets, Stetsko, and the grandson – Stepanchonok. This system was substantially destroyed by standardization. Nevertheless, many of the listed forms can be found in composition of the modern passport surnames, and «live» educations remain in the modern nicknames [13:112].

Concept of pragmatics doesn't come down only to a concept of pragmatically value of language units - it much more widely and includes all questions connected with various degree of understanding participants of communicative process of these or those signs or messages and with their various treatment depending on linguistic and extra linguistic experience of participants of communication. In 7-8 it was specified that extra linguistic experience (what sometimes is called «background knowledge» - background knowledge) participants of the communicative act considerably determines by itself understanding them language and speech units what has been given concrete examples. In the present section we will consider a question of how these factors influence process of transformation and in the choice of translation compliance to these or those units of SL.

As it has been told in noted section of chapter 1, the situation at which extra linguistic information, available SL and TL carriers, doesn't coincide is quite usual - that is «background knowledge the» of people speaking on SL and on TL is various. As a result of it much, clear and obvious to SL carriers, is obscure or in general unclear for TL carriers (and vice versa). The translator, naturally, can't but consider it in the activity - even the most «exact» translation doesn't achieve the objectives if he remains unclear for those to whom he is intended. Therefore the accounting of a pragmatically factor is a necessary condition of achievement of full translation adequacy.

At the same time it must be kept in mind also that circumstance that not all types of the translated materials to the same extent demand the accounting of a pragmatically factor. So, famous theorist of the translation And. Noybert [14:30-31] divides all types of the translated materials into four groups depending on what role is played in them by the pragmatically moments: 1) scientifically literature which is to the same extent focused on carriers both SL, and TL - degree of her understanding is identical, in general, at the people speaking different languages as she is designed for the experts expert in the field knowledge; 2) the materials of the local press and some other texts calculated on «the internal consumer»; though their contents isn't always easily available to understanding of the foreign-language reader, practically they are translated into other languages extremely seldom and the account problem at their translation of a pragmatically factor, as a rule doesn't arise; 3) the fiction intended, first of all, to people to whom this language is native however it is often translated into foreign languages and therefore represents for the translator special difficulties in the pragmatically plan; 4) materials of foreign policy promotion and advertising of the goods going for export - at their translation the accounting of a pragmatically factor plays a crucial role.

In general, distracting from concrete types of the translated material, it should be noted that the accounting of pragmatically aspect is most important by transfer of those categories of lexicon most of which often are among the untranslatable, namely, proper names, geographical names and any names of cultural and community realities. So, translating into Russian place names like the American Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Virginia, the Canadian Alberta, Manitoba or the English Middlesex, Surrey and so forth, it is necessary to add, as a rule, the State of Massachusetts,

Oklahoma, Virginia (or Virginia), Albert's province, Manitoba, the county Middlesex, Surrey and the ave., [15:245] as the Russian reader in most cases doesn't know that is designated by these names. Thus, information which is contained in the source text implicitly (that is known to the SL carrier as his part of «background knowledge»), will be expressed in the target text explicitly. Cf.:

«Where you girls from?» I asked her again... «Seattle, Washington...» (J. Salinger, the Catcher in the Rye, 10)

Where you come from? - From Seattle, the State of Washington.

Cf. also when translating from Russian into English:

Junk dealing, theft of firewood and Teso in forest warehouses on the coast of Oka or on Sands was more revenue, than. (M. Gorky, ChildhoodXIII)

But I found that the profits from junk dealing were less than from stealing boards from the lumberyards on the bank of the Oka River or on the Sands.

Any Russian reader knows well that Oka is a name of the river; however this information isn't supposed surely known for the English-speaking reader therefore in the target text the word river is added.

In general the additions bearing in it such information which is supposed known to SL carriers, but not TL are standard practice of the translation which purpose - to achieve the fullest understanding of the translated text TL carriers. V. N. Komissarov in the work «The word about the translation» (page 150) gives an interesting and indicative example of such addition:

It was Friday and soon they'd go out and get drunk. (J. Brain, Room at the Top)

There was a Friday, the pay-day, soon these people will go outside and will get drunk, (T. Kudryavtseva Lane and T. Ozerskoy)

The words added in translation it was necessary to enter there because the Russian reader, as a rule, doesn't know what is known by each Englishman: the wages in England is paid out weekly, on Fridays (on the eve of «weekend»).

We will give two more examples of such additions which need is caused by pragmatically factors:

For dessert you got Brown Betty, which nobody ate... (J. Salinger, the Catcher in the Rye, Ch. 5)

On sweet - «red Bettie», a pudding with treacle, only nobody ate it...

Gayev: I am a person of the eightieth years (A. Chekhov, The Cherry Orchard)

I'm a good Liberal, man of the eighties.

In the first example addition red Bettie reveals sense of the name, unclear for the Russian reader. In the second it is necessary for Gayev's characteristic - the person of an era when the starry-eyed liberalism which was peacefully getting on with the most severe political reaction prospered (a connotation, well-known to the Russian viewer - the contemporary of Chekhov).

In other cases, on the contrary, the accounting of a pragmatically factor is expressed in omission of these or those words in translation. Cf. the following example:

There were pills and medicine all over the place and everything smelled like Vicks' Nose Drops. (J. Salinger, the Catcher in the Rye, Ch. 2)



Everywhere there were some bubbles, pills, everything smelled of cold drops.

Here in translation Vicks - the company name of drops, nothing speaking to the Russian reader is lowered. Though it also leads to insignificant loss of information, for this context this information is insignificant and she can quite be neglected.

Perhaps, still more often than additions and omissions, in translation practice are applied replacements as an connection to the reader owning TL, this or that information which is directly not expressed in the original, but, nevertheless, to the clear reader - the TL carrier. We will take for an example the following fragment from the book of the American historian and the journalist U. Shearer of «The Rise and fall of the Third Reich»:

The jubilant Prime Minister faced a large crowd that pressed into Downing Street. After listening to shouts of 'Good old Neville'..., Chamberlain spoke a few words from a second-story window in Number 10. (Ch. 12)

Any Englishman knows well that the Downing Street in London is located in the house N 10 down the street. The Russian reader, however, cannot know it; therefore in Russian translation it is necessary to tell: Chamberlain has pronounced several words from a window on the second floor of the residence'

Similar replacement was made by translators of NPA, translating into English the sentence It has gone to army on June 22, 1941 as On the day when Germany attacked Russia, he joined the army.<sup>1</sup> the Date memorable for each Soviet person can is told nothing, to the English-speaking reader and demands disclosure in translation as in

The example is followed from the edging. L.L. Chernyakhovskoy «Reorganization of speech structure for transfer of components of semantic partitioning of the statement at the translation from Russian into English». (M, 1971) where materials of the translations executed in NPA are widely used.

This case it is important to emphasize that the person about whom there is a speech went to army in the first day of war.

Often such replacement has character of generalization, which is replacement of the word with concrete value the word with more general, but value, more clear for the SL carrier. Cf. the following example:

We will sit down to have dinner at the station and she demands the most expensive and tips to footmen on ruble. (A. Chekhov, the Cherry Orchard, 1)

We sit down to dinner at a station and she orders, insist on the most expensive things and give the waiters double tips. (Tr. by S. Young)

To the English or American viewer or the reader it can be unknown what actual cost of the Russian ruble, therefore in translation instead of the indication of the concrete sum (that in this case doesn't play a role) is noted unreasonably generous character of tip which Ranevskaya gave. (In other translation of the same play costs: gives the waiters a florin each that is quite acceptable, considering that it is about Ranevsky' stay abroad.)

Here examples of generalization when translating from English into Russian:

A 'swept' yard that was never swept - where Johnson grass and rabbit-tobacco grew in abundance. (H. Lee, To Kill a Mockingbird, I)

The«pure» yard which was never swept and all grew with weeds. (N. Gal Lane and R. Oblonskoy)

The temperature was an easy ninety, he said, (ib., 18)

The heat is intolerable, he told.

In the first example in the original the names of weeds known to inhabitants of the southern states where there is an action of the story are given. However, such plants as «Johnsons a grass» and «rabbit tobacco» therefore translators resort to generalization here especially as in this context not with what plants the yard grew is essential, and the fact that it grew with weeds that is that nobody looked after him are hardly known to the Russian reader. In other context (e.g., in the text of a handbook on botany) such generalization would be inadmissible and unnecessary.

Celsius is impossible as this system is obsolete in the USA where there is an action of the story. Translators resorted also here to generalization reception because, besides in this context not the exact indication of temperature is important, and the fact that there was a strong heat.

Generalization is often expressed in replacement of a proper name (quite often company name) with the common noun giving the patrimonial name for this subject, Compare:

I could see my mother going in Spaulding's... (J. Salinger, the Catcher in the Rye, 7)

I imagined how mother went to sports shop...

I lit a cigarette and got all dressed and then I packed these two Gladstone's I have, (ib., 7)

I lit, put on, and then put both suitcases.

You, the mother, to Pechyory, to Asaph-skhimniku descend..., (M. Gorky, Childhood, V)

You'd better go to Asaf-the-Recluse at the abbey, my good woman.

Along with generalization, the accounting of a pragmatically factor in translation is sometimes expressed in application of opposite reception, namely a specification, that is replacement of the word with a general meaning the word or words with narrower, concrete value opening an essence of this phenomenon. We will review the following example:

The British people are still profoundly divided on the issue of joining Europe. (From newspapers)

To the Russian reader can be not clear in what sense the word Europe is used here; to the resident of Great Britain, however, familiar with a political situation in the country on the eve of 1973, the sense of expression of joining Europe is clear without explanations. Considering this, this sentence it is necessary to translate into Russian:

In the English people still there are deep disagreements on the entry of England in European «Common market».

At last, in some cases for an explanation of these or those phenomena, realities and so forth, clear to the reader on SL, but little-known or unknown to the reader on TL, the translator is forced to resort to the help of the comment. So, in the play

Chekhov «The Cherry Orchard» Epikhodov asks the interlocutor: «Do you read Boklya? « In English translation to this place of the text the footnote in which it is told is made: «Buckle's 'History of Civilization' is better known in Russia than here. To have read it is a sort of cachet of popular erudition...»

As it is possible to judge by the examples given by us, the accounting of a pragmatically factor when translating demands from the translator of good knowledge of the objects and situations described in the source text that is profound extra linguistic knowledge. It demonstrates once again that translation implementation in principle is impossible without participation of extra linguistic factors.

On the other hand, application of the translation receptions stated above demands from the translator of «sense of proportion» as any abuse of replacements in translation process can lead to semantic or stylistic distortion of the original. The translator has to explain to the reader the phenomena unclear or unfamiliar to him and concepts, but he shouldn't substitute them familiar, habitual to the reader for TL for the phenomena and concepts at all. Otherwise the translation can develop into the conscious or unconscious distortion of the original which is expressed in «transferring» of the situations described in him to a situation, habitual for TL carriers, - what in the history of Russian translation of the 18-19th centuries was called «inducement on the Russian harmony». The famous translator of the middle of the 19th century Irinarkh Vvedensky who in Dickens and Thackeray's translations replaced the English realities with Russians often fell into such mistake (in his translations such «Russicisms» as the carrier, the salesman, a frogged overcoat, the clerk, the coachman and so forth abound). [16:119] In this case we deal with the direct opposite to that abuse of a translation transcription; however it is other extreme which should be avoided in translation as clearness of the translation shouldn't be reached at the price of his vulgarization. Numerous translators of «Tale of Igor's Campaign» into modern Russian who, seeking «to bring closer» this work to -also fell into the same mistake to the mine reader, in every possible way «modernized» him therefore «each translator brought those elements which made a basis of an esthetics urgent at that time» and «any new transfer in the version... I represented the new distortion of the original caused by tastes of that social group to which the translator»[In the same place, page 260].

The curious example of such «modernization» of the text caused by pragmatically installation is provided by the American theorists of the translation E.Nida and Ch. Taber in the monograph «Theory and practice of translation».[17:134].

It is about the translation of the Bible into modern English in which text the translator in some cases allows the deviations from the original caused by pragmatically factors, aspiration «to bring closer» the bible text to the modern reader. Here two such places in comparison with earlier translation more precisely keeping the text of the original:

Old translation

Woman who had an evil spirit in her that had kept her sick for eighteen years.  
(Luke, 13:11)

Then Satan went into Judas. (Luke, 22:3) New translation

Woman who for eighteen years had been ill from some psychological cause.

Then a diabolical plan came into the mind of Judas.

It must be kept in mind that for modern translators the Bible is not a collection of ancient myths, but, first of all, the tool of ideological influence on believers; therefore they quite often go for semantic distortions to make the bible text more modern for the reader that appears from the given examples. From a point of sight of translation theory, it is available cases of preference given to pragmatics in comparison with semantics here. The concept of adequacy of the translation, that is the requirement of equivalence of the text of TL to the text of SL, assumes, however, the equal account both pragmatically, and semantic factor - the second shouldn't in normal conditions be sacrificed to the first. At most what the translator can allow in this case is a small loss of information, insignificant for this context, examples of what have been given above (cf., in particular, reception of so-called generalization, the leader, as a rule, to insignificant semantic «victims»).

«The word «translation» has several various values». So, in «The explanatory dictionary of Russian» under D. N. Ushakov's edition it is indicated presence at this word of five values which 1 majority, clear, has no relation to the problem interesting us (e.g., 'transfer of the manager to other position', 'postal order', etc.). But even when the word «translation» is used in sense 'the translation from one language on another', it also in this case has two different values:

The translation as result of a certain process», that is designation of the most translated text (e.g., in offers: «It is very good translation of the novel of Dickens», «The new translation of the poem of Byron «Childe Harold c Pilgrimage» into Russian was published recently «, « he read this author in the translation», etc.

To transfer «Transfer as process» that is as action from a verb as a result of which the target text in the first value appears. Mainly in this second value the term «translation» will be used on further.

