



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2020; 6(5): 445-447
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 21-02-2020
Accepted: 24-03-2020

Aslonov Shahram Sherzodovich
Samarkand State Institute of
Foreign Languages, Faculty of
Translation Theory and
Practice, Translation Theory
And Practice English
Language, Second Year
Student, Uzbekistan

**Ruzimurodova Zarina
Dusmurod Kizi**
Samarkand State Institute of
Foreign Languages, Faculty of
Roman-Germanic Philology,
Second Year Student,
Uzbekistan

Correspondence Author:
Aslonov Shahram Sherzodovich
Samarkand State Institute of
Foreign Languages, Faculty of
Translation Theory And
Practice, Translation Theory
And Practice English
Language, Second Year
Student, Uzbekistan

Problems of the general theory of translation

Aslonov Shahram Sherzodovich and Ruzimurodova Zarina Dusmurod Kizi

Abstract

The article is devoted to the study of the theory of translation, the "essence" of translation. On the problems encountered when translating text from one language to any other languages.

Keywords: Translation, synchronous, consecutive, speech activity, communication, language means, interpretation, equivalence, identity

Introduction

The theory of translation is often divided into general, special and particular theories of translation. The general theory of translation should presumably study the "essence" of translation, which is characteristic of all types and subtypes (types and subspecies) of translation (written, oral; synchronous, consecutive by ear and from the sheet; one-sided, two-sided, scientific, technical, official, military, socio-political, artistic, cinematic, etc.) from any language to any other. It is believed that, in principle, it can illustrate its provisions in any pair of specific languages and in any form or subspecies of translation. In other words, the presentation of the fundamentals of the general theory of translation does not require the coverage of all languages of the world and all types and subspecies of translation, which is technically and impracticable. Special translation theories should study the specifics of types and subtypes of translation either for all languages of the world (general special translation theories) or for a specific pair of languages (private special translation theories). Private translation theories should study the specifics of translation from one particular language to another, either with respect to all types and subtypes of translation (general particular translation theories), or with reference to specific types and subtypes of translation (private special translation theories). The expressions "special theories of translation" and "special theories of translation" are synonymous in this scheme. For each pair of languages, two general particular theories of translation are usually constructed ("round trip", for example, from French into Russian and from Russian into French, etc.) and many special particular theories of translation (depending on how many independent types and subtypes of translation are distinguished), multiplied by two more (also "there and back").

So far, the question of the typology (classification of types and subspecies) of translation, which largely predetermines the scientific development of the nomenclature of translation specialties and specializations (narrow specialties) within the framework of the profession of a translator, the methods of teaching translation and the definition of the most required set of special translation theories, cannot be considered finally resolved. There is no consensus among translation specialists on the problem of typology of translation. What some authors call "types" or "types" of translation (for example, interpretation and translation), other authors call "forms" of translation, distinguishing them from types or types of translation (literary, scientific and technical, etc.), subdivided still on the "genres" of translation. Sometimes computer translation is also referred to such "forms" of translation, although, in principle, computer texts can be translated both written and oral, and it is logical to contrast computer translation only with "human" translation. Whereas for one authors, the types and subtypes of translation distinguished by them (for example, one-way and two-way translation, translation from a sheet) seem indisputable, other authors do not consider them to be independent types or subspecies of a translation at all, calling, for example, a translation from a sheet "transfer reception". A number of authors are inclined to call

"Types of translation" something that is certainly more appropriate to relate to the methods and techniques of translation (for example, literal and descriptive translation, tracing, transliteration, etc). Some authors attribute to the "types of translation" various qualitative gradations of the translation (adequate translation, mediocre translation, literal translation, free translation, etc). Many authors strive to bring any kind of language mediation under the concept of translation, including abstracting, annotating, retelling, adapting, or altering the originals, which causes objections from other authors who prefer to speak here not about "actual translation" but about "adaptive transcoding", about "quasi-translation" or even about "pseudo-translation." Therefore, the typologies of translation and lists of translation specialties proposed by different authors coincide only partially and the differences between them are sometimes quite large (Ba Khoudary 1975: 4649; 1987 Vannikov: 3155 ^[2]; Komissarov 1980: 119126 ^[7]; 1984 Commissars Lilova 1985, 3537, 223239 ^[9]; Minyar Beloruchev 1980 ^[10], 516, 144155; Pronina 1986:125129 ^[12]).