However from the very beginning it is necessary to make an explanation concerning in what sense it is necessary to understand the term «process» in relation to the translation. It is essential to emphasize that we have no here in a look mental or cerebation of the translator, which is that psychophysiological process which proceeds in the translator's brain during implementation of the translation by him. Of course, studying of this process represents in the psycholinguistic plan great interest, in particular for the theory of interpretation. However, «not to mention that now we have still extremely vague idea of the nature of this process (it can be a studying subject only in the comprehensive psycho-linguistic plan), we are interested here, first of all, consideration of translation process in the plan linguistic, in derivation from the physiological and psychological factors defining his realization.

It means that the term «process» in relation to the translation is understood by us in purely linguistic sense, which is as certain look language, more precisely, interlingual transformation or transformation of the text in one language in the text in

other language. Besides, the term «transformation» can't be taken literally - the source text or the text of the original «will not be transformed» in the sense that he doesn't change in itself. This text itself, of course, remains invariable, but along with it and on the basis of it other text in other language which we call «translation» in the first sense of this word (the translation as the translated text) is created. In other words, the term «conversion» (or «transformation») can be used here only in that sense in what this term is applied in the synchronous description of language generally: it is about a certain relation between two language or speech units from which one is initially, and the second is created on the basis of the first. In this case, having the source text and in language A, the translator, primary to it certain operations («translation transformations» of which it will be a question below), would create the text in language B which is in certain natural relations with the text and. In the set these language (cross-language) AND operations make what we call «translation process» in a linguistic sense. Thus, the translation can be considered a certain type of transformation, namely, cross-language transformation.

Adding, one may say, that a subject of linguistic translation theory is the scientific process description of the translation as cross-language transformation, that is conversion of the text in one language in the equivalent to it the text in other language (about what contents invests in the term «equivalent», it will be a question below.) In other words, the task of linguistic translation theory is process modeling of the translation in the sense stated above.

So, the linguistic translation theory puts the task creation of a certain process model of the translation that is some scientific diagram which is more or less precisely reflecting the essential sides of this process. As it is about theoretical simulation so far as all that characterizes theoretical models generally belongs to translation theory. Here it is especially important to emphasize the next two moments:

The translation theory as any theoretical model reflects not everything, and only the most essential lines of the described phenomenon. As the famous Soviet philosopher B. M. Kedrov writes, «the model shall be mandatory more simply than the modeled process or a subject and shall as it is possible is more convex to display its side interesting us»[18:175]. Even more sharply this idea the outstanding Soviet physicist-theorist I. Freckle introduced in due time: «The good theory of difficult systems shall represent only good «caricature» of these systems exaggerating their those properties which are the most typical and intentionally ignoring all remaining - unessential - properties»[19:80] The translation theory shall consider not any relations between texts of a pas language of the original and target language, but only the relations natural, that is typical, regularly repeating. Along with them in the comparative analysis of the text of the original and the target text a large number of the relations (compliances) single, the irregular, set only for this specific case is opened, as a rule

As such single compliances don't give in to generalization, the linguistic translation theory, naturally, can't consider them in the constructions though it should be noted that these «irregular» compliances and present the greatest difficulty for

translation practice. The creative nature of translation activity also consists in ability to find the individual, single, «not provided» by the theory compliances just. On the other hand, in process of development of the translation theory many phenomena which are represented individual in the beginning irregular, gradually «fit» into an overall picture, receive an explanation and join in an object of races - watching translation theory; in other words, as well as in any science, progress in translation theory is, in particular, that behind a set of seeming «exceptions» and «irregularities» the certain general regularity operating them and defining their character is gradually opened.

2) As well as in any other theoretical discipline, in translation theory it is possible - and really takes place - creation not of one some, but the whole set of the models which are differently displaying the modeled process and reflecting its various properties. Complexity of the described object, his versatility exclude a possibility of creation of the unique «universal» model which would be able to reflect all parties of the studied phenomenon in all of them a difficult interconnection and the relations at once. Owing to this fact in modern translation theory there is a number of so-called «models of the translation», and each of these models reflects this or that aspect, this or that party of the real-life phenomenon - translation process as a certain type of interlingual transformation. It would be naive to ask a question: what of nowadays existing models of the translation is «correct» or «true»? - All of them are in own way faithful as all of them model the same phenomenon (translation process), though from the different parties; and, certainly, any of the existing models can't apply for the absolute validity or universality. Same, clear, treats also that model of the translation which is presented in the real work and which it is possible to call «semantic-semiotics model» (the motivation of such name will be stated in hl. 2). On the other hand, the existing translation models (and also those which can be created in the future) don't exclude each other at all - they in many respects coincide, partially block each other and only in the set give an idea of translation process in all its complexity and variety adapt, partially superimpose each other and only in the set give an idea of translation process in all its complexity and a diversity.

Thus, we defined translation process as transformation of the text in one language in the text in other language. When translating, so, always there are two texts (according to A. I. Smirnitsky [20:8-9], «speech works») from which one is initial and are created irrespective of the second, and the second is created on the basis of the first by certain operations - cross-language transformations. The first text is called the text of the original (or simply «the original»), the second - the target text). We will call source language in which the text of the original is said or written (in abbreviated form SL; English, source language - SL). We will call language, a pas which is made a transfer (target text language) the translating language (in abbreviated form TL; English, target language - TL).

We need to define most which one is most important: can we consider the target text the equivalent to the text of the original? For example, what gives to us the grounds to say that the Russian sentence my brother lives in London is the translation of the English sentence of My brother lives in London while the Russian sentence I

study at university isn't the translation of the above-stated English sentence - in other words, isn't equivalent to it? Obviously, not any changeover of the text in one language to the text in other language is the translation. The same thought can be expressed differently: translation process or cross-language transformation is carried out not randomly, and by some certain rules, in some strictly certain frames for which in case of an output we already lose the right to speak about the translation. To have the right to be called the translation (in the first value); the text on TL shall comprise something like that that contains also in the text on SL. In other words, in case of changeover of the text by SL the text on TL some certain invariant shall remain; the measure of saving this invariant also determines by itself a measure of equivalence of the target text to the text of the original. So, it is necessary to define, first of all, what remains invariant in translation process, which is in the course of conversion of the text on SL in the text on TL.

In case of the solution of this problem it is necessary to proceed from the following. Translation process directly depends on the fact that in science about sign systems - a memiotic - calls double-sided character of a sign.

It means that any sign is characterized by existence of two sides or as they are called still, plans: plan of expression or form and plan of contents or value. Language, as we know, represents specific sign system therefore language units also both forms, and values are characterized by two-planned character, existence. At the same time the crucial role for the translation is played by the fact that different languages contain units differing in respect of expression that is in the form but matching in respect of contents that is on value. For example, in the sentences given above the English word brother differs from the Russian word the brother in respect of expression, on matches it in respect of contents, that is has the same value. (For simplicity of presentation we meanwhile distract from that the fact, very important for translation theory, which this coincidence of units of different languages in respect of their contents is, as a rule, not full, and the partial. So, for example, English, brother, in addition to brother value, has also the values put in Russian into words 'fellow', 'fellow countryman', 'colleague', 'friend', etc., and Russian the brother in a combination the cousin corresponds in English not brother, a cousin which, in return, means not only 'cousin', but also 'cousin' etc. As we will see further, this phenomenon, namely incomplete coincidence of systems of values of units of different languages, though considerably complicates translation process, doesn't change its entity.) On this base we can tell that if we replace the English brother on Russian the brother, then translation process as these words differing in respect of expression that is in the form, match takes place here or are equivalent in respect of contents, that is on value. Actually, however, as the minimum text (the speech work) is the sentence so far as translation process is always carried out within at least one sentence (more often the whole group of sentences), and in a sentence that mismatch between units of different languages in respect of contents of which it was talked above.

Returning to our example, we shall revenge that when translating we not simply replace the English word brother on Russian the brother or the English lives on the

Russian lives, but we replace all English sentence of My brother lives in London with the Russian sentence my brother lives in London, different from the initial English sentence in respect of expression, that is in the form, but the equivalent to it in respect of contents, that is matching it on value.

Proceeding from it, we can give the following specified translation definition now:

The translation is called process of conversion of the speech work in one language in the speech work in other language when saving the invariable plan of contents that is value.

At the same time from the very beginning it is necessary to make two extremely essential stipulations;

1) The term «plan of contents» or «value» should be understood most widely, meaning all types of the relations in which it is sign (in this case, language) unit. Their description will make a subject of the following chapter; now it is enough to mark that it is illegal to reduce the concept «values» only to what is often called «object and logical» or «denotative « value (in our operation these values wear the name «referential»). Thus, the correct understanding of an entity of translation process requires, first of all, detail development of the theory of language values or semasiology.

2) It is possible to speak about «saving the invariable plan of contents» only in the relative, but not in an absolute sense. In case of cross-language conversion (as well as in case of any other type of conversions) losses are inevitable, that is incomplete transmission of the values expressed by the text of the original takes place. So, the target text can never be a complete and absolute equivalent of the text of the original; the task of the translator is in making this equivalence of completer, That is to try to obtain convergence of losses to a minimum, but to require «absolute» coincidence of the values expressed in the text of the original and the target text would be absolutely unreal. It means also that one of tasks of translation theory is establishment of what it is possible to call an order of sequence of transmission of values: considering that there are different types of values, it is necessary to set what of them take advantage by transmission in translation process and what can be «sacrificed» semantic losses when translating were minimum. This problem will be us in details having considered in further presentation.

With these two essential stipulations we can accept the translation determination offered above as working, having been it the basis for the «semantic-semiotics model» of the translation developed here.

To finish reviewing of a question of a translation entity, it is necessary to answer one question which arises in connection with the definition given above translation equivalence as based on saving the invariable plan of contents, which are values. It was already marked that the possibility of saving the plan of contents, that is value invariances when translating (at least and the relative) assumes that different languages contain units matching on value. However here it is lawful to ask a question: this assumption is how fair? If value is how we assume (and how it will be justified further), an integral part of a sign and, so, language units whether then it



means that to each sign system, including each language, the specific values are inherent? And whether follows from this what in case of conversion of the text in one language in the text in other language, that is, in translation process not only language forms, but also values expressed by them inevitably shall change? On what base we then say that value in translation process shall remain invariable?

This question is very serious and deserves detailed reviewing. Discrepancies in semantic systems of different languages - the certainty which is a source of the numerous difficulties arising before the translator in the course of translation implementation; in further presentation due attention will be paid to these discrepancies. Many researchers on it a basis - scientific research institutes find it possible to claim that equivalence of the original and the translation isn't based on identity of the expressed values. From numerous expressions on this subject we will quote only one, belonging to the English theorist of the translation J. Ketfordu: «... A judgment on what the text on SL and the text on TL«have the same value» or that when translating there is «transfer of meaning», is deprived of the bases. Value, from our point of view, is property of a certain language. The text on SL matters, peculiar SL while the text on TL matters, peculiar TL; for example, the Russian text has the Russian value (just as also the Russian phonology or a graphology, grammar and lexicon), and the equivalent to it the English text has the English value».

Nevertheless we suppose that given by us translation definition nevertheless is higher is lawful. In favor of it is possible to adduce the following arguments:

1) In system of values of any language results of human experience that is knowledge by the person of objectively existing reality are imprinted. According to K. Marx and F. Engels, «neither thoughts, nor language form in itself a special kingdom..., they - only manifestations of the valid life»[21:449]. The system of language values reflects all outside world, and also its own inner world surrounding the person in any language, which is all practical experience of the collective speaking this language, is set. In that measure in what this experience it is identical at the collectives speaking different languages also the values expressed in these languages (values, but not language units expressing these values) are identical. As the reality surrounding different language collectives has much more common features, than distinctions so far as values of different languages coincide much more, than they disperse. Another thing is that these values (elementary units of sense or «semantic») are differently combined, grouped and expressed in different languages; but it already belongs not to the plan of contents, and to the plan of expression of language. Further we will give rather large number of examples of how values articulates differently, classifies and unite in different languages (on the example of Russian and English); however this phenomenon though it also very complicates translation process, doesn't undermine the principle of the translation at all, that is doesn't make impossible transfer of these values by means of other language.

3) The translation has been defined as process of transformation of the speech work in one language in speech above about in other language. Thus, the translator deals not with languages as systems, and with speech works, that is with texts. Those divergences in the semantic party, that is in values about which there is a speech

belong, first of all, to systems of different languages; in the speech these divergences are very often neutralized, erased, nullified.

When, speaking about a divergence of systems of values in different languages, try to prove by it the thesis about impossibility of transfer of SL values means of TL, usually give examples of the semantic discrepancies or separate words or, at best, isolated, taken out of a context of offers. However it must be kept in mind that for the translation equivalence of values not of separate words and even not isolated offers, but all text being translated (the speech work) in general in relation to all target text is essential. Concrete distribution of elementary units of sense («this» or «semantic components») is determined by separate words, phrases and offers of this text by numerous and difficult factors and, as a rule, doesn't coincide in the text on SL and the text on TL; but it besides belongs not to the plan of contents any more, and to the plan of expression and isn't violation of the principle of semantic equivalence of texts of the original and the translation at all. In confirmation of told we will give only two examples. The following offer occurs in the story of the famous English writer S. Maugham «A Casual Affair»:

He'd always been so spruce and smart; he was shabby and unwashed and wild-eyed.

This place is transferred in Russian translation so:

Before he was such dandy, such elegant. And now I wandered about streets of Singapore dirty, in tatters, with a feral look, (M. Litvinova Lane)

At first sight Russian text seems not quite equivalent to English: in him such words as before and now meet, I wandered about streets of Singapore which don't have direct compliances in the text of the original. Actually semantic equivalence is available here though there is no verbal equivalence, of course. The matter is that the Russian words before and now transfer here values which in the English text are put not into words, and grammatical forms: oppositions of forms of the verb be - (ha) of d been and was (on A. I. Smirnitsky's terminology, «the category of a temporary denotation» [22:189-310] expresses precedence of the first event to the second which in Russian is expressed lexically, by means of time adverbs. Words I wandered about streets of Singapore transfer semantic information which also contains in the source English text, but not in this offer, and in one of the previous offers (Not didn't keep the job in Sumatra long and he was back again in Singapore). So semantic equivalence is provided not between separate words and even not between separate offers here, and between all text on SL and all text on TL in general.

Other example: in the story of the American writer Harper Lee «That Kill a Mockingbird» is available the offer of Mr. Raymond sat up against the tree-trunk which is transferred in Russian translation as Mr. Raymond has sat down and has leaned against an oak. (N. Gal Lane and R. Oblonskaya) Besides can think that the Russian offer on the values expressed in him not quite corresponds to initial English: in him there are words and has leaned, absent the original; the English adverb of up specifies in sat up that the subject of a verb has come to a sitting position from lying (cf. sat down) while this information doesn't contain in the Russian offer; at last, the English tree-trunk means not an oak, but a tree trunk. However actually semantic

equivalence is available here, only for her establishment it is necessary to consider, first, lexical and grammatical transformations («translation transformations») taking place in translation process and, secondly, to be beyond this offer in wider context.

Russian had sat down and leaned corresponds to the English sat up against so far as one of values of a pretext against is value of contact with something or a support on something; that information which is transferred by the English up to sat up in the Russian translation is taken from the subsequent sentence- Earlier he lay on a grass; at last, a tree, to tory Raymond has leaned, it is mentioned in the previous context where it is specified that it is about an oak (cf. We chose the fattest live oak and we sat under it).

Semantic equivalence of texts on SL and on TL and in this case is established not at the level of separate words or even offers and at the level of all text in general.

So, semantic divergences between languages can't serve as an absolute obstacle for the translation of N force of that circumstance that the translation deals not with languages as abstract systems, and with concrete speech works (texts) within which the difficult interlacing and interaction of qualitatively diverse language means is carried out, being spokesmen of values - words, grammatical forms, syntactic and «plurisegmental» means and so forth, in the set transferring this or that semantic information. That semantic equivalence of texts of the original and the translation which we consider necessary a condition of implementation of translation process exists not between separate elements of these texts, and between texts in general, and in this text not only are admissible, but often and numerous regroupings, shifts and redistributions of separate semantic elements («translation transformations») are simply inevitable. When translating, so, the strict rule is the principle of submission of elements whole, the lowest units the highest in what we will have further an opportunity repeatedly to be convinced.

1) Told doesn't mean at all that in translation process absolutely full («absolute») transfer of all values expressed in the text of the original is always carried out. We already said that when translating semantic losses are inevitable and that the speech can go only about the greatest possible completeness of transfer of the values expressed by the text of the original. Doubts in a possibility of preservation when translating the values expressed in the text on SL is proved so far as it is about absolute identity of the expressed values. As, however, we impose requirement not of absolute, but the greatest possible completeness of transfer of values when translating with observance of what we call «order of sequence of transfer of values» so far as these doubts disappear.

As a matter of fact, on it consideration of a question of a possibility of transfer of the values expressed in the text on SL at his transfer to TL could be finished. However for final explanation of this problem («a convertibility problem») it is necessary to dispel one more doubt concerning a possibility of full and adequate transfer of the values expressed in one language, means of other language. A source of this doubt is the look - and it is more correct to tell, a prejudice according to which there is languages «developed», «civilized» and the languages «undeveloped», «primitive», «backward». From this point of view which is still occurring in narrow-

minded groups [R. A. Budagov. About a linguistics subject. «News of Academy of Sciences of the USSR», Series of literature and language, t. XXXI, issue 5, 1972)], those arguments which were adduced in advantage of convertibility are valid only in relation to the «developed» languages, but don't relate to languages «primitive» or «undeveloped» as these last, owing to «primitiveness», are incapable to express all those values which can be expressed by means of the developed «civilized» languages.

It is necessary to declare vehemently that the specified point of view in every respect is absolutely insolvent. Her political insolvency is obvious in the light of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine about equality of languages: «That not the Marxist», - V. I. Lenin wrote, - »that even not the democrat, who doesn't recognize and doesn't defend equality of the nations and languages»[23:125].

But this point of view is insolvent as well in purely linguistic relation. Having got acquainted with numerous «exotic» languages of natives of Africa, Australia, North and South America, linguists have come to a conclusion that all of them are characterized by rather «developed» grammatical system and rich dictionary structure. In one of languages known nowadays both live, and the dead, it wasn't succeeded to find any lines which it would be possible to consider with this or that share of persuasiveness indicators of «primitiveness» or «backwardness».

Really: we will think for a minute - in what the difference between «developed» and «undeveloped» can be shown languages? Specifics of any language are defined, first, by his sound (phonologic) system, secondly, grammatical system and, thirdly, dictionary structure. As for a sound system, to hardly anyone will come to mind to claim that there is a difference between a «primitive» and «civilized» sound system. Certainly, in many «exotic» languages there are sounds, unusual for us (for example, the so-called «clicking» or «soaking-up» sounds in Hottentotic and Bushman languages), but there are no bases to believe that these sounds in character are in any relation «primitive» or «uncivilized». So, the speech can go only about grammar and the dictionary. But also in the analysis of these aspects of structure of language of supporters of division of languages into «primitive» and «developed» expects disappointment. Many languages, really, have the peculiar, specific grammatical system which isn't keeping within schemes of Latin, Russian or English grammar, habitual for us. But unless it can form the basis to consider their grammatical system «primitive»?

From the fact that in many «exotic» languages there are no such grammatical categories as, say, time or number, doesn't follow at all that concepts of time or number are unusual for thinking of the people speaking these languages. The analysis of a system of these languages shows that all of them can express and really express any concepts including the most abstract, such as action time, quantity of objects and so forth; however these concepts are expressed in these languages not in the grammatical, but lexical way. To see in it some «primitiveness» of these languages it would be extremely naive. Languages of any grammatical system are able to express any thought and any concept - such is an unbiased fact which meanwhile nobody managed to disprove.

It is curious that when in «exotic» languages there is no this or that grammatical category, supporters of the theory of the «primitive» and «developed» languages see «diffusion», «indivisibility» of primitive thinking; when, on the contrary, in them this or that category unusual for the acquaintance for us is found (European, mainly) to languages, speak about insufficient «abstractness» of primitive thinking, his «inability» to distract from expression of these or those concrete values and relations. In other words, the same phenomenon in «the» languages is considered as an indicator of their development («abstractness» - it is good; «indivisibility» - too it is good), and in «primitive» - as the testimony of their backwardness («indivisibility» - it is bad; «excessive concreteness» - too it is bad). Certainly, all this has nothing the scientific argument if we are in advance convinced that our own language is the most perfect than others.

The same is found also in the analysis of dictionary structure of so-called «exotic» languages. The dictionary structure (lexicon) of language, as we know, imprints in the most direct and direct way and fixes data of human experience, which is that reality which is reflected in consciousness of the collective speaking the published language. Certainly, in languages of the parades which are at the lowest steps of social and cultural development are absent or such categories of lexicon as scientific, technical, political terminology, designations of abstract and philosophical concepts and him similar - for that obvious reason are extremely poorly submitted that the corresponding objects and concepts in general are absent in practical experience of the people belonging to these language collectives.

On the other hand, it is worth to remember also that such categories of lexicon as scientific, technical, abstract and philosophical terminology are absent in active and even in the passive dictionary at very many people speaking the so-called «developed» languages. The same treats also the different periods of history of the same language. Not only in languages of savages of New Guinea or the Central Africa, but also in Russian of times of Pushkin there are no such words as phone, radio, the TV, astronautics, the rationalizer, a socialist competition, cultural and many others, nowadays well-known to each Soviet school student. However will come to nobody to mind to claim that Russian in which Pushkin who was less «developed» and «civilized» spoke and wrote than modern Russian.

If to speak about the quantitative party, then in this regard the dictionary structure of so-called «primitive» languages in general doesn't give way to the dictionary of the languages «developed» at all because absence in the first scientific and technical and abstract terminology is compensated by wealth and a variety of lexicon connected with those areas of life and activity which are characteristic of human collectives - carriers of these languages. Languages of many uncivilized people are characterized by existence of a large number of the words and expressions relating to such spheres of human activity as hunting, fishery, agriculture; in them such words as names of various animals, plants, instruments of labor and so forth abound, many of which in general are unknown to the people speaking «civilized» languages. All talk on the people and languages in which dictionary there are allegedly only several honeycombs of words, - a continuous invention; though the

number of words in a lexicon even of one person and furthermore whole people to define with an accuracy extremely difficult, nevertheless we can claim quite definitely that in a quantitative sense between dictionary structure of the so-called «developed» and «primitive» languages there is no basic difference.

One more argument to which supporters of the theory of inequality of languages sometimes resort is the statement that in the dictionary of «undeveloped» languages words with narrow, concrete values allegedly abound and at the same time there are no words of the generalized, abstract value. Really, sometimes in so-called «exotic»

languages the phenomenon which, at first sight, confirms this situation is observed: so, in Bushman language, under the recognized professional[24:11], there is no verb with transfer value in general, but there is a large number of the words designating various ways of carrying - on the head, on a back, on a shoulder, on the end of the stick shouldered on hands, etc. However it is illegal to do on this basis the conclusion about «primitiveness» of this or that language: the same phenomenon, namely, big extent of differentiation of word meanings in one language in comparison with another is found also by comparison with each other of so-called «civilized» languages.

All of them convincingly say that the structure of dictionary structure (as well as grammatical structure) different languages is various, but not about «superiority» of one language over another at all. From the fact that in English there is no word with finger value at all, and there are differentiated names for 'a thumb on a hand' (thumb), 'all other fingers on a hand' (finger) and 'toe' (toe), it is impossible to make a conclusion about «backwardness» of English in comparison with Russian in any way. Besides when comparing «primitive» languages with «civilized» also the opposite phenomenon - not differentiation of a word meaning is so often observed; so, in the same Bushman language the same word designates not only meat, but also all edible wild animals in general. However, as we already know, it doesn't confuse at all adherents of the theory of the «developed» and «undeveloped» languages which in this case speak about «diffusion» of primitive thinking, following the same principle - «that it is good for the language and it is bad for the stranger». [25:26].

At last, sometimes the difference between languages «advanced» and «primitive» is seen that in the last allegedly there is no stylistic differentiation while existence of a large amount of the developed functional styles is characteristic of the first. But also this argument is illegal: in any language there is certain stylistic differentiation though, of course, not in all languages (and not during the entire periods of existence of the same language) the same functional styles are distinguished. So, in languages socially and culturally backward people there are no such styles, of course, as scientific, publicist and others, but in them, as a rule, stand out styles religious and mythological, folklore, colloquial and household and some other clearly. As soon as in this or that language scientific, political and other literature appears, in it immediately arises both the corresponding functional style and first of all the corresponding special terminology what we already spoke in relation to dictionary structure of language about.

One is undoubted: division of languages into «highest» and «lowest», «progressive» and «backward», «civilized» and «primitive» has on the being racist character what there were subjective views and intentions of the persons adhering to this point of view. In rather recent past this theory has received a peculiar refraction in the Soviet linguistics in the person of bad memory of the so-called «new doctrine about language» of the academician N.Y. Maher and his followers. If Marxist were right, then it would mean that upon transition from lower level of social development to higher also the system of language of these or those people would change. History of parades and languages of the USSR, however, has disproved in the most convincing way this vulgar-sociological concept. It is known that many people and tribes living in the territory of the former imperial Russia before revolution were at the level of a primitive-communal or patrimonial system from which they at once, passing a feudal and capitalist formation, have passed to socialism. However at the same time their languages remained in general the same, as before, without having undergone any special «high-quality» changes neither in the field of a grammatical system, nor in dictionary structure (in his main kernel). Certainly, their dictionary was replenished with a large number of the terms of scientific and technical, social and political and philosophical character (formed both due to loans, and of internal resources of these languages); but this process as it has been already told, happens continuously in any language. For years of the Soviet power extensive scientific and technical, social and political and philosophical literature has been translated into languages of once backward people of the USSR; however there were absolute obstacles for such translations anywhere and never. Thus, practice of language construction in the USSR has given the most evident denial of the concept of not convertibility in relation to the relation between so-called «primitive» and «advanced» languages, having shown full insolvency of the most such division of languages.

Presently not only to the linguists standing on Marxist positions, but also unscientific nature of division of languages on «developed» and «primitive» is clear to most of foreign scientists. Here, for example, that the famous American linguist of R. A. Hall speaks: «All researches which were conducted still in «primitive» languages have shown» that they have the same type of a structure and the same rich dictionary, as well as other languages... To put it briefly, at the present stage of human development there is no such thing as really «primitive» languages. Obviously, there was a stage at which the human speech has been much less developed than now, but this period took place at least several hundredthousand years ago and from him there is no trace left anywhere. All languages which speak now even languages of tribes of the American Indians, Africans and Australians, have reached in general same development steps...

Our own language, whether it be English, French, Italian or German and all other so-called «civilized» languages, are civilized only so far as those groups of people who speak these languages have done sufficient technical progress in certain areas to construct «civilization», that is more difficult culture. Many so-called «primitive» languages... have a grammatical system which symbolizes other and so

important distinctions in the world surrounding us, as a system of ours of «civilized languages». When one popular ezhenedelnik<sup>1</sup> has characterized Hindi as «rather primitive language which, unfortunately, lacks a scientific and technical vocabulary» his editors have simply found own ignorance and tendency to take on trust walking estimated judgments, which not the place neither in scientific, nor in the popular description of distinctions between languages»[26:469].