The qualification of inter language correspondences established in practical bilingual lexicography and comparative linguistics is controversial. Some authors attribute them to the field of translation and use the term "vocabulary (lexicographic) translation," while others believe that only text-text conversions are legitimate. Perhaps the last point of view is nourished by the concept according to which there are no meanings in the language, no information, these phenomena appear only in speech, in context. However, it remains a mystery not only all the same, lexicographers and linguists manage to look for a semantic commonality between the "insignificant" isolated units of different languages, but also how people from language units without meanings create meanings in speech that are understandable to other people. Recognizing the existence of linguistic meanings before speaking does not necessarily lead to recognition of the appearance of information in texts. The meanings of the linguistic signs themselves do not contain information due to the fact that they are known in advance to the communicants and therefore are "redundant", although he states that people could not communicate without knowing the meanings before the speech. Here the conclusion is already drawn about the "lack of information" of language, speech (texts) and knowledge. Information should probably be considered something new, unknown, which after turning into knowledge ceases to be information, although it remains unclear how such a transition from information (ignorance) to knowledge can be made. According to some authors, although information is transmitted through texts, knowledge is contained and accumulated only in language units, the texts are not primary, but the knowledge that exists before the texts and after reading the texts are not stored in the memory of a person in the form of texts memorized by heart and not even with the help of words, and with the help of "semantic shares" ("elementary semantic attributes") whose nature is not yet exactly known (Vereshchagin, Kostomarov 1980:4964) ^[3]. Here again, the meaning of creating and storing texts, transmitting them from generation to generation, remains unclear. References to non-written societies prove little. According to some authors, the term "text" applies only to the field of written language (Halperin 1981:1819). The text is considered only

written speech, consisting of many utterances (the question of the minimum utterances sufficient to recognize this written entity as a text is usually bypassed). From this point of view, there are no texts in non-written societies, and interpretation does not deal with texts. However, if you still require the texts to be "units of communication" ("communication"), then such units exist in the sphere of oral speech (Kolshansky 1984:89126) ^[6], because otherwise communication with it would be impossible. As regards such properties as connectedness, integrity, completeness, etc., oral texts also possess them to one degree or another, but their presence is not an obligatory attribute of the text in itself. In addition, oral and written texts are created and operate in completely different communicative situations, and they do not have to be built in exactly the same way, therefore oral and written versions of the same language form relatively independent systems (Amirova 1985:1853; Gelb 1982:1333) ^[1, 5]. This is confirmed by the fact that some translators successfully cope with the translation of written texts from a language other than their native language, without knowing the pronunciation of the words they translate and without understanding the foreign language of speech. In many literate societies, there is a strictly fixed tradition of teaching especially important oral texts, without which it is hardly possible to effectively transmit culture from one generation to another. In non-written societies, where such a tradition is not sufficiently developed, there is a loss of cultural information. Such texts can be gleaned from texts that cannot be obtained through semantic and etymological analysis of the language. If knowledge is contained and accumulated in units of the language, then it is contained and accumulated in texts, as long as the latter consist of a unit language, but this knowledge is of a different order compared to knowledge contained in units of the language.

There are many definitions of the concept of translating texts from one verbal (verbal) language to another or the characteristics of the essence of such a translation. Translation is "the transfer of information contained in this work of speech, means of another language."