And here opinion of the American anthropologist prof. Richard Li who has lived long time among Bushmen: «Conditions of their life furnish the clue to understanding of last periods of history as problems which they face in the everyday life, the same which the primitive person could face. I have lived among them several years; have studied their way of life and their language. I have come to a conclusion that... they are just the same people as well as we and that their intellectual level isn't lower than ours at all... I believe, most of us will agree that creation of larger nuclear warheads brings nobody benefit. Concerning my own specialty I can claim that attempts to find a difference in mental capacities of representatives of different races won't lead to anything good»[text of an interview published in the Moscow News 2.X.1971 newspaper].

More clearly, apparently, it is impossible to be expressed.

So, we need to draw a conclusion: as opposition of the languages «developed» and «undeveloped» is scientifically insolvent as far as the principle of a basic possibility of the translation which is put forward by us («convertibility») on a basis

Transfer of the values expressed in one language, means of other language doesn't know restrictions and it is applicable to the relations between any two languages.

In the previous statement we have several times used the term «linguistic translation theory». In this regard there is a need to specify, first, on what basis the translation theory is among us linguistic disciplines; secondly, whether there are some other approaches to translation theory problems accept linguistic; thirdly, what place is taken by linguistic translation theory among other branches of science about language.

In translation process transformation of the text in one language (SL) in the text in other language (TL) is carried out when saving the invariable plan of contents, which is value or, more precisely, than set of the values expressed in the source text. To carry out the task, namely to reflect essential regularities of the translation, the translation theory has to establish first of all coincidence and divergences in ways of expression of identical values in SL and in TL and on this basis to reveal the most typical ways of overcoming these divergences («translation receptions»). Such task of the being you show linguistic, and the translation theory setting such task for itself can't be anything else as linguistic discipline.

It would be possible to object to it, at first sight, that the problem of establishment of coincidence and divergences in ways of expression of values in different languages enters competence not of translation theory, and comparative linguistics. Actually the translation theory is closely connected with comparative linguistics which forms for it direct theoretical base; and still the linguistic translation



theory isn't identical to comparative studying of languages. The comparative linguistics, as well as linguistics in general, deals with systems of languages - his functions include opening of lines of similarity and distinction between systems of two languages in the field of their sound (phonologic) system, dictionary structure and a grammatical system. Therefore for comparative linguistics (as well as for linguistics in general) essential is differentiation of levels of language hierarchy, that is reference of these or those units of language (or two compared languages) to a certain aspect or level of language system. The translation as it has been underlined above, deals not with systems of languages, and with concrete speech works, that is with texts. In the speech, as we know, stratification of language system on levels or aspects is overcome (morphological, syntactic, lexic-semantic and so forth); within the speech work difficult interaction and synthesis of qualitatively diverse means of expression of values is carried out.

So, if for linguistics in general and for comparative linguistics in particular the essential moment is differentiation of levels of language system, for translation theory, on the contrary, the most important is to consider and to compare the language phenomena in their communication, in that interaction in which they enter speeches, in structure coherent text [A. Shveytssarov. To a question of the analysis of the grammatical phenomena when translating. «Translator's notebooks», issue 1, M., 1963].

In this regard it should be noted that in modern linguistics in general the tendency to pass from studying of language as abstract system to studying of functioning of language into speeches is observed. This tendency is shown also in the increased interest in the problems of speech activity investigated in respect of psycholinguistics and in development of the subject connected with so-called «urgent syntax» and «communicative partitioning of the offer» that is imaginable only at the accounting of functioning of the offer in a system of the coherent speech, and, at last, in emergence of new branch of linguistics - «text linguistics»[27:197]. All these directions of studying of language are very closely connected with translation theory; it is possible even to claim that the linguistic translation theory is no other than «comparative linguistics of the text», that is comparative studying of semantic identical multilingual texts.

At the same time it is necessary to make the following explanation: strictly speaking, speech per se can't be a linguistics subject because it is always individual, single and unique, and any science can study only something the general, natural, typical and regularly reproduced. The speech serves for linguistics only as material from which it takes the object of a research, namely language [28:19]. If we say that in modern linguistics the tendency to studying of use and functioning of language in the speech is observed, then it means only shift in studying of the same object - language, expressed in an emphasis not on static, and on his dynamic party, not on approach to language as to stock of units, and on his studying in operation, in real functioning. It is possible to tell that the main objective of modern linguistics is creation of «the working model of language»[29:5-6], the model displaying dynamic aspect of the language considered in Humboldt's terms as «energy» (activity), but not

as «ergon» [30:91] (an activity product). On this way there is one of the main directions of modern linguistics - the so-called generating linguistics (in the United States, we have N. Chomsky's school in the Soviet Union applicative grammar and the similar directions).

Having defined translation theory as linguistic discipline, it is necessary to set its place among other branches of science about language. In the modern linguistics division into two primary partitions is accepted: micro linguistics and macro linguistic[31:81-82]. The first of these sections includes linguistics in the narrow sense of the word that is a language study, by words F. de Saussure, «in and for»[32:207], in derivation from the extra linguistic facts, as object, rather independent of other phenomena. Here such classical disciplines of a linguistic cycle as phonetics and phonology, grammar, a lexicology and semasiologiya<sup>5</sup>, considered in the plan as the general belong and private linguistics, both historically (in a diachronic), and the comparative-historical and comparative and typological study of languages is descriptive (in synchronism), and also.

To macro linguistics, that is to linguistics in a broad sense, those directions in linguistics which learn language in its communication with the extra linguistic phenomena, that is with the factors lying out of the language belong. Such disciplines as the psycholinguistics studying psychophysiological mechanisms of speech activities belong to their number; the sociolinguistics studying interaction of language and social factors; the ethno linguistics researching correlation of language and cultural and ethnographic factors; linguistic geography which subject is influence on language territorial factors; and some other directions in a language study.

In addition to the specified division of linguistics on micro and macro linguistics, there is also a division of linguistic disciplines on theoretical and application-oriented. As it was already noted in linguistic literature, the role of extra linguistic components of the speech act in disclosure of value of these or those elements of the text consists, first of all, in disambiguation (both lexical, and grammatical or structural) the language units used in this text and also in completion of those language text units which can be lowered as a result of the ellipsis caused situational terms. Generally speaking, any language has all means necessary fully and unambiguously to express any contents, without resorting to the help of extra language factors. In practice, however, it turns out that existence of these extra language factors is almost always taken into account both participants of the speech act, giving them the chance to eliminate all or many excess elements from the speech and by that to provide more economical use linguistic resources[33:1]. Full ignoring of extra language (situational) factors would lead to the fact that from the speech it should eliminate any ambiguity and «sender» would be forced to reveal completely and unambiguously through a language context the maintenance of all elements of the speech that inevitably would result in excessive speech redundancy, to unreasonable «swelling» of the speech work.

Really, existence in a speech situation of the certain elements helping to open unambiguously the maintenance of these or those language units gives the chance to lower (to subject to an ellipsis) those components of the text which value can be

taken from the most cash situation. So, the Russian (elliptic) offer is possible, taken itself but itself, out of any certain situation it is semantic incomplete. However, if this offer is said by the person standing on that side of the closed door, and his pronouncing is preceded by knock at a door, then this offer at once is unambiguously treated by us as I Can enter? In other situation the same offer will receive other interpretation. So, if he is said by the child, at the same time giving a hand to the apple lying on a table, then this offer will be interpreted differently, namely: I can eat this apple? The elements of the offer (word) lowered as a result of an ellipsis are restored on a situation, on the situation which is present at present, and only thanks to what both telling, and listening unambiguously perceive and interpret this situation, there is possible a phenomenon of an ellipsis, that is elimination from the text of language units superfluous in this situation.

In the same way in the conditions of a concrete situation there is also a disambiguation, that is disclosure meaning of the multiple-valued word or grammatical meaning of a multiple-valued syntactic design. Value of the many-valued word, generally speaking, reveals usually through a speech context, that is an intra-linguistic way; so, value of the English many-valued technical term tube (in Russian to it there can correspond 'pipe', 'tube', 'camera' (buses), 'electron tube', 'trunk' (tools), 'tube' (microscope) and some other) in a sentence of Such units that use a single tube for both functions are called transceivers single-digit is defined as the electron tube thanks to existence in the same sentence of other radio engineering term - the words transceivers, and also to existence of other terms from area of radio engineering in other sentences of the same text. However absence of a language context can be compensated also by existence of a certain extra linguistic situation: the same tube can be interpreted with very high probability as a radio tube in a sentence of Where did you put the tube?, if this last is said by the radio technician during an operating time in a workshop on radio equipment repair. In precisely the same way the English sentence of Passengers aren't allowed to ride on the platform, in view of (word platform polysemy, will be clear only if it is read on a cliché in bus [34:21] where platform is received at once by single-digit interpretation as a bus site.

Not smaller, and perhaps the large role in single-digit interpretation of the speech work is played by that extra linguistic information which participants (the speech act, that is their knowledge of the world around, or the facts of objectively existing reality have. Besides it is shown, first of all, in ability to correctly disclose value of many-valued units of language whether there is a speech about lexical or about grammatical meanings. English PEN in a sentence of John is in the PEN is understood by us as the shelter for the cattle, but not as the pen only that data sizes of objects are known to us and we know that the person can be in the shelter, but not in the pen. In the Russian sentence the Spring sun replaced summer - it much more generous a subject, despite the lack of explicit grammatical indices, is summer (sun), but it is only clear to us thanks to knowledge of that extra linguistic fact that the summer replaces spring, and not vice versa. The number of examples of this kind can be increased easily. So, we will consider the following sentences taken by us from Ch. Dickens's works:

That Rob had anything to do with his feeling as lonely as Robinson Crusoe. (Dombey and Son, Ch. XXXIX)

«Rome wasn't built in a day, ma'am... In a similar manner, ma'am,» said Bounderby, «I can wait, you know. If Romulus and Remus could wait, Josiah Bounderby can wait.» (Hard Tunes, Ch. X). «I don't wonder that you... are incredulous of the existence of such a man. But he who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage existed, and Judas Iscariot existed, and Castlereagh existed, and this man exists!» (Hard Times, Ch. IV)

«Open the door,» replied a man outside; «it's the officers from Bow Street, as was sent to, to-day.» (The Adventures of Oliver Twist, Ch. XXXI)

Any of these offers can't be completely understood if «recipient», that is the reader, has no certain data on the objects which are mentioned in them, persons and the phenomena, fictional or real. To understand the first offer, it is necessary to know why the name of Robinson Crusoe is associated with concept loneliness and for this purpose acquaintance to D. Defoe's novel «The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe», that is knowledge of the English classical literature is necessary. The understanding of the second of the provided offers requires knowledge of the one who were Romulo and Remo that is knowledge of history and mythology of ancient Rome. The third of the given examples is unclear if listening or reading it bible myths about Esau who has sold right of precedence for lentil soup and about Judas Iscariot who has betrayed Christ are unknown; to understand this offer, it is also necessary to know who such was Castlereagh and why his name is associated with a concept of bribability and treachery, that is knowledge of certain facts of the English history is necessary. At last, the last offer becomes clear only in case listening or reading it is known that the head police department was located on Bowe Street in London. To put it briefly, in all these (and many others) cases the understanding of sense of the offer is impossible without knowledge of any facts and the phenomena lying out of language that is without extra linguistic («encyclopedic») information.

This circumstance is essentially important for theory and practice of translation not only because the translator for understanding of the text being translated needs to have a certain stock of extra linguistic knowledge, but also considering the fact that the translator can't count at all that SL and TL carriers will have identical this knowledge necessary for understanding of the text. Just the opposite - and usual the situation at which the volume of extra linguistic information at SL and TL carriers doesn't coincide - much of what is known is normal and it is clear to readers or listeners of the text of the original, it is unknown and unclear for readers or listeners of the target text.

## II. TRANSLATION STANDARDS

The general translation theory includes both descriptive and standard (prescriptive) sections. While descriptive sections studies the translation as means of interlingual communication, observed phenomenon in standard sections of linguistics of the translation on the basis of theoretical studies of the translation formulates the practical recommendations submitted on optimization of translation process, simplification and improvement of quality of work of the interpreter and formulates methods of an assessment of the translations and a technique of training of future interpreters. V. N. Komissarov states that, practical recommendations to the interpreter and an assessment of the translation are interconnected. If the interpreter has to fulfill any requirements, then the assessment of results of his work is defined by that, how successfully he fulfilled these requirements. Everybody who evaluates the translation recognize that correct translation has to respond defined requirements. Sum of requirements imposed to translation quality is called translation norms

In standard sections of linguistics of the translation quality is defined by degree of its adequacy to translation norm and character of diversions from this norm.[35:227-228]

Results of translation process depends from degree of semantic proximity of the translation to an original, genre and stylistic accessory of texts of the original and the translation, the pragmatically factors influencing the choice of option of a translation, the requirement of standard use by the translator of target language, need to consider the common notions on the purposes and problems of translation activity divided by an society during a certain historical period. Proceed from this, V.N.Komissarov [35:229] suggests to distinguish five types of standard requirements, or norms of a translation:

1. Standard of equivalence of the translation;
2. Genre and stylistic translation norm;
3. Standard of the translation speech;
4. Pragmatically translation norm;
5. Conventional translation norm.

We will sort everyone these standard requirements separately.

The standard of equivalence of the translation means a requirement of perhaps bigger community of a subject-matter of the original and the translation, but only in the limits compatible to others standard requirements, providing adequacy of the translation. Perhaps big community of maintenance of an original and the translation is what it is necessary to aspire to. But this aspiration shouldn't put excessive pressure on an interpreter. After all, we should make sure, indispensable translation quality; it makes «good» translation, the adequacy of it. For achievement of adequacy of the translation taking into account pragmatically factors of which it was talked in appropriate section the interpreter is forced to recede from full, exhaust information transfer, that is forced to endow some part of maintenance of an original. If the greatest possible semantic proximity isn't obligatory for successful interlingual communication, then the translation is considered accepted even if the relations of

equivalence sets not at optimum level. Another matter if the translation admits nonequivalent, mistranslate contents of the original at least at the lowest level. In this case, V. N. Komissarov definition, violation of standard of equivalence is absolute, and the translation is evaluated as low-quality translation [35:229].

It's possible to define a genre and stylistic norms of the translation as the requirement of compliance of a translation of proponent function and stylistic particularity of a text type to which the translation belongs. It should be noted that the choice of this kind is defined by character of the original, and stylistic requirements to which has to answer translation are standard edited, the characterizing texts of similar type in target language. The genre-stylistic norm in many respects determines both the necessary level of equivalence, and proponentfunctions [35:229]. In other words, in a translation process the translator creates the text of the same type, as the original. If the original represents the technical text, then and the translation will have all signs of the technical text. At the same time it is necessary to consider the fact that in the requirementsSL and TL shown to texts of the same type cannot coincide. For example, language of the English press was always considered as less official, than language of the Russian-language press (however, these distinctions became not so recently). In the English-language press headings of articles, as a rule, are under construction in the form of the two-member offer, and in the Russian press — as the homogeneous offer. Translating from one language on other similar materials, the translator has to build the target text as it is accepted in target language.

Respectively, estimating translation quality, it is necessary to consider genre and stylistic independence of the original and a condition of implementation of the translation, which is a type of the translation. To translate of written texts other requirements, than are imposed to the translation of oral. But also written texts are various. The translation official document is evaluated not as the translation of the art text. In the first case the main criterion — degree of accuracy of transfer of the information stock, in the second — literary advantages. But even at an assessment of literary translations critics carry out distinctions between literatures.

V. N. Komissarov notes, «Would be essentially incorrect use identical criteria for an assessment of the translation of the fiction and the highly artistic literature work...»[35:230]. Evaluating results of interpretation, critics convert attention, on whether the general meaning of an original expression is conveyed. And here some transgression of usage and norms of target language in an interpretation is considered quite admissible, especially if it is about the simultaneous interpretation.

For any translated text are mandatory a rules of a norm and usage of TL. At the same time it is necessary to consider that translated texts are secondary; their orientation selects such texts among other speech works in the same language for the foreign-language original. Set of translated texts of any language makes the special variety of this language crossing its functional styles and other varieties. The Orientation on the original inevitably modifies the nature of use of language means, of a language norm and especially usage. The contact of two languages inevitably carries to the relative likening of language means. Many words and phrases are significant at first for language of the translations, and only then they penetrate into

language of original works. Such combinations as «to make initiatives», «reduction of military opposition», etc. appeared originally in translations with English language. The foreign-language origin is guessed and in the phrase «Education shall help Russia to respond on the calls standing before, it in social and economic spheres» (from «The strategy of a reforming of education»). All these examples evident about extension of norms of the Russian speech in language translations. Thus, the norm of the translation speech can be defined as the requirement to follow rules of a norm and usage of SL taking into account usual peculiarity of translated texts on it language [35:231].

The pragmatically translation norm can be define as the requirement of support of pragmatically value of the translation. The aspiration to carry out the specific pragmatically task is the some kind of super function subordinating all remaining aspects translation norms [35:231]. Solving a similar task, the translator can refuse the greatest possible equivalence, translate the original only partially, change genre accessory of the text when translating, and reproduce some formal features of the original, breaking a rules of a norm and usage of TL, to replace the translation retelling or the paper.

It is necessary to consider that in language collective at a certain stage of historical development can exist strictly certain views of the purposes and tasks of the translation. So, at a turn of the 18-19th centuries «inducement on our customs», that is Russification of the text in translation, was considered as quite regular practice, that is was a norm. In France the 18th century translators aimed «to improve» the original, to bring closer it to requirements «good taste». Further in relation to the translation other approaches began to be used.

It shows that in any historical period in society there is a certain «conventional norm». In relation to a present stage a development of society the conventional translation norm can be defined as the requirement of the maximum closeness of the translation to the original, its ability to fully replace the original as in general, and in details, carrying out tasks for the sake of which the translation was accomplished[35:232]

On the practical level between separate normal of the translation there is a creation hierarchy. First of all, the translation shall have pragmatic value, and it means that the leading translation norm is pragmatically norm. Further. The nature of actions of the translator substantially is defined stylistic genre by accessory of the text of the original. Therefore a genre and stylistic norm — next on the significance. The genre and stylistic norm defines a speech type selection in translation that allows delivering a norm of the translation speech on the third place.

The conventional translation norm which defines ways the translator to the operation is following on the significance. The finite normative requirement — an equivalence norm. These rules are respected on condition of respect for all remaining aspects of a translation norm. On V. N. Komissarov's confirmation, «observance of all normative rules, except an equivalence norm, has more general character and is something self-evident, and the correctness level to the original is that variable most

of which determines the level of professional qualification of the translator and an assessment of quality of each separate translation» [35:233].

The classification of translation norms offered already known to us Gideon Touri is of estimate interest. In its judgment, the translator's conclusion in translation process can determine by three factors: the mandatory rules imposed by language norms, translating norms, which is the main decisions of the translator defining his strategy and a behavior and a subjective choice (idiosyncrasies). In these triad translation norm stakes central position between objective and subjective [36:128].

G. Touri distinguishes preliminary and operational norms. Preliminary norms define policy of the translator at the choice of the original and at the solution of a question whether there will be a translation realize directly from the original or through some intermediate language. The similar translation policy exists already because the choice of an original is carried out not randomly [37:58]. Operation norms work in the translation process and define distribution of language materials in the text (matrix norms) and a formulation of contents of the text (textual norms). Textual norms can be the general, that is use to all translations, and private, that is use only to certain types of texts or to certain type's translation [37:59]. Also refers to operational norms of G. Touri already called «initial norm» (preliminary norm). It is basic orientation of the translator to the original or to norms of TL. In the first case the translator will strives to create adequate translation (we will notice that the concept «adequacy» of G. Touri puts other sense) as it is possible closer corresponding to an original and allowing only necessary changes caused by distinctions between languages and literature. In the second case in the center of his attention providing the maximum acceptability of the target text from the point of view of language and literature of TL. Actually in real translations something is created between these two extreme aspects. [36:128]

Norms can be also main (committed) and minor, shown in a look tendencies and defining only an admissible supplying. Besides, G. Touri allocates also various universal behavior of the translator. In an illustration quality he points to tendency of translators to explicate information which implicitly contains in the original.

In conclusion we will note that an assessment of quality of a translation the procedure complex. It also taking into account translation norms, more precisely, than a level of compliance of the translation to requirements imposed to him and from the point of view of success of an accomplishment by the target text of functions inherent in him. At the same time some researchers insist on considerable specification of operations, the realize at a translation quality assessment. It is offered to estimate also translation quality of words and phrase, both translation quality of statements, and quality of transfer of elements of an expression and stylistic features of the original, and force of influence of all translated text in comparison with original [38:60] It is represented, as in this case the speech first of all goes about compliance of the translation to standard of equivalence and pragmatically translation norm or — in other terminological and conceptual system — about degree of equivalence and achievement of adequacy. Therefore, the criteria for evaluation of translation quality considered in combination with standard requirements let it in



quite exhaustive way to evaluate the translation. And therefore it is hardly possible to agree with opinions of Anthony G. Hettinger who wrote: «How difficulties of the translation were big, difficulties of an assessment of translation quality aren't less difficult. For now in this questions everyone to the judge»[38:61]

## **2.1 Types of interlingual transformations**

The subject of translation transformations (or transformations) is in the center of attention and domestic and foreign translator, but between scientists still there is no consensus that is translation transformation. The domestic theory of translation focuses attention on translation transformations (transformations or methods), foreign – on translation receptions to which a translation dung and notes belong.

Before analyzing a role of translation transformations in process of conversion of stories of D. G. Lawrence, we will consider definitions of it I rubbed a mine, offered by the leading Veda (V. N. Komissarov, L. S. Barkhudarov, Ya. I. Retsker, A. D. Schweitzer and others). So, according to L. S. Barkhudarov, translation transformations are various interlingual transformations which are carried out for achievement of translation equivalence of the translation [39:190]. Ya. I. Retsker calls transformations receptions of logical thinking by means of which the translator discloses value of the foreign-language word in a context and finds to him the Russian compliance which isn't coinciding with dictionary (lexical transformations) and transformations of sentence structure in translation process according to standards of the translating language (grammatical transformations). A. D. Schweitzer believes that the term «transformation» is used in theory of translation in metaphorical sense and calls transformation «transformation» [40:118].

Speaking about translation transformations, it should be noted lack of uniform system of classification of transformations when translating. Ya. I. Retsker, L. S. Barkhudarov, V. N. Komissarov, A. D. Schweitzer, A. M. Fiterman, T. R. Levitskaya and others offer various divisions of translation transformations from which they distinguish: 1) shifts, 2) replacements, 3) additions, 4) ommissions [9].

Russian the writer Veda Z. D. Lvovskaya considers that «between different types of transformations there is no blank wall, the same transformations can sometimes represent a disputable case, they can be carried to different types» [10]. The author of the textbook «Transfer and Cross-cultural Communication» Alexander Burak doesn't subdivide transformation on grammatical, lexical and stylistic, and allocates twelve most general transformations in translation process which are used by each translator: 1) omission (omission), 2) addition (addition), 3) change of a word order (transposition), 4) change of grammatical forms (change of grammatical forms), 5) compensation of semantic losses (less - of - meaning compensation), 6) a specification (concretization), 7) generalization (or generalization) (generalization), 8) the antonymictranslation (antonymic translation), 9) semantic development (meaning extinction or sense development), 10) the metonymic translation

(metonymic translation), 11) combination of offers (sentence integration), 12) partitioning of offers (sentence fragmentation)[41:49].

When performing any translation, and in our case it is about the literary translation, the translator needs to reproduce numerous transformations for the most exact transfer of the contents of the text of the original in target language.

As illustrative material, we will give a number of both lexical, and grammatical transformations from some stories of the English writer D. G. Lawrence («The groom for emergency», «Days i nuke to spring», «Stumble») translated to Ukrainian by the author of this report [3; 4]. So, in offers: «He gave his luggage to a porter» – «It has given baggage to the porter» (the possessive pronoun of «his») [42:55]; «He had forgotten he was tired» – «It has forgotten about fatigue»[42:56] by us has used lexical transformation «omission». Sometimes omission is used owing to lack of need of the translation of each word for the English offer because of redundancy of information in Russian. Such transformation as addition is observed in the following offers: «Oh, and this is Friday evening, and Winifred is coming just as she used to – how long ago?»[42:58] – «Oh, today Friday evening, and as always how long «she comes?»»; «nor I you don't have No –» – «, and I didn't expect you to see»[42:59]; «One goes on – remains in office, so to speak ...» – «to someone is pleasant to spend time as if it works at office»[42:62]. This reception of transformation is used because «compression» is peculiar to English [43:98]. The English text consists generally of short offers and the use of short words and the compressed designs is peculiar to British.

For achievement of adequacy of the translated text, the analyzed stories of the writer, translation reception «specification» is used. The specification is such lexical transformation as a result of which the word (term) of wide semantics in the original is replaced with the word (term) of narrow semantics [44:300]. Such way of the translation is applied when words with «indistinct» value, for example, to thing are translated, to matter, affair, unit, challenge, range, claim, concern, to go, to get, to come, to leave, to let, to be and others. We will give examples. «She let Coutts into a small, very warm room that had a dark, foreign sheen, owing to the black of the curtains and hangings covered thick with glistening Indian embroidery and to the sleekness of some Indian ware.» – «She has led Kutts to the small, but cozy room which had an unusual appearance, thanking we blacken to curtains and curtains which have been covered with a thick layer of a brilliant Indian embroidery and luster of smooth Indian ceramic figures»<sup>42</sup>[42:56]. In this example – «to resolve» the verb «let» it is replaced with narrower contextual value, the verb «see off», the word «owing» is translated to value « thanks to», the word meaning of «ware» – «goods, products» – is translated to narrower – «pottery, figures».

In the following example: «The tone of his question had a challenging twang» – «Tone to what he has asked a question was provocatively unpleasant»[42:279]. The word «challenge» has many values at the translation into Russian, but in this context is translated as «defiant». «The path through the wood, on the very brow of a slope, ran winding easily for a time» – «A footpath lasted through the wood, coiling, even to the top of a slope»[42:279]. In this example the verb «run» – «to run, run» has

narrower value «last, coil». We will pay attention that in this offers not only the specification, as well as lexical transformation - «addition» is used. When translating, at the beginning of the offer we have added the word which wasn't in the original – «lasted», thereby without having changed sense of the offer of the original. According to domestic the Veda V. I. Karaban an essence of transformation of addition of the word consists in «introduction to the translation of lexical elements which are absent in the original, for the purpose of the correct transfer of sense of the sentence (original) which is translated, and/or respect for speech and language norms which exist in culture of target language»[44:308-309]. In our opinion, in the course of work on the translation, often used transformation is a change of a word order. It is known that in English, unlike Russian, the word order – fixed and semantic shades are expressed by other means. For example, «There was silence» – «Has come silence»; «... for a long time neither spoke» – «... both long were silent»[42:294]. Neither the word «neither» has negative value and is translated as – neither that nor another, any, nobody (from two). Thus, in this example also such reception as «contextual replacement», namely the antonymic translation when it is necessary to replace a negative design on affirmative and vice versa is traced. Such transformation as change of grammatical forms, (the English passive design), is replaced with an active Russian design: «Frances was peculiar for these great, exposed looks, which disconcerted people by their violence and their suddenness» – «This lingering, open look was peculiar to Frances, he disturbed people»[42:293]; «It's got to be killed» – «Need to kill it»[42:296]; «I suppose they have to be killed» – «I think that they should be killed» [42:297]. As we see, in the given examples, it isn't always possible to track application only one, the so-called and often used Veda of «pure» transformation. Translation transformations can be used at the same time, being combined with each other.