In the wording of L.S. Barkhudarova "translation refers to the process of converting a speech work in one language into a speech work in another language while maintaining an unchanged plan of content, that is, meaning" (Barkhudarov 1975:11) ^[2]. In the understanding of I.R. Halperin "translation is the transfer of semantic content and stylistic features of statements in one language by means of another language" (Halperin 1987:20). Translation is a socially necessary and mediating communication process for converting text in the source language into text in any other language, in which it only serves as a source of information for people who do not speak the source language. In the opinion of G.V Kolshansky, "translation as one of the most important types of communicative activity focuses primarily on the full and adequate transmission of the original language containing the entire totality of implications of the linguistic, social and cultural plan" (Kolshansky 1980:112) ^[7]. According to V.N. Komissarov, "translation can be defined linguistically as a special kind of correlated functioning of languages" (Komissarov 1980:37) ^[7]. Translation is the transmission of information, more precisely, the translator decrypts the information of the original author contained in the text of his work, re-encoding (re-encrypting) it in the system of his language,

and the information contained in his text is again decoded by the reader of the translation. According to A. Lilova, from the epistemological point of view, "translation is an adequate reflection and creative re-expression of the original," translation as a result of translation activity is "an analogue of the original," and translation as a process "is a specific oral or written activity aimed at reconstructing the existing oral language or a written text (work) in another language while maintaining the invariance of the content and qualities of the original, as well as author's authenticity" (Lilova 1985:3233)^[10]. As suggested by Yu. N Marchuk, a translation from one natural language to another can be interpreted "as the process of creating in another language some text (oral or written), equivalent in content and ways of language expression to the source text" (Marchuk 1985:38). R.K Minyar Beloruchev speaks the following definition of translation: "translation is a type of speech activity that doubles communication components, the purpose of which is to transmit a message in cases where the codes used by the source and recipient do not match" (Minyar Beloruchev 1980:39)^[11]. To translate this means to adequately understand what is adequately recreated by means of another language, to reproduce taking into account the interaction of content and form. According to A. The Fedorov, "to translate means to express correctly and fully by means of one language, which has already been expressed by means of another language, and it is precisely in the fidelity and completeness of the transmission that he sees the difference between the translation itself and the alteration, from retelling or abridged exposition, from any kind of so-called "adaptations" Fedorov 1983b:1011^[14]. According to A.F Shiryayev, "translation is a type of specialized speech activity based on the use of two languages in order to recreate speech statements in one language that are equivalent in form and content to speech utterances in another language" (Shiryayev 1982:12)^[15]. One can mean by the "actual translation" cases when the translator translates the original according to predetermined inter language correspondences (for example, dictionary) without addressing the situation of reality, wide context and past experience, and cases, when there is an appeal of the translator to the indicated phenomena, call "interpretation". It should be noted that there are almost as many definitions of a correct translation as there are authors who discuss the subject and develop the concept of "dynamic equivalence" of a translation, according to which any translation can be recognized depending on specific needs and circumstances — from super-literal to super-arbitrary.

References

1. Amirova T.M. Functional relationship between written and sound language –M: Science, 287.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. Questions of general and particular theory of translation –M: International relations, 1975, 240.
3. Vannikov Yu V. Scientific and technical translation as a special type of activity (structure, research and rationalization prospects) // scientific and technical translation –M: Nauka, 1987, 3155.
4. Vereshchagin E.M, Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture. Linguistic and Terrestrial Word Theory –M: Russian language, 1980, 160.
5. Galperin I.R. Introduction // The big English dictionary –4th ed, T.I –M: Russian language, 1987, 1121.
6. Gelb I.E. Experience in the study of writing (Fundamentals of grammar) –M: Rainbow, 1982, 367.
7. Kolshansky G.V. Contextual semantics M: Nauka, 1980, 149.
8. Komissarov V.N. Linguistics translation –M: International relations, 1980, 166.
9. Komissarov V.N. Translation and language mediation // Notebook translator –M: Higher school, 1984; 21:1826.
10. Lilova A. Introduction to the general theory of translation Per with Bulg –M: Higher school, 1985, 256.
11. Minyar –Beloruchev R.K. General Theory of translation and interpretation –M: Military Publishing., 1980, 237.
12. Pronina R.F. Translation of scientific and technical literature –3rd Ed, Rev. and add –M: Higher school, 1986, 175.
13. Fedorov A.V. The art of translation and the life of literature. Essays L: Sov Writer, 1983a, 252.
14. Fedorov A.V. Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (Linguistic problems) –4th Ed, Revised and add –M: Higher school, 1983b, 303.
15. Shiryayev A.F. Picture of speech processes and translation, Translation as a linguistic problem –M: Publishing house of Moscow state university, 1982, 312.