We will note that for adequate translation of texts, us have been used, both lexical, and grammatical transformations. It is necessary to emphasize that in translation process, translation transformations in pure form are present, but after all they have complex character, we observe their combination.

Thus, for the most right or adequate translation, the translator should use different types of translation receptions, and often the whole complex of transformations as they perform special function: they are productive from the point of view of generation of translation discrepancies.

For achievement of adequacy when translating from one tongue on other translator uses tongue means of other tongue on which the translation, both the corresponding receptions and methods becomes. Lexical, grammatical, stylistic and different distinctions of original language and target language cause need of various transformations (replacements) when translating. Are the most widespread: lexical, grammatical and stylistic transformations.

#### 1. The lexical transformations used when translating

In each tongue there is the lexical system including a lexicon of this tongue. Each word, that is a lexical unit, isn't something isolated, and is a part of lexical system of tongue. Each word bears a certain concept and can be more common in one

tongue and have narrower or even terminological value in another. It is possible to carry international words in the Russian, English and French tongues to such words. For example, word «debate», dispute (English) and dispute (Fr.). In English the first dictionary and alternative value completely coincides with Russian:

The third reason causing the necessity in lexical transformations is distinction in word compatibility. What is possible in one language can be unacceptable in another.

In each language there is a habitual use of the word, peculiar clichés are developed (standard models of word usage, standard schemes of phrases and syntactic designs, and also the general models of speech behavior in concrete situations), as if the ready formulas, words and combinations of words used speaking this language. They aren't phraseological units, but have completeness. These combinations aren't broken at introduction to them of additional words.

In the book «Translation Theory and Translation Practice» of Y.I. Retsker writes: «... Though it isn't always possible to classify accurately an every example of the translation because of an interlacing of categories, generally it is possible to allocate seven kinds of lexical transformations:

- 1) Differentiation of values;
- 2) Specification of values;
- 3) Generalization of values;
- 4) Semantic development;
- 5) Antonymic translation;
- 6) complete transformation;
- 7) Compensation of losses in translation process.

Quite often separate methods of transformations are combined; especially it is characteristic of the first two categories.

The differentiation, specification and generalization used when translating.

Broad application of methods of differentiation and specification when translating from English into Russian has talk abundance in English of words with wide semantics, which there is no direct compliance in Russian. So, at a translation from English of such words as meal, drink, walk in an addition from a context can be required a specification or differentiation of a concept of the word meal - a breakfast, a lunch, a dinner, and drink - whisky, with narrowing of a concept depending on a context, walk - walk, a way, a walk etc. «... Differentiation without specification is possible when it is necessary to transfer value of a wide abstract concept without its specification in the translation. It is wrong to concretize what is intentionally veiled in the original»[45:41]

Differentiation of values

Many words with wide semantics in the English and French languages have no complete compliance in Russian. Dictionaries not molut to pledge complete semantics words of a foreign language. Ya. I. Retsker gives an example with determination of ruthless which can be used as undifferentiated. He says that in such cases and in translation it remains the simple amplifier, without specification and gives the following example. Describing the efforts of newspapers of Hurst and Pulitzer directed to initiation of war with Spain from - for Cuba, the author of «Social

history of the USA» Fernes calls this campaign the orgasmic acme [‘aekmi] (the Greek highest point), of ruth-less (ruth [ru0] - pity) newspaper jingoism (chauvinism) where ruth-less, of course, has no dictionary value ruthless. At the same time orgasmic acme will also demand transfer-

Motion, most likely reception of integral conversion, in result of what we will receive in translation: bacchanalia of extreme newspaper chauvinism. In this example differentiation is used without specification. Very often reception of differentiation is used for transmission of words, the phenomena and processes which aren't transferred thus in other language.

The bolted racks (English), Les rayons boulonnées (Fr.) - Shelves, bolted.

The participle «rally» is used very seldom.

Specification of values

The big specification, than to the appropriate lexical units of English or French is peculiar to lexicon of Russian. The specification is always followed by a differentiation and is impossible without it. We will take for an example the English floor meal - acceptance of food, food. In case of the translation of the phrase of have you had your meal? The translator should concretization the word meal depending on time: You have already breakfast? (Have dinner, have supper?) Specifications are exposed such words as: to go, to get, to come, to say, bad, nice, good, fine, thing, side (English); aller, manger, vider (Fr.), etc.

«... The noun of student which in English is used in value the student, the pupil, scientific (PORPOISE) can be a bright example of the undifferentiated use of words with wide semantics. However in translation into Russian the value specification is often necessary. Preparation for college in the United States involves a succession of choices. The student doesn't have to make a choice at an early age as to whether or not he will go to college.

Here student, of course, not «student», but pupil of high school.... The context doesn't give the chance to confuse the scientist or the student with the school student.

Any lexical transformation demands from the translator of sense of proportion and thorough knowledge of the text being translated and the related situation.» \*

Value generalization

Reception of generalization of values is opposite to methods of differentiation and a specification. It consists in replacement private the general, a specific concept patrimonial.

The necessity of generalization can be caused by the stylistic norms accepted in Russian and literature. In Russian it isn't accepted to specify the exact growth and weight of characters therefore when translating generalization is used in works of art: high, average or low height. Generalizations are exposed such words as arm and hand - a hand, foot and leg - a leg etc. In the book «Translation Theory and Translation Practice» Ya. I. Retsker writes: «The necessity of generalization can be caused also by danger of distortion of meaning at the translation of the word or phrase its dictionary compliance. So, during a number of years the English parliament discussed the bill of abolition of the death penalty. The English newspapers steadily called it No Hanging Bill. But the bill of hanging cancellation most likely would be understood as

replacement of one way of an execution with another, for example, by execution. Only in this case the generalizing translation is correct: Bill of abolition of the death penalty».

The same word can be exposed to differentiation (a value narrowing) and generalization (expansion) of value. For a rendering of the same contents by means of other language quite often doesn't matter what form of the word will be expressed this contents. «The subject can be replaced with his sign, process by a subject, a sign a subject or process and in t. e....

We will consider the following newspaper phrase: The Liverpool by-election was an acid test for the Labour candidate. Hardly is it possible to translate: A by-election in Liverpool was test candidate of the Labour Party. Obviously, process to replace him with attribute - a litmus piece of paper, in accordance with standard of Russian»[45:45] (Ya. I. Retsker. Page 45). Along with differentiation, a specification and generalization when translating also other receptions, such as reception of full transformation and compensation, the antonymic translation are used.

#### Antonymic translation

Reception of the antonymic translation represents replacement of any concept expressed in the original, an opposite concept in translation from corresponding by reorganization of all statement for saving the invariable plan of contents.

Use of an opposite concept of the translation provides replacement of the affirmative offer with negative and negative - affirmative.

Don't stop moving! (English) - Continue the movement!

Priere de se faire annoncer! (Fr.) Without report not to enter!

The Antonymic translation is used quite often when translating proverbs and sayings.

No man is wise at all times (English). Il n'y a pas de sage qui ne fasse rage, (Fr. Even a wise man stumbles.

A word spoken is past recalling (English). Parole jetee prend sa volee (Fr.). A word spoken is past recalling.

In the first case the negative offer is replaced with affirmative, and in the second - positive is replaced with negative.

The great value to the antonymic translation was attached by K. I. Chukovsky. In the book «High Art» he gives a number of the English proverbs translated antonymic:

Let the sleeping dog lie. - Awake with He dashing while sleeps quietly.

Every cloud has a silver lining. There's no evil without good. Antonymic translates sentences of type:

She reads a little. - She doesn't read much, (English) Elle ne lit pas beaucoup (Fr.)\*

Some dictionary compliances can be antonymic. Such combinations as to keep off, to keep out are translated into antonymic Russian: not to come nearer, not to allow etc.

The Antonymic translation can be the only possibility of the correct transfer of a thought when the direct translation leads to absurdity.

No sooner had he arrived than he fell ill. - Hardly he has managed to arrive as I have got sick.

We had no end of good time. - We have excellently spent time.

No flies on him. - You won't carry out it (the LEOPARD, page 508).

At the antonymic translation the dictionary of synonyms or the English explanatory dictionary containing synonyms and synonymic phrases can give essential help.

The antonymic translation can be as a result not only lexical, but also grammatical transformation if the translation is considered from the point of view of grammar. The translation (or adaptation) is the action which always is carried out consciously, and mediation, carried out by means of decisions or preferences which eventually become methods or procedures.

Georges Bastin

The role of adaptation and others not «quite» translation the practical in translation infrequently becomes a subject of the serious analysis of theory of translation. It is even less works in which adaptation appears the main object of a research. In this article we will remember that we spoke about adaptation of classics of the Soviet theory of translation, and also we will analyses that new the researchers of the translation working in Russia and in other countries of the former Soviet Union today speak about her.

As the Ukrainian researcher V. V. Demetskaya fairly notes, in theory of translation of adaptation «the modest part of the stepdaughter» is assigned [46:107]. The low status of adaptation is recorded also in the modern dictionary of translation terms L.L. Nelyubin [2] in whom adaptation is defined as follows:

1. Reception for creation of compliances by change of the described situation with the purpose of achievement of identical influence on a receptor.

2. Adaptation is understood as usually various text processing: simplification of his contents and a form, and also reduction of the text for his device for perception by readers who aren't prepared for acquaintance to him in his original look.

3. The text device for not enough prepared readers. For example, «simplification» of the text of the literary and art work for beginners to learn foreign languages. [2, with. 12-13]

The last two points of this definition precisely reflect traditionally skeptical if not negative, the relation to this «reception» – not deserving serious studying – in works of most of classics of the Soviet theory of translation.

In the known work of «Fundamentals of the general translation theory» [3] A. V. Fedorov completely exclude adaptation from all types of translation activity:

At all originality of requirements imposed on the translator by this or that type of the translated material at all difference in degree of endowments and a creative initiative, in the volume and character of the data necessary otherwise, for all types of this activity by the general two provisions are:

- 1) The translation purpose — as it is possible to acquaint closer the reader (or the listener) who isn't knowing SL with this text (or the content of oral speech);

2) To translate — means to express truly and fully means of one language what is already expressed by means of other language earlier. (In fidelity and completeness of transfer — difference actually the translation from alteration, from retelling or the reduced statement, from any so-called «adaptations»). [3, with. 15]

R. K. Minyar-Beloruchev develops Fedorov's position about incompatibility of «any so-called adaptations» with the translation, claiming that when translating there is «a transfer of the message and any adaptations transfer not the message, but the general contents of the speech work, i.e. in abbreviated form state, remake, and retell the message». [4, with. 36]. Ya. I. Retsker in «The theory and the translation and translation practice» [5] avoids the term «adaptation» at all, being limited to single use of the term «retelling». But also in his definition of problems of the translation we hear echoes of the above-stated statements:

The translator's task – to tell by means of other language completely and precisely contents of the original, having kept his stylistic and expressional features. In other words, unlike retelling, the translation has to tell not only what is expressed by the original, but also as it is expressed in him. This requirement belongs as to all translation of this text in general, and to his separate parts. [5, with. 10]

L. S. Barkhudarov, including the translation by «interlingual transformation» [6, page 6], reduces all types of transformations (transformations) to «four elementary types»:

1. Shifts;
2. Replacements;
3. Additions;
4. Omissions. [6, with. 190]

As we see, to neither adaptation, nor even retelling wasn't in this list of the place.

For the first time adaptation, retelling, the reduced statement and other «not translation» kinds of activity really come into the view of the Soviet theorists of the translation only after publications of the end of the 1970th years of the Leipzig researcher Otto Kada in which works the concept Sprachmittlung has appeared (see, e.g. [7] – [10]).

L. K. Latyshev defines language mediation as «communication of multilingual communicants by means of the language intermediary knowing two languages». At the same time, as the author notes, «the concept language mediation is wider than a concept of the translation: the translation is only one of his types». He refers to other types of language mediation retelling, the reduced translation and certain «hybrid» forms, noting that fact that «language mediation in all his real manifestations is studied obviously not enough» [7, page 8-9].

V. S. Vinogradov who refers to language mediation «both transfer, and summarizing, and retelling, and other adapted transpositions» agrees with Latyshev. [8, page 5]

In his «Translation theory» [9] the concept «adaptation» occurs at the language mediation of A. D. Schweitzer accepting the idea repeatedly, however, mainly, in the context of critical evaluation of the existing theories of foreign authors. So,



discussing model of translation process to Kada, Schweitzer claims that in the course of changes which are observed in the final text in comparison with the source text the happening «readdressing of the text to other recipient can't but influence his communicative purpose» which is definitely modified. However he notes at the same time that such «modification is admissible only in the known limits»:

The speech can go only about adaptation of author's intension to other communicative conditions, but not about her radical revision which is absolutely inadmissible at least owing to representative mission of the translation. [9, page 73] Full adaptation to standards of other culture, Schweitzer claims, it is impossible owing to «biculturalism» of the target text which «adapting to culture receptor, never completely breaks off with initial culture». [9, page 61]

However from all authoritative figures of the late Soviet and Post-Soviet theory of translation the subject of adaptation has received more or less system lighting, perhaps, only at V. N. Komissarov.

The translation, according to Komissarov, is «a type of language mediation which is entirely focused on the foreign-language original», and «a foreign-language form of existence of the message which is contained in the original» [10, page 43]. However «as the language intermediary the translator can make not only a transfer, but also different types of so-called «adaptive transcoding» which he defines as follows:

Adaptive transcoding is a type of language mediation at which there is not only a transcoding (transfer) of information from one language on another (that takes place and when translating), but also her transformation (adaptation) with the purpose to state her in other form determined not by the organization of this information in the original, and a singular problem of interlingual communication. Specifics of adaptive transcoding are defined by orientation of language mediation to specific group of Receptors of the translation or to the set form of transformation of information which is contained in the original. [10, page 48]

At the same time, the author created as a result of such transformation (adaptation) the text «claims it isn't intended for full replacement of the original», and still «the translation is a main type of language mediation». Adaptive transcoding of the original has «Para translation character and it can be presented as association of two consecutive transformations: transfer and the set adaptation of the target text». [10, page 48]

Komissarov refers the reduced transfer and the adapted translation to main types of adaptive transcoding. And if the first «consists in omission when translating separate parts of the original for moral, political or other reasons of practical character», then the second in a partial explication (simplification and the explanation) of structure and contents of the original in translation process with the purpose to make the target text to the separate groups of Receptors, available to perception, which don't have sufficient knowledge and professional or life experience which are required for full-fledged understanding of the original. [10, page 49]

This definition of the adapted translation, as well as the examples of adaptation given by the author (the translation of the «adult» text for youth and the difficult

scientific text for non-professionals) [10, page 49], send us to dictionary definition in [2] which we gave in the beginning of article. But Komissarov speaks about two types of adaptation which, on all signs, don't imply that on the intellectual or professional grade the reader of the original exceeds the reader of the adapted translation. It is stylistic adaptation and transcription.

Stylistic adaptation, according to Komissarov, is applied when «some features are found only in one of languages», and then «specific means of presentation in the original are replaced with the language means meeting the requirements of this style in TL». [10, page 127]

Transcription is defined by it as one of varieties of the adapted transcoding, «the desirable effect oriented on achievement» (for example, the advertising translation):

Change of the addressee requires use of absolutely other arguments and different ways of belief that it is connected to essential changes by transmission of structure and content of advertising. An extreme case of similar adaptation is creation on TL of the parallel text of advertising (co-writing) connected to the original only unity of the advertised goods and the general pragmatically task – to induce buyers to acquire these goods. [10, page 50]

Thus, transcription is beyond «the translation as process of creation of the text, communicatively equivalent to the original» [10, page 221], but, as well as some other types «Para translation» the practical, described by Komissarov, can be executed by the translator in translation process [10, page 225].

The analysis of theoretical operations of the Russian authors who succeeded classics of the late Soviet period shows, as they have relations between transfer and adaptation, the concept of language mediation which is going back to Otto Kada generally defines.

I. S. Alekseeva treats those famous experts who don't use this concept, for example. She mentions language mediation in the textbook «Introduction to Theory of Translation» [11] only once. It refers adaptation to category «text processing when translating» in which also includes stylistic processing, authorized translation and a co-authorship, the selective translation and the summarizing translation [11, page 23-26].

However in the majority of the modern textbooks on the translation the traditional approaches which are guided by the concept of language mediation are replicated (see, for example, [12], and [13]). In line with classical tradition also V. V. Sdobnikov and O. V. Petrova's popular book «Translation theory» is written [14].

So, we find simple merge of typology of Komissarov and Latyshev in their description of the adapted transcoding [14, page 103-105]. Transcription, as well as at Komissarov, is discussed by authors separately; after it they select in transcription such elements as an explicating, omission, generalization and a specification, marking at the same time that «these methods of transcription don't assume the considerable change of maintenance of an expression in the translation» [14, page 163-168]. Questions of national and cultural and chronological adaptation of art texts are especially considered by authors. As, by their own recognition, «no theoretical problem specific to the literary translation, at the same time arises» [15, page 391-

392], it isn't really clear why this type of adaptation couldn't find the place in typology of adaptive transcoding or, say, transcription.

Nevertheless works in which traditional views of model of language mediation and, respectively, for an adaptation role in her, begin to be reconsidered meet.

In this regard, small article of the researcher from Kazakhstan R. Z. Zagidullin with the characteristic name «Criticism of the Concept of the Translation as Type of Language Mediation» [16] deserves attention.

Zagidullin criticizes one of the central elements of the traditional concept of language mediation – division of process of transformation in actually «translation» and «adaptive transcoding»; he doesn't agree and that «the concept «translation» covers all types of language mediation, including adequate translations so-called volitive (abstract, segment, aspect, etc.)». [16, page 24]

Zagidullin considers by Basic Element of the translation transformation of information in the course of communication:

Any texts on TL (including and full translations of the original) are created as a result of transformations of information, reduction and adaptation (i.e. adaptive transcoding» in a varying degree); at the same time even the selective translation ... can be for the communicant equivalent according to contents to the text of the original. [16, page 27]

Therefore, the author believes, the concept of language mediation is narrow as the translator «quite often performs communicative functions – the informant, editors or the critic of the original», – that, according to Komissarov, is beyond this concept. [16, page 27]

On the basis of reflections about the tasks of the translator which are beyond traditional understanding of language mediation he builds «fuller frame of the concept «translation»«

One more attempt of revision of the concept of language mediation is offered in N. K. Garbovsky's work «Translation theory» [17]. Defining the translation as «public function of communicative mediation between the people using different language systems» [17, page 215], Garbovsky allocates the central place in the book to theoretical justification of the interlingual transformations happening in translation process [17, page 358]. And here, as in these interlingual transformations adaptation is localized by him:

Adaptation is an extreme form of transformations, admissible in translation, and consists in substitution of the subject situation described in translation, another. Adaptation breaks semantic structure of the original speech work and, thus, can't be considered as means of achievement of equivalence of the translated text to the text of the original. However adaptation can be referred to means of achievement of adequacy in translation, i.e. to that boundary level of compliance outside which it is possible to speak about the translation only conditionally. [17, page 383]

Garbovsky considers all transformations (transformations) at three levels: 1) pragmatically, 2) semantic (denotative) and 3) semantic (significative). At the same time the adaptation caused by the requirement of «preservation of pragmatically value» of the initial message «for achievement of adequacy» the translation appears

at the semantic (denotative) level of transformations assuming that in translation other is described, than in the original, a subject situation. [17, page 392-393]

Besides, Garbovsky refers adaptation to pragmatically caused transformations which «aim at achievement in the target text of the communicative effect equivalent to that which can be revealed in the text of the original». [17, page 395]

Garbovsky, thus, shows that adaptation and transfer, being «transformations» (transformations), represent the phenomena of one order. A basic difference between them that at adaptation these transformations reach the most admissible depth:

Adaptation is the last step, having passed which, the translator leaves area of the translation and it turns out in the field of others, similar to the translation, but less strict forms of interlingual and cross-cultural mediation – papers, alterations, imitations, etc. [17, page 403]

In translation the Ukrainian researcher V. V. Demetskaya very densely is engaged in studying of a role of adaptation. She is an author not only sets of articles on this subject, but also the author of the monograph «The theory of adaptation: cross-cultural and problems of theory of translation» [18], she has also defended the doctoral dissertation on the subject «The Theory of Adaptation in Translation» [19].

What new we learn about adaptation and transfer in her works?

In the summary to the thesis it declares intention to refuse a traditional view of adaptation as by sight the language mediation providing «an extreme form of transformations, admissible in translation» and to offer approach, «according to which adequacy of the translation of pragmatically focused text is possible in the conditions of his adaptation to linguocultural stereotypes of the recipient». [19]

In this formulation the fact that adaptation is considered by Demetska only for a limited set of texts, namely «pragmatically focused texts» (or «pragmatist») – texts, «directed to change of behavior of the addressee» [20, page 4] attracts attention. She carries «the dictionary entry, an educational text type, an oratorical text type (a political performance, the sermon), an advertising text type» to such texts, at the same time emphasizing that the main attention is paid by her to texts of «political and religious discourses» [21, page 3].

The purpose of the translation of a pragmatist, across Demetskaya, consists in «a reconstruction of pragmatically potential of the text or a discourse in translation from the accounting of linguocultural stereotypes of native speakers and cultures of the recipient». [19]

Entering distinction between two types of the translation (translation strategy) – the «reproductive translation» (focused on «a reconstruction of a linguocultural code of the sender») and «the adaptive translation» («with proponent installation on language and cultural stereotypes of the recipient of the translated text»), – Demetskaya claims that «adequate translation as result of translation activity, is possible only on condition of the complementary nature of reproductive and adaptive strategy»; and, therefore, «adequate translation anyway assumes adaptation». At the same time she notes the following:

Various types of texts are tested different extent of adaptation, namely: adaptations can be subject elements of semantic, structural and pragmatically levels.

Therefore we suggest considering the following types of adaptation: 1) adaptation on hypertext level (structural and composite); 2) adaptation at the text level (stylistic); 3) adaptation at the hypo text level (lexico-semantic, grammatical). [22, page 37]

Demetskaya considers that the obligatory characteristic of transfer adaptation which distinguishes it both from the translation reproduction, and from other kinds of intertekst (summaries, commenting, transfer based on) is that «translation adaptation is consciously focused on comparison and check by the text of the original» [22, page 8]. In the adaptation she allocates two strategies: 1) adaptation of a text type and 2) adaptation of information of a text type, or adaptation of information; and she considers the last strategy not so much translation how many editorials. [22, page 18]. Demetskaya's statements for refusal of traditional definition of adaptation as «an extreme form of transformations, admissible in translation», we consider as polemic attack against the classical characteristic of adaptation of Jean Paul Win and Jean Darlene [23, page 164] or, is closer by today, against already quoted Garbovsky's formulation in [16]. By the way, between views of the last and Demetska, in our opinion, it is possible to find much in common. It is easy to notice, for example, that the typology of levels of adaptation offered Demetskaya has something in common with classification of translation transformations of Garbovsky. And it shouldn't be to us surprising because both Demetskaya, and Garbovsky look at adaptation and transfer as on equivalent kinds of activity and see a main objective of adaptation / translation transformations in preservation of pragmatically / communicative effect of the initial message.

Any speech work, except language material, from which is under construction, demands as a necessary condition of the of existence of three more components: subjects of the message, a situation in which it is carried out the communicative act and the participants of this act having both linguistic, and extra linguistic knowledge. The accounting of not language moments is one of necessary conditions of achievement of translation adequacy as through them the contents of the text reveal in many cases. The fact that the volume of these not language factors at the different people isn't identical therefore the translator shouldn't hope for that described, on - an example is known, in the source text (ST) an object will be available to the representative of the translating language (TL) in this connection the translator has to have all necessary competences to inform of the maintenance of IT in a look, clear for a translation receptor. In linguistic literature this moment is called pragmatically aspect of the translation. «Concept of pragmatists in linguistics (more widely - in semiotics) at all not amounts only to a concept pragmatically values language (and in general sign) units. This concept much wider - it includes all questions connected with various degree of understanding of communicative process of these or those language units and speech works and with their various treatment depending on language and not language (extra linguistic) experience of people, learning in communication»[46:107]. The pragmatics a feather - water is defined by V. N. Komissarov as «influence on the course and result of translation process of need to reproduce pragmatic -the sky potential of the original and aspiration to provide the desirable influence on a translation Receptor» [47:210]. Under pragmatic-the sky

potential of the original ability of the text is understood « communicative effect, to cause in the Receptor the pragmatically relations to reported, in other words, to carry out pragmatically impact on the recipient of information» [47:31]

On the basis of the definition offered by V. N. Komissarov it is possible to reveal the following chain of the consecutive processes which are coming to an end with concrete result: reproduction of pragmatically potential of IT → communicative effect on the recipient of TL → perception by a receptor of the translation of the initial message.

Before starting the translation, the translator needs - to wind lips a number of the essential moments promoting reproduction of pragmatically potential of the original for achievement of an objective i.e. to reach the desirable effect on the recipient of the translated text (TT). First, the translator has to understand the communicative intension of the creator of the text caused by some requirement. In - the second to establish proponent function of the text. Each text gives proponent function which purpose is to make definitionpragmatically impact on a text receptor. The given function is considered by the creator of the text by his drawing up, for example, texts of social and political character aim impacts on public. Thirdly, in pragmatically aspects of the translation much attention is paid to a communicative orientation an outcome - a message leg. A. Noybert allocates four types of texts taking into account that attraction of the pragmatically moments depends on type a feather - the driven text [48:197-198].

1) The texts of foreign policy -ideological character aiming to influence external public, i.e. citizens of other countries. Such texts are formed so that to render defined influence on certain a receptor. The accounting of the pragmatically moments at the translation of similar texts is necessary for achievement of the desirable effect.

2) The works of art calculated on SL carriers, but in many cases they are transferred to others of language therefore Pragmatic factors in them play an important role.

3) The texts interesting only SL carriers, for example, of newspaper materials. Texts of this kind are translated in the narrow scale in this connection the pragmatically moments aren't considered. However when it is necessary to translate, for example, any newspaper article, destination for reading by TL carriers, it is necessary to consider pragmatics.

4) The texts of scientific and technical character created for science purposes and focused both on SL carriers, and on the TL carriers which are engaged in this or that scientific sphere. Here isn't present necessity pragmatically to adapt ST in connection with presence at TL carriers of necessary information for understanding and disclosure of contents the text as in this case there is no need in an additionalexplanation. And at last, to reach the necessary communicative effect at the disposal of the translator there is a number of the receptions helping him thread those moments of IT which can be not understood by a receptors. These receptions make so-called transcription of the translation. Transcription represents the changes made to the target text with the purpose to achieve necessary reaction from a translation receptor. Writes the following about those changes which the translator does in the

text being translated A. Noybert «it is obliged - to undertake the translator such «changes» that the text of B which focuses the recipient of the management about operation of the car speaking on (TL) the same as the text and - speaking on (SL) has turned out. As a result there will be admissions, additions, shifts, transferring of accents etc. which if literally to translate them back, can seem speaking on (SL) a mangling, distortion, inadmissible addition, verbosity, admissions, change of habitual classification» [49:195]. This multilevel analytic operation made by the translator leads to that TL has made the same pragmatically impact on the receptor what was rendered by SL on the recipient. Here, however, it is necessary to specify the concept «communicative effect» or «pragmaticallyinfluence «. It isn't limited only to a concept of influence literally of this word, i.e. to cause concrete reaction in the reader or to force it to experience some emotions or feelings. It is wider, means also such moment as understanding the reader of contents of the message. The translator's task also consists in it. It means that the translator has to retell the matter of the original so that the receptor of the translation has understood contents of this text as receptor of the original understands the initial message. As for a concept of effect of the first value, it isn't always possible to reach it. Even the text focused on the people belonging to the same society causes different reaction owing to distinctions personal is given to these people, not to mention people of other culture, another world view. V. N. Komissarov fairly speaks about this fact: «identical reaction of readers of the original and the translation isn't necessarily purpose of any translation, and in certain cases she essential unattainable, owing to features of receptors of the translation, impossibility to define reaction of receptors of the original and a row of the reasons»[50:140]. Reactions of recipients of SL and TL can coincide only then if their personal characteristics of owls - fall, «if we compare a fan of all possible individual reactions to SL and the same fan of reactions to TL, then those will coincide individual reactions where coincide individual and personal characteristics of addressees of SL and TL. It means that archetypes of reactions of individuals, classes of reactions to SL and on TLcoincide. In this sense of equivalence of regulatory influence of SL and TL means literally the following: SL and TL give to the addressees the objective chance to react equally to the message and whether there will be reactions multilingual addressees equivalent, depends on extent of their coincidence personal properties» [50:32]. Translation it is intended for other person having other mentality, belonging to other society so far as adaptation of SL so that he was available to him, is necessary. Adaptation is carried out by means of extra linguistic information of the translator. There is some ways of adaptation of SL, somehow: 1) addition;

2) Omission; 3) generalization; 4) specification; 5) comments. We will give the following offer as an example of use of addition: «It is impossible to present Russia without Volga». Any Russian reader know what is Volga, however this information isn't supposed known for the English reader in this connection it is necessary to add the word «river» to TL.

## CONCLUSION

In the real operation the understanding of an entity of the translation as process of cross-language transformation, treated within what it is possible to call «semantic-semiotics model» is explained in general. The entity of this model, in anormalized look, is as follows: to the translator the text in this or that language (SL) representing the sequence of units belonging to this sign system (SL system) constructed by certain rules and bearing certain information is set. The task of the translator is conversion of this text to the equivalent to it the text in some other language (TL). The concept «equivalent» is understood in a sense «bearing the same information», that is having the same semantic contents, though differing on methods of expression of this contents.

As the text is the sequence language, in other words sign units, the semantic maintenance (value) of these units and all text in general can and shall be opened by establishment of communications between these units and something, lying out of them, that is disclosure of the relations between sign units and what they designate, and also the relations of sign units to each other. The relations of three types are established by such way: the relations between a sign and its reviewer, between a sign and «customer» of a sign (language collective) and between signs in this language system. In other words, values of three types - referentially, pragmatically and intra linguistic values reveal; and, as the text is not just the sequence of sign units, but the sequence definitely organized and integrated understanding of value of the text doesn't come down only to understanding of value of units entering it, but assumes, first of all, understanding of value of all text as whole,

The task of the translator, having understood value of the source text, to express the same value (more precisely, system of values) means of other language. At the same time, as there is a cross-language conversion, that is changeover of one sign system another (though same), the semantic losses concerning, first of all, system of intralinguistic values of the source text, but not only them are inevitable. The translator is obliged to achieve that these losses were minimized, that is to provide the biggest level of equivalence of the source text and target text (realizing that achievement of «absolute» equivalence is, in essence, the unattainable task, a certain ideal at which he shall aim, but reach which he will never manage). It, in turn, demands from it establishment of «an order of sequence of transmission of values», that is determination of what within this text needs to be saved first of all and then it is possible to sacrifice for the purpose of support of the maximum equivalence.

Though the most general principle of sequence can be formulated as the sequence «referentially values - pragmatically values - intra linguistic values», this principle quite often should be broken, especially in case of the translation of the texts having preferentially pragmatically or preferentially intra linguistic installation.

Thus, translation process from this point of view can be spread out to two main stages corresponding to two stages in operation of the translator over the text being translated - an analysis stage and a stage of synthesis. The entity of the first stage consists in understanding the translator of value (the amount or system of



values) the source text; an entity of the second stage - in expression of the same value (the same amount or system of values) means of other language. The first, that is the understanding, assumes establishment of hierarchy of language system - from a morpheme (in certain cases even phonemes or graphemes) to all text in general. The second, that is expression of the understood value means of other language, requires finding of appropriate units of expression of the same value at all levels of language hierarchy in TL. At the same time, owing to a discrepancy in the formal and semantic structure of units of SL and TL, numerous and difficult conversions or transformations are inevitable; however, remembering that any conversion is accompanied by a certain loss of information, the translator shall aim to reduce these transformations to a reasonable minimum as far as it norms (lexical, grammatical and stylistic) TL and extra linguistic pragmatically factors allow. Figuratively speaking the translator is stimulated to maneuver between Scylla of literalism and Haribald of free translation all the time, trying to find in between that narrow, but rather deep pass, going which, he will be able to come to the desired purpose - the most equivalent translation.

The basic concepts of the semantic-semiotics model of the translation offered by us are that, in general. It is thought that this model, in principle, can be quite formalized; however its formalization is imaginable only under certain conditions which are absent now. The main such condition is development of the adequate linguistic theory of values which would be rather strict and formalized. In this regard we are meanwhile very far from the purpose. First of all, problems of semantics were developed still, mainly, on material only of the lowest levels of language hierarchy, preferentially at the level of morphemes and words. Of semantic structure of units of higher order - phrases, sentences and the text in general - we meanwhile have only very vague idea. Meanwhile for translation theory would be especially important to develop the principles of «integration» of values of separate discrete language units within all speech work as single system - the task which execution we only begin to start.

Further, the theory of semantics (semasiology) was restricted still generally to a research the referential of values and almost didn't concern other types of values, that is pragmatically and intra-linguistic. At the same time the concept of equivalence of the translation implies the completest transmission of all information which is contained in the source text, and not just the referential of values of the language elements entering this text. At last, both for understanding, and the account and the extra linguistic factors defining process of speech communication - a subject («subject») of an expression, participants communicative is necessary for expression of all system of values of the speech work (text) process («sender» and «receiver») and an expression situation (time, the place and conditions in which communication process proceeds). Meanwhile we don't even know whether these extra linguistic aspects of speech activities of formalization give in and if yes, that in what forms it can be realized. The adequate translation theory, however, can't be built as exclusively micro linguistic discipline, in derivation from external, not language conditions of course of the speech act.

All these difficulties getting in the way of creation of exact and strict semantic-semiotics model of the translation are real and very big, but aren't insuperable. We believe that the specified model not only has the right for existence, but in a number of aspects it can be stronger, than other models. It is known that attempts to build translation theory, proceeding from units of the plan of expression («the translation of lexical units», «the translation of grammatical forms», «transmission of a word order» and so forth), were though the useful, but, in general, ineffective because for the translation important, first of all, that expresses, and how it expresses, it shall be subordinate to the first (as well as generally in any act of communication the transmitted data is the purpose, and ways of its transmission - means of achievement of this purpose). Therefore rather adequate and «strong» model of the translation shall be, first of all, model semantic; and as semantics, that is value, is function of a sign, it can't but be at the same time model semiotics. It doesn't mean that any other way to a study of the translation is impossible. The translation - too difficult and polygonal phenomenon completely to be laid down in inevitably limited frames of some one model or the theoretical diagram. The more will be such models and diagrams, the better, the more deeply we will be able to learn a translation entity. We will hope, in this regard, that the provisions advanced by us in this research and observations will be reasonably useful.

There is, however, also other aspect of the question - the practical Value of researches in the field of translation theory. For application-oriented discipline which the translation theory is this aspect is not of the secondary importance.

As it has been already noted though the translation theory proceeds from practice and, generalizing the material which is available at her order, draws the conclusions on its basis, she projects further these conclusions to practice in a look some of recommendations or standard installations. Relying on practice, the translation theory at the same time lays her a way. Therefore presently when the profession of the translator became really mass and when with the translation, as a matter of fact, it is necessary - in this or that form - acquaintance to basic provisions of translation theory it is absolutely necessary to deal to all who are anyway connected with a learning of foreign languages or with the types of work demanding use of knowledge of foreign languages for everyone who doesn't wish to work in this area blindly and, so to speak, anew «to peddle old stuff» where she is already opened by efforts of others. Without evidence-based translation theory nowadays there can't be a successful translation practice - such is an indisputable truth which is useless to be challenged. At the same time it is impossible to believe, of course, fondly that knowledge of provisions and the principles of translation theory can replace with themselves skill of the translator. Always it is necessary to remember that «... the translation is something much bigger, than science. It as well ability, and quite high-quality translation, eventually, always is also art.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 Сепир Э. Коммуникация. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии. М.: 1993. – 655 с.
- 2 Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. - М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. – 203 с.
- 3 R.H. Robins. General Linguistics. An Introductory Survey. London, 1971
- 4 Берков В.П. Вопросы двуязычной лексикографии (Словник). - Л., 1973
- 5 Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: (Учеб. пособие) — М.: Слово, 2000. - 624 с.
- 6 Ермолович Д.И. Имена собственные на стыке языков и культур. — М.: Валент, 2001. - 200с.
- 7 Энциклопедия «Кругосвет». [www.krugosvet.ru](http://www.krugosvet.ru) / под. ред. Беккера, Демидовой, Мельвиля, 2005
- 8 Веселовский С.Б. Ономастикон / Древнерусские имена, прозвища и фамилии. - М.: Наука 1974. – 382 с.
- 9 Жапова. Д.Н. Антропонимы как этноисторическое явление // Бытие и язык. Новосибирск, 2004. - С. 216-219)
- 10 Системы личных имен у народов мира. Отв. ред. М.В.Крюков. - М.: Наука, 1989
- 11 Калакуцкая Л.П. Фамилии. Имена. Отчества. Написание и склонение. - М.: 1994, 256с.
- 12 Унбегаун Б.О. Русские фамилии. - М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 435 с.
- 13 Королева И.А. Происхождение фамилий и отчеств на Руси. - Смоленск, СмолГПИ, 1999. – 174 с.
- 14 And. Neubert. Pragmatische Aspekte der? bersetzung. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift, «Fremdsprachen», II, Leipzig, 1968, SS.
- 15 A. D. Schweitzer. Translation and linguistics, page 245
- 16 K. Chukovsky. High art. M, «Art», 1964, page 119
- 17 E. Nida and Ch. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden, 1969, p. 134
- 18 B. M. Kedrov. Lenin and dialectics of natural sciences of the 20th century. M, «Science», 1971, page 175.
- 19 «Science and life», 1972, N 4, page 80
- 20 A. I. Smirnitsky. Syntax of English, 1957, page 8 – 9
- 21 A. I. Smirnitsky. Yaza English morphology. 1959, pages 289 – 310
- 22 V. I. Lenin. Half-N of C.Ed., t. 24, page 125
- 23 E.Nida. Translation science. «Linguistics questions», 1970, N 4, page 11
- 24 [R. A. Hall. Introductory Linguistics. Philadelphia, 1964, PP. 13 - 14, 469]
- 25 «Materials of the scientific conference «Text Linguistics», MGPIIYa of M. Thorez, M., 197
- 26 L. I. Smirnitsky. Objectivity of existence of language, page 19
- 27 A. K. Zholkovsky, I. A. Melchuk. To creation of the working model of the «sense-the text» language. «Machine translation and application-oriented

- linguistics», the issue II, M., 1969, page 5 - 6.]
- 28 V. A. Звегитцев. Linguistics history the 19-20th century in sketches and extraction. P. I. M., «Education», 1964, page 91
- 29 G. Trager and of N. of Smith. An Outline of English Structure. Washington, 1957, p. 81 – 82]
- 30 F. de Saussure. Course of the general linguistics. M, Sotsekgiz, 1933, P. 207
- 31 G.V.Kolshansky. Functions of paralinguistic means in language communication. «Linguistics questions», 1973, page 1
- 32 G. V. Kolshansky. Decree, page 21
- 33 Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). М.высш. шк, 1990
- 34 Комиссаров В.Н. Общая теория перевода (Проблемы переводоведения в освещении зарубежных ученых). М.: ЧеРо, 1999
- 35 Toury, Gideon. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995
- 36 Крупнов В.Н. В творческой лаборатории переводчика (Очерки по профессиональному переводу) М.: Междунар. Отношения, 1976
- 37 Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод / Л. С. Бархударов. – М., 1975. – 240 с.
- 38 Швейцер А. Д. Текст и перевод / А. Д. Швейцер. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 216 с.
- 39 Бурак А. Л . Translation Culture – 1. Words . Перевод и межкультурная коммуникация – 1. Слова / А . Л . Бурак. – М.: Р. Валент, 2010. – 216 с.
- 40 Lawrence D. H. Collected Stories / D. H. Lawrence. – L.: Everyman's Library, 1994. – 1397 p.
- 41 Слепович В. С. Курс перевода (английский – русский язык): учеб. пособ. / В. С. Слепович. – 7-е изд. – Мн.: ТетраСистемс, 2009. – 320 стр.
- 42 Карабан В. І. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури / В. І. Карабан. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2002. – 564 с.
- 43 Retsker I. Theory of the transfer and translation practice. M, 1974. P. 41.
- 44 Демецкая, В.В Адаптация в переводе: теоретический аспект Тезисы докладов. СПб.: Факультет филологии и искусств СПбГУ, 2007 107 с
- 45 Комиссаров 1990, Теория перевода(лингвистические аспекты М.: Высшая школа, 1990
- 46 Ноиберт. Прагматические аспекты перевода. Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике: Сб.статей М.: Международные отношения, 1978
- 47 Комиссаров 1999, Современное переводоведение, М.: 1999
- 48 Латышев 2008, Технология перевода: М Академия 1